


The Story Infinite

 aymon de tigliettem

INTRODUCTION

No matter from which side the modern church is looked at, it is about invisible, without influence, weak and stunned.

This is the result of at least two situations that have entered the church and put deep roots in her bosom:

Pietism and the World

Pietism retires the church in a spiritual only state, away from the sinful and evil world to the Christian "fortress". The end result is that the "Salt and Light" are taken away from the world and cease to proclaim the Kingdom of God for they are now in the Christian citadel under a bushel, exactly contrary to what our Lord has commanded. We could say: "Ichabod".

The world's effect is more penetrating and perhaps more destructive. It may seem a paradox that the pietistic churches (most, these days) are those with little defense against the world's lures. Almost wanting it, the Pietists have slowly brought the ways of the world in the church's womb and have assimilated its most flattering manifestations, such as: democracy, equality of sexes, egalitarianism, even illuminism, and, believe it or not the theory of Evolution.

These choices have revealed themselves lethal and deadly for both the purity of the church as to her very existence. These days if someone sticks exactly to what is written on the Bible he is immediately branded as "fundamentalist", intended as a defecated word, intended as categorizing one out of reality, out of the world. Well out of the world, yes. These brethren must have forgotten that all we know about God has come out of the Bible and the same applies to what God wants from us, created creatures out of nothing and kept in life by God Himself. There is no other personal revelation of God outside the Bible, so why are we seeking truth in the world???

Today we read something in the Bible and say: "Yes, OK! But these things were for other days, now we are more modern and know more, beside we more emancipated." Really? What are we actually saying? We are effectively affirming that we are not believing in the Bible, or at least, the Word of God has to be interpreted according to our times, tunes, culture and, ABOVE ALL, to us. But if we put in doubt a part of the Bible, what have we actually done? We have in effect reduced the Bible to a nullity, because, for us, there is nothing of absolute in the Verb having lost the point of divine reference in replaced it with our shifting references. Bu what saith mighty God: [For I am the LORD, I change not;](#) ([Malachi 3:6 AV](#))

Now, having become like the world, in facts and deeds, obviously we have nothing to say to it, we are, as plainly seen in all places, useless and of naught influence.

One of the major contemporary problems of the church is the feministic "revolution", a true child of the world that of divine has nothing (actually it is truly satanic) that has corrupted their mind and has even dragged the majority of men into it putting the church upside down (seems a veritable Eden II, see [Adjunct D](#)). Even the existence of Adam and Eve as real human beings is put to the ridicule, but if we

do not believe that the first 3 chapters of Genesis speak of real persons, we might as well throw the Bible away for in that case it is useless.

Well let us see a little of what that implies concerning the relationship between man and woman.

INDEX

[INTRODUCTION](#)

[THE FOUNDATION](#)

[THE ROLE OF MAN](#)

[THE ROLE OF WOMAN](#)

[HOW DOES JESUS BEHAVES TOWARDS HIS HEAD - GOD !!](#)

[Didactic arguments not supported by the Word but deduced from It.](#)

[ADJUNCT A: \[Prophetesses and other females\]\(#\)](#)

[ADJUNCT B: \[Are women permitted to be deacons?\]\(#\)](#)

[ADJUNCT C: \[Are women permitted to teach or preach?\]\(#\)](#)

[ADJUNCT D: \[Eve Is Again Listening to the Voice of the Serpent\]\(#\)](#)

[ADJUNCT E: \[What doe the Greek 5399 says!!!\]\(#\)](#)

[ADJUNCT F: \[The case of Galatians 3:28\]\(#\)](#)

[ADJUNCT G: \[Egalitarian Priesthood!!!\]\(#\)](#)

[ADJUNCT H: \[Dress Symbolism\]\(#\)](#)

[ADJUNCT I: \[The Head Covering A Biblical Perspective\]\(#\)](#)

[ADJUNCT J: \[What About Women Wearing Pants?\]\(#\)](#)

THE FOUNDATION

BELIEVE YE THAT THE BIBLE IN ITS COMPLETENESS IS INERRANT?
if not, READ NO MORE, FOR IT WOULD BE USELESS TO YOU.

BELIEVE YE THAT IT IS THE BIBLES THAT INTERPRETS THE WORLD, THE SOCIETY AND TIMES,

AND NOT VICE VERSA?

THEN READ WHAT THE WORD OF GOD SAYS ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MAN AND WOMAN.

01.	The man, Adam, was created first.	And Jehovah God formed the man <i>out of</i> dust from the ground, (Genesis 2:7a)
02.	The man received the breath of life.	and blew into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. (Gen 2:7b)
03.	The woman was not created but extracted from Adam.	And the rib, which the LORD God had taken from man, made he a woman , and brought her unto the man. (Genesis 2:22 AV)
04.	Nevertheless the woman is of the same essence of man for she was derived from the man, and it is for this reason that the man has the pre-eminence.	And Adam said, This <i>is</i> now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man . (Genesis 2:23 AV)
05.	The original words say this:	for Man = iysh for Wo-man = ish-shash (from man)
06.	The woman was made specifically for the man, as his helper and for his needs. Without the man there is no reason, for the woman, to be, obviously. The man was not created for the woman.	And the LORD God said, <i>It is</i> not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him . (Genesis 2:18 AV)
07.	The man Adam received his punishment as the federal head of the human species and for listening to his wife to participate in the transgression.	And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife , and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee , saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed <i>is</i> the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; (Genesis 3:17 AV)
08.	The woman Eve received her punishment for having disobeyed the order of the Lord, passed on to her by Adam, on her own independent rebellion.	Unto the woman he said, <u>I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception</u> ; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; <u>and thy desire shall be to thy husband</u> , <u>and he shall rule over thee</u> . (Genesis 3:16 AV)
09.	The woman, for her sin, is condemned to a state of affliction and submission, a just punishment for that sin, in which she tried to gratify the desire of her eyes, of her flesh and of her ego. Her sin was the catalyst that brought the world into a valley of tears.	Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception ; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire <i>shall be</i> to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. (Genesis 3:16 AV)
10.	The original phrase "your desires" appears only two other times, besides here. The second time is referred to Cain signifying that sin has "his	If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire , and thou

	desires" to possess him. Is this not what we see today's women doing, wanting to possess what God has given to man!	shalt rule over him. (Genesis 4:7 AV)
11.	"and he shall rule over thee" is none other than God's command "wives be subjected to your husbands". If the man had not sinned he would have governed with wisdom and love, if the woman had not sinned, she would have obeyed with humility and docility.	Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire <i>shall be</i> to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. (Genesis 3:16 AV)
12.	Adam gave to all animals their names, and thus he was in Eden quite a long time before the "cloning" of Eve. The number of animals was enormous and it takes time to come up with new names, try it. In all this time Adam was not seduced by the evil one.	And out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought <i>them</i> unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. (Genesis 2:19 AV)
13.	Eve fell in transgression soon after her entry into the scene, for it was commanded them to procreate and she was not pregnant when they were expelled out of Eden.	And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply , and replenish the earth, (Genesis 1:28 AV) And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived , and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD. (Gen 4:1 AV)
14.	The man Adam named the woman, just as he had done with the animals.	And Adam called his wife s name Eve; because she was the mother of all living. (Genesis 3:20 AV)
15.	The Kingdom of God is not democratic nor egalitarian, but theocratic and hierarchic and the head of the woman is the man.	But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ ; and the head of the woman is the man ; and the head of Christ is God. (1 Corinthians 11:3 AV)
16.	The man is the image and the glory of God.	For a man indeed ought not to cover <i>his</i> head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God . (1 Corinthians 11:7a)
17.	Whilst the woman is the glory of man. but the woman is the glory of the man. (1 Corinthians 11:7b AV)
18.	The order of creation.	For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. (1Co 11:8 AV)
19.	The woman's "raison d'être" (reason to be).	Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man. (1 Corinthians 11:9 AV)
20.	The man and the woman are of the same essence and even though the woman comes from the man, man is born by a woman and everything is of God.	Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman <i>is</i> of the man, even so <i>is</i> the man also by the woman; but all things of God. (1 Corinthians 11:11-12 AV)

21.	The whole of the above is summarized thus:	For Adam was first formed , then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression . (1 Timothy 2:13-14 AV)
22.	For these two reasons the woman is placed in submission to the man and she cannot teach nor have authority over the man but she be in silence . To note that the comma after "teach" makes the verb general thus not only referring to the man but to all aspects of life.	But I suffer not a woman to teach , nor to usurp authority over the man , but to be in silence . (1 Timothy 2:12 AV)
23.	Some modernists could possibly even concede that the woman is subjected to the man only on spiritual things, but the word of God says: " in everything "	Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so <i>let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing</i> . (Eph 5:24 AV)
24.	In silence and under obedience as also saith the law. This is a reference to Gen 3:16 " and he shall rule over thee ". With this the Apostle evidences the reason as to why women must not speak in the church or preach or teach publicly or being involved with ministerial functions, or any other form of governing for these are acts of power and government and thus contrary to the submission God, in His Law, exacts of women towards men.	Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak ; but <i>they are commanded</i> to be under obedience , as also saith the law . (1 Corinthians 14:34 AV)
25.	And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home . The objection comes: "and if the husbands cannot teach?". In this case, approved by their husbands, they can be taught by pastors, elders or other godly men, at their home.	And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home : for it is a shame for women to speak in the church. (1 Corinthians 14:35 AV)
26.	Women can prophesy and pray what she receives from the Lord, if she wears long hair and having the sign of submission on her head. The hair is ordinary covering whilst the veil (not a hat) is covering when praying or prophesying in meetings. The woman cannot lead in prayers.	But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven. (1 Corinthians 11:5 AV) But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for <i>her</i> hair is given her for a covering . (1 Corinthians 11:15 AV)
27.	Whilst the man must not cover his head when praying and prophesying for he is the image and glory of God. .	Every man praying or prophesying, having <i>his</i> head covered, dishonoureth his head. (1 Corinthians 11:4 AV) For a man indeed ought not to cover his head , forasmuch as he is the image and glory

		of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. (1 Corinthians 11:7 AV)
28.	The original Greek word that describes the relationship of the woman towards the man is "Phoebe" which means "fear". (see adjunct E)	the wife see that she reverence (phoebe) <i>her</i> husband. (Ephesians 5:33 AV) While they behold your chaste conversation <i>coupled</i> with fear (phobos). (1 Peter 3:2 AV)
29.	Or are you thinking that the Word of God came from you, and you alone?	What? came the word of God out from you? or came it unto you only? (1 Corinthians 14:36 AV)
30.	Or are we contentious?	But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God. (1 Corinthians 11:16 AV)
31.	Paul says that these are commandments of the Lord.	If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord. (1 Corinthians 14:37 AV)
32.	To be remembered, always.	Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed <i>it</i> , Why hast thou made me thus? (Romans 9:20 AV) Why dost thou strive against Him? for he giveth not account of any of his matters. (Job 33:13 AV)

THE ROLE OF THE MAN

01.	He must accept the role of headship of the family and be responsible of it to God and in front of men.	One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (1 Timothy 3:4 AV) the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. (1 Timothy 3:12 AV)
02.	He must provide for his family and ever ready to defend it.	But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel. (1 Timothy 5:8 AV)
03.	To take care of his wife as Christ takes care of His church.	Husbands, love your wives , even as Christ also loved the church and gave Himself up on its behalf, 26 that He might sanctify it, cleansing <i>it</i> by the washing of the water in <i>the Word</i> , that

		He might present it to Himself as the glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such things, but that it be holy and without blemish. So, husbands ought to love their wives as their <i>own</i> bodies, (he loving his wife loves himself), for then no one hated his <i>own</i> flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, even as also the Lord the church. (Ephesians 5:25-29)
04.	To love (AGAPE) his wife to the point of giving his life as Jesus gave His for the church.	Husbands, <u>love (agape)</u> your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; (Ephesians 5:25 AV)
05.	To live with his wife in understanding.	Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with <i>them</i> according to knowledge , giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered. (1 Peter 3:7 AV)
06.	Not to be bitter against wife.	Husbands, love <i>your</i> wives, and be not bitter against them. (Colossians 3:19 AV)
07.	Giving honour to the wife as the weaker vessel and as being co-heir onto salvation.	Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with <i>them</i> according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered. (1 Peter 3:7 AV)

THE ROLE OF THE WOMAN

01.	The permanent status in the Word of God is that women be married, if not kept virgin by their father.	But the man who is strong in mind and purpose, who is not forced but has control over his desires, does well if he comes to the decision to keep her a virgin . (1Co 7:37)
02.	To be married and to reproduce, keep the home, live a godly life. Not given to a career, but dedicated to husband, children, home and charity. Pro 31:10-31, see " <u>the perfect wife</u> "	Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing , if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety. (1 Timothy 2:15 AV) I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully . (1 Timothy 5:14 AV)
03.	To love (Phileo) her husband and children, dedicated to home works, chaste, good, obedient to her own husband, teaching younger women	4 That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, 5 <i>To be</i> discreet, chaste, keeps at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed . (Titus 2:4-5 AV)

	to do the same.	
04.	To succour those in need. the wife of one man, Well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work. (1 Timothy 5:9-10 AV)
05.	Their example and blessing is Sarah Abraham.	¶ Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; While they behold your chaste conversation <i>coupled with fear</i> . Whose adorning let it not be that outward <i>adorning</i> of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel; But <i>let it be</i> the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, <i>even the ornament</i> of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price. 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 Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters ye are , as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement. (1 Peter 3:1-6 AV)
06.	The woman, even though the weaker vessel, she is nevertheless co-heir to salvation.	Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with <i>them</i> according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered. (1 Peter 3:7 AV)
07.	God used the woman, the glory of man, to bring the Saviour into the world.	Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. (Matthew 1:23 AV)

HOW DOES JESUS BEHAVES TOWARDS HIS HEAD - GOD !!

But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. (1 Corinthians 11:3 AV)

01.	He did not rebelled against the calling of His head, God, nor did he pulled back, nor disobedient thoughts were found in Him.	5 The Lord GOD hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back. 6 I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting. (Isaiah 50:5-6 AV)
02.	His greatest pleasure is to do His Father's bidding and to obey His every commands. His only "food" is to do the Will of His Father and only that one, not His own.	I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart. (Psalms 40:8 AV) Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work. (John 4:34 AV) For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me. (John 6:38 AV)
03.		

	Of His own he cannot do anything, as ourselves. Nor He wants to do of His own, only the Will of the Father.	I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me. (John 5:30 AV)
04.	The Father did not abandon Him for He always does the Will of the Father and thus He ever dwells in His Love. The same, Christ within us, if we observe His commandments.	And he that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him. (John 8:29 AV) If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love. (John 15:10 AV)
05.	Jesus obeyed the Will of the Father from the beginning, even to be found in the form of man.	And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. (Philippians 2:8 AV)
06.	Even if the command of His Head was onerous and painful, He did not avoid it, but limited Himself simply to ask with humility to ask if at all possible to avoid it, saying : "not my will, Father, but Yours be done".	And he went a little further, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou <i>wilt</i> . (Matthew 26:39 AV) He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done. (Matthew 26:42 AV)
07.	Continuously He deeply committed Himself to complete the Works His Head commanded, even to the death on the cross.	I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work. (John 9:4 AV) I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. (John 17:4 AV) When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost. (John 19:30 AV)

Having seen Jesus' behaviour, our supreme example, towards His Head (God, His Father) how should the man behave towards his Head (Jesus, the Son) and how should the woman behave towards her head (the man, the image and glory of God)?

Didactic arguments not supported by the Word but deduced from It.

01.	A woman can be a Deacon in the church.	<p>The Bible states that both Elders and Deacons should be husbands of only one wife. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. (1 Timothy 3:12 AV)</p> <p>This does not mean that these men have to be necessarily married (for polygamy is in mind here) but it does clearly mean that they need to have the attributes to be marry to a woman, that is, be men. It would be rather interesting to see a woman, husband of only one woman. See adjunct B</p>
02.	Was Phebe in Romans 16:1 a deacon?	<p>Certainly not. The sense of the word used here is to describe her as a "servant" with the meaning that all believers are servants of God. See adjunct B</p>
03.	<p>It is claimed that because some women, having acted like men, had success, it is proof that God has blessed this activity.</p>	<p>That women having acted by themselves, contrary to the Word, have had success as interpreted by the world could also be true. But this does not necessarily imply that God has blessed this work, for even the heathen can show apparent success.</p> <p>What to say then of the success of the Jehovah witnesses? They can show a pretty good growth. Has God blessed their work?</p> <p>And what to say of the spreading of Roman Catholicism? The Pope can attract millions at his open air meetings. Has God blessed this christo-pagan religion?</p> <p>Shall we consider those Christian missionaries that have given their best years to spread the Gospel with apparent little results? There are quite a few in that situation whilst many others have even lost their lives. Has God not blessed them?</p> <p>And those in Hebrews 11:36-37? Were they un-blessed?</p>
04.	<p>The four daughters of Philip prophesied in <u>their father's home</u>. (see "the role of women" 01)</p> <p>To note that nothing of what these girls have presumably said is recorded in the Word. At least Paul did not take enough notice of that to write it down. But they had to await the coming</p>	<p>And the next day we that were of Paul's company departed, and came unto Caesarea: and we entered into the house of Philip the evangelist, which was one of the seven; and abode with him. And the same man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy. And as we tarried there many days, there came</p>

	<p>of the prophet Agabus to hear what the Spirit was saying, and this is recorded.</p> <p>Note also that Philip kept his daughters virgin.</p>	<p>down from Judaea a certain prophet, named Agabus. And when he was come unto us, he took Paul s girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said, Thus saith the Holy Ghost, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver <i>him</i> into the hands of the Gentiles. (Acts 21:8-11 AV)</p>
05.	<p>MIRIAM - DEBORAH - HULDAH - ANNA - PRISCILLA and other females.</p>	<p>To note that everyone of these prophetesses were under the authority of the man: Miriam under Moses, Deborah and Huldah under their husbands, the daughters of Philip under their father, Anna under the High priest, and the female donkey of Balaam (that prophesied) under her owner. See adjunct A</p>

ADJUNCT A: Prophetesses and other females

MIRIAM:

Miriam was the sister of Moses and Aaron. The memorable thing that we hear about her is that she sang, with the women, a song to the Lord, Exodus 15:20-21. What Miriam sang is presented as a great personal thing, but, in fact it is not so. The facts are that in Exodus 15, it was Moses, with the men, that sang a thanking song to the Lord, 19 verses, 1-19 whilst Miriam, and the women, sang only one verse, they simply repeated the first verse of the 19 of Moses.

Miriam, the prophetess usurped the authority (Eve comes to mind here) of both God and that of Moses, in Numbers 12:2. In the first place because she took the gift of prophecy as her personal one and not as only the mouthpiece of God and in the second because she railed unjust accusation to Moses (her head for it is not said she was married) that was, moreover, the chosen of the Lord. Aaron, pathetic figure, was not the instigator of this rebellion but Miriam. This can be easily proven by noting three things: in verse 12:12 it is Miriam that attacked Moses, secondly it is Miriam that receives the corporal punishment (leprosy) and it is only after Moses intercedes for her that God grants grace by commutating the heavy punishment into a banishment of only seven days away from the camp, the same punishment as if her father had spat on her face Num 12:14 (fatherly authority of Moses confirmed), and in the third place it is the character of Aaron, easily lead by others, see golden calf. From that time on, the deeds of Miriam are not heard of, anymore.

DEBORAH

Of Deborah, it has been said that the meaning of the reference to the palm and to her husband is not understood. This is so if one starts from a forced interpretation that gets lost, but if one starts from the established order of God, there is no difficulty. First of all it must be accepted that God has given clear and fixed regulations on how mankind should behave and also He has well defined the relations and functions of the man and of the woman, as those between Man to Christ and Christ to God, 1Co 11:3. Now, the fact that He has imposed these regulations onto mankind does not mean that He is subjected to these laws for He is sovereign on all in all and he is outside of the laws he gave to His creation, Deu

29:29. Alas, in this democratic mentality we live in, it is almost inconceivable that God can act outside the laws He has imposed upon mankind, nor how He can possibly infringe them. This is one of the reasons why "Christianity" is so weak these evil days.

That God can do as He wants and nobody can stay His hand is demonstrated by the fact that He has brought the Saviour into this world not through His first fruit of creation, that is the man (who is His image and glory) but through the weaker vessel, the woman (the glory of man) to obviously demonstrate His ABSOLUTE Sovereignty over all things.

God has given the government of the world to the man and not to the woman, but this does not mean that He cannot lift up whom He wants (and this without changing the laws He gave to mankind). He can anoint a she donkey to prophesy, without homologating her to sit and to bray in the midst of the congregation. Jesus Himself said that the stones would "cry out" for Him. People, let us not limit God in our minds. Incidentally, when compiling a list of female prophetesses, this female donkey is usually left out.

Then, what is the meaning of the palm and of the husband? The palm denotes the place where Deborah passed on the oracles of God, that is, notwithstanding she was a prophetess and a judge, but like for all the other women, it was not permitted her to sit in the midst of the elders, nor at the gates, nor in the temple, nor she had governing authority, for she was a woman. This gets confirmed by the mentioning of her husband, meaning, that notwithstanding her calling to be a mouthpiece of God, she had nonetheless to submit in everything else to the authority of her husband as established by the irrevocable Law of God, 1Co 11:3 We see a paralleled situation between Jesus, Mary and Joseph, Jesus was the anointed of God, and was not the son of Joseph, but Jesus was subjected to His vicarious father, Joseph, as the Law commands. The case of Deborah is another situation where God demonstrates His Absolute Sovereignty on all things.

Regarding Barak (as all the Baraks of today) he may have been a warrior but he was missing internal fortitude, he was mentally castrated, just like the men of our days, and it is for this reason he was dependent on a woman, characteristically as today. The woman Deborah said to him : ... [Has not Jehovah the God of Israel commanded? Go and draw toward Mount Tabor,](#), God had actually told this to him directly, but Barak did not trust God and had need for a woman to confirm this command, he needed her to "hold" his hand. And for this the final humiliation was given him by another woman for it was Jael to kill the hated enemy Sisera and in a despicable way, totally contrary to the ethics of true warriors. To note that in ancient times the guests were **Highly** respected, but with deceit and a vile act Jael killed Sisera in his sleep. No greater offence could be given to Barak, the great warrior. (Incidentally do note that Jael's husband is also mentioned, for the above reasons).

In defence of this pathetic figure of a man, we need to note that Barak does appear in the list of heroes of the Faith in Hebrews 11, whilst Deborah is not. Perhaps he had redeemed himself in the end.

It is obvious that in those days (as today) men had a pusillanimous nature and it is for this that God raised a woman to put them to shame.

It is said (underline by some women, obviously) that Deborah decided to go with Barak without apparently asking her husband's permission, but this is only a conjecture. It is clear that that was a desperate situation and was part and extension of the occupation that God had in sovereignty and exceptionally called her. Whether or not she had asked her husband's permission it is not known, but in this desperate situation her not doing so does not in any way abrogate the submission of woman to the man (as some women intend), otherwise 1Co 11:3 is false. Besides, even if she did not ask for

permission, it does not follow she was free to do so, she simply acted on her own in disobedience to the law.

ULDAH

Huldah, stayed at home. She was the wife of Shallum (maybe widowed at that time, there is no clear evidence) who was the uncle of Jeremiah. [Jeremiah 32:7](#)

Huldah is mentioned only twice and for the same reason in 2Ki 22:14 and 2Ch 34:22 in the context that King Josiah, only 26 years old, was distraught by the content of the book of the Law, lost but just found during the works of renovation in the Temple.

Apparently the reason as to why the delegation did not look for Zephaniah was that at time he was too young and had not started prophesying as yet, nor they sought Jeremiah because he was in Anathoth, a fair distance away, but the agitated sentiments of the king incited the deputation to find immediately anyone that could prophesy so to give immediate response to the king, for he said generically with anxiety " [Go, inquire of Jehovah for me, 2 Kings 22:13](#), and for this reason the "college" is mentioned for it was a living quarter very near the royal palace, where Huldah lived.

The Four Virgin daughters of Philip (probably kept virgin be their father 1Co 7:37,38)

Of the four virgin daughters of Philip, only this can be said: first of all they lived in their father's home, and of what they purportedly said, nothing is reported. Whilst of what Agabus (the prophet) said, all is reported in details, Act 21:11. If anything can be construed it is only on Agabus.

To note that Paul remained many days at Philip's place to await for Agabus, but in all this time, nothing is recorded of what these girls said (if anything was said) nor Paul seems to have taken act of it.

Hanna

Hanna was a widow of 84 years old that lived in the Temple and she got in the scene probably because hearing the commotion of the situation, [Luk 2:38](#). She repeated in part Simeon's words, a man full of the Holy Ghost that the Spirit brought to the Temple to see Jesus, as it was promised him, [Luk 2:27](#).

The she donkey of Balaam

Let no one think of himself as "something" for the Lord can even use a donkey to prophesy, [Num 22:28](#) and also, as Jesus said: [And he answered and said unto them, I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out. \(Luke 19:40\)](#)

Women at the Tomb

Some present "much ado" of the first recorded announcement, of the resurrection, that was given to the two women who were instructed to go and tell Jesus' disciples about it, that the Apostles did not believe, anyway.

The facts presented are that the two Marys were at the tomb, not because they believed and had more faith than the Apostles, but because their normal occupation was to anoint the dead body with spices and oils before burial. They knew where Jesus body had been placed [Mark 15:47](#), so they brought with them the spices and oils they had prepared two days before and debating between themselves how

could they remove the stone blocking Jesus' burial place. For this reason they were there. Subsequently they received notice of the resurrection by the two angels that told them to bring this info to the Apostles, on the way Jesus confirmed the charge. The Apostles did not believe them but they neither believed the report two men that Jesus met on the way to Emmaus to whom beginning from Moses, and from all the prophets, He explained to them the things about Himself in all the Scriptures [Luk 24:27](#).

In these modern times there is a push to make it appear as if the charge to inform the Apostles, given to the woman by the angels and by Jesus, elevates these women to high position in the church, almost apostles. Whilst the whole thing was simply a postal service.

Jesus chose only men as His disciples and there is no evidence that he has changed idea in the meantime. [Heb 13:8](#).

Interesting to note that Jesus, in a similar manner, sent others to proclaim His bidding, such as the Gardarene maniac: [Howbeit Jesus suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee. \(Mark 5:19 AV\)](#). Does this mean that the demoniac became an Apostle?

Aquila and Priscilla

Aquila and Priscilla were husband and wife and given that they are mentioned together, and that sometimes Priscilla is mentioned before Apollo, and so not a few modernists proclaim the ascendancy of Priscilla over Apollo.

But let us see the Biblical appearances:

Aquila First:

And found a certain Jew named **Aquila**, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife **Priscilla**; (because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome:) and came unto them. ([Acts 18:2 AV](#))

And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue: whom when **Aquila** and **Priscilla** had heard, they took him unto *them*, and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly. ([Acts 18:26 AV](#))

The churches of Asia salute you. **Aquila** and **Priscilla** salute you much in the Lord, with the church that is in their house. ([1 Corinthians 16:19 AV](#))

Priscilla Prima:

And Paul *after this* tarried *there* yet a good while, and then took his leave of the brethren, and sailed thence into Syria, and with him **Priscilla** and **Aquila**; having shorn *his* head in Cenchrea: for he had a vow. ([Acts 18:18 AV](#))

Greet **Priscilla** and **Aquila** my helpers in Christ Jesus: ([Romans 16:3 AV](#))

Salute **Prisca** and **Aquila**, and the household of Onesiphorus. ([2 Timothy 4:19 AV](#))

The circumstances:

Aquila First: Two accounts of decision making

One account of salutation

Priscilla First: One account as voyage companion

Two accounts of salutation

From here there is no indication that Priscilla was the one that was teaching and preaching. What can be gleaned from Act 18:24,27 is that they both heard Apollo that seemed to have some lacunae (he knew only the baptism of John [Act 19:1-7](#)) and so they took him, probably in their home, perhaps for lunch (usual Christian practice) and in a quiet private environment they talked about this lacunae. There is nothing here to justify a presumed official teaching ministry of Priscilla. Moreover it was only a matter of baptism and not of Theology, for Apollo was [mighty in the scriptures, Acts 18:24 AV](#)

For those who do not believe in the baptism of the Spirit these verses should offer them some headache for wanting to make Priscilla appear as a teacher, they have to admit, since the argument was the baptism of the spirit, to them heresy, that Priscilla was in fact teaching heresy (if she was teaching indeed) and this is the very reason why the woman cannot preach or teach.

by aymon de tigliettem

ADJUNCT B: Are women permitted to be deacons?

This is a loaded question! I know that no matter how I answer this question, there will be those who will take issue with me. However, I am not nearly as concerned about how others might judge me as I am about the manner in which I will be judged by God.

Because of the feminist movement in our culture our perception of male and female roles has been altered. The Scriptures (which we are being told are archaic) establish a role which is not politically correct.

[1 Corinthians 11:3 \(NASB\)](#)

" But I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman, and God is the head of Christ."

This is not a popular view of the male female role, therefore, we are told, it is to be rejected. Therefore an emotionally charged issue has been created by those who have an agenda.

When we talk about male female roles, we must first understand that no one in the church that I know of believes that males are superior to females. The two highest I.Q. scores of all time, were obtained by women. We are not talking about equality, or tradition, or chauvinism. When we come to a subject like this we must concern ourselves with, what do the Scriptures say?

Our questioner really asks two questions, what is the woman's role in the church, and can a woman serve as a deacon? I will handle the 2nd question first. Can a woman serve as a deacon?

I believe that there are basically only two verses in all of the New Testament, both of which are indecisive, upon which a position may be formed to affirm that the New Testament talks about women as deacons.

The first one is found in Romans 16:1:

Romans 16:1(NASB)

"I commend to you our sister Phoebe, who is a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea. . ."

The word translated by the NASB as "servant" comes from the Greek word diakonos. (diakonos) {dee-ak'-on-os} It is translated by the King James Version as: minister 20 times, servant 8 times, deacon 3 times. Diakonos means:

1) one who executes the commands of another, esp. of a master, a servant, attendant, minister

1a) the servant of a king

1b) a deacon, one who, by virtue of the office assigned to him by the church, cares for the poor and has charge of and distributes the money collected for their use

1c) a waiter, one who serves food and drink

So, the question here in Romans 16:1 is: was Phoebe a "deacon," in the sense that she occupied an official office in the church, or was she a "deacon" in the sense that she was one who served the church as millions of women have through the centuries without occupying an official office?

From this verse alone it is impossible to come to a conclusion. Since words must be defined by their context, and the word "diakonos" literally means a servant, attendant, or minister, it is inappropriate to force a conclusion or an interpretation on this verse. We know for certain that she was a "servant," for the church at Cenchrea. That's all we know.

Phoebe is the only female in the entire New Testament to whom the term "diakonos" is applied. Throughout the history of the translation of the Bible into English, only one version (the RSV of 1946) transliterates the term as "deaconess." The NIV, which is not a "translation" in the truest sense of the word places "deaconess" in the marginal notes.

Remember that translations do not determine the meaning of words in the New Testament. The only thing you can say for certain about the way different translations translate words is that they reflect the understanding of the translating groups. To properly understand a Bible word, and its' definition, one must consult the Bible!

Therefore, based upon Romans 16:1 alone, there is no reason to believe that the New Testament church had an official "office" known as deaconesses. There simply is not enough evidence to come to such a conclusion.

The second one is found in 1 Timothy 3:11:

The only other passage in the New Testament that could possibly be used to support woman as deaconess is found in 1Ti 3:11.

1 Timothy 3:11 (NASB)

"Women must likewise be dignified, not malicious gossips, but temperate, faithful in all things."

This verse is found in the qualification list of elders and deacons. It is asserted by some that this is then the qualification list for deaconesses. The word translated "women" in this verse is also commonly

translated "wives." This passage then could easily be referring to the qualifications of the elders and deacons wives.

Since there is not a single definitive passage in all of the New Testament, which talks about "deaconesses" as an official office in the New Testament church, one might ask: is there any evidence that such an office existed in the New Testament church to be found in sources outside the Bible?

The answer is NO. For over 300 years there is a total lack of evidence for the office of deaconesses. After 300 A.D. as the church slipped deeper and deeper into apostasy with regard to church organisation and structure, we do find the office of deaconess. We also find the official office of "bishop" being applied to one elder, who had rule over several congregations, which is in direct violation of the New Testament teaching with regard to congregational autonomy. Nothing after the 3rd century would help us to understand how the New Testament Christians understand church organisation and structure.

Therefore, no one can say for certain that the office of deaconesses existed in New Testament times, and anyone who asserts that a woman may serve as a "deacon" today does so without Biblical authority.

By Mike Scott Minister

Further study on the Subject

Phebe is referred once as a servant and there is not sufficient evidence to doubt that her service was primarily serving the female members of her church. She would certainly have opened her home to itinerant believers, as Paul says of himself, but to give her a status of government in the church is to read in it more than what it says. To make much of her presumably taking the letter is not proving anything but practicality, for in those perilous times an old woman like Phebe would have had a better chance to get there than a man, but there is no absolute evidence that she actually did that.

Then here are the two "evidences"

The first reference is found in 1 Timothy 3:8-12

8 ¶ Likewise *must* the deacons *be* grave, not double tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre;

9 Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience.

10 And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being *found* blameless.

11 Even so *must their wives be* grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things.

12 Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. (1 Timothy 3:8-12 AV)

The Revised Version follows strictly the translation of Wescott and Hort (reputed non believers) who translated the Alexandrine/Sinaiticus/Vaticanus text which is the basis of the NIV, not the KJV which is

based on the Textus Receptus.

The word in question (wives) in verse 11 is expressed in the Greek as **GUNE** that can be translated as Wife/Wives/Woman/Women depending on the context.

This is also common in some European languages.

If we now study the immediate context of the thought expressed on the Deacons (an official position) and change verse 11 to "Even so must their women be grave" or even "Even so must the women be grave" it is plainly obvious that the concept is not in tune with the immediate context, and here we have an insurmountable obstacle.

If we then pass on to the next verse, still part of the same concept "Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife". It is plainly obvious that if in verse 11 women in general were referred to, and not the wives, we are lost. For how can a woman satisfy: "Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife"? Impossible, it cannot be? That is, how can a woman be the husband of one wife???

The second and last reference is in Romans 6:1 where the woman Phebe is referred to as "deaconess".

The Greek word **DIAKONOS** can be translated as: **Deacon, Minister/s and Servant/s** and appears 30 times in 28 verses. Again we must take into account its context.

The Diakonos appearances are translated as follows:

Deacons (As office deacons) appears 3 times: [Philippians 1:1](#), [1Ti 3:8,12](#)

Minister appears 14 times: [Mat 20:26](#) [Mar 10:43](#) [Rom 13:4](#) (2 times) [e Rom 15:8](#)
[Gal 2:17](#) [Eph 3:7](#) [Eph 6:21](#) [Col 1:7](#) [Col 1:23,25](#) [Col 4:7](#) [1Th 3:2](#) [1Ti 4:6](#)

Ministers appears 6 times: [1Co 3:5](#) [2Co 3:6](#) [2Co 6:4](#) [2Co 11:15](#) (2 times) [2Co 11:23](#)

Servant appears 4 times: [Mat 23:11](#) [Mar 9:35](#) [Joh 12:26](#) [Rom 16:1](#) (Phebe)

Servants appears 3 times: [Mat 22:13](#) [Joh 2:5,9](#)

Clearly when in Romans 6:1 Phebe is mentioned as "deaconess", it is not intended "official deacon" but "servant" in the sense of a woman (as million of other) that has given herself to serve the church (other women) as a practical help but without the official tag of a Deacon as the above references clearly show.

The above is coherent with both the immediate context of 1Ti 3:8-12 and Rom 6:1 and the general tenor of the Bible, and especially with the first 3 chapters of Genesis. Whilst if we replace "wives" with "women" in 1Ti 3:11 and interpret it as modern churches do, we have insurmountable conflicts.

From the ancient writings we have received so far, no reference whatsoever to deaconess/es, is found till the years 300. If after Constantine (the beginning of paganised christianity) deaconesses were appointed proves nothing, but only heresy and the corruption of the church.

If we accept the heretical appointment of deaconesses in the church, then by the same measure, we must accept also the modern appointments of women, lesbians, homosexuals and all sort of other

perverse appointment to the position of elders and pastors.

Alas! Many churches do these despicable things, already. OH Lord! Come quickly, Rev 22:20.

by aymon de tigliettem

ADJUNCT C: Are women permitted to teach or preach?

Because of the feminist movement in our culture our perception of male and female roles has been altered. The Scriptures (which we are being told are archaic) establish a role which is not politically correct.

1 Corinthians 11:3 (NASB)

But I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman, and God is the head of Christ.

This is not a popular view of the male female role, therefore, we are told, it is to be rejected. Therefore an emotionally charged issue has been created by those who have an agenda.

When we talk about male female roles, we must first understand that no one in the church that I know of believes that males are superior to females. The two highest I.Q. scores of all time were obtained by women. We are not talking about equality, or tradition, or chauvinism. When we come to a subject like this we must concern ourselves with, what do the Scriptures say?

There are two primary passages which speak to this issue, 1 Corinthians 14:34,35 and 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

1 Corinthians 14:34-35 (NASB)

34 The women are to keep silent in the churches; for they are not permitted to speak, but are to subject themselves, just as the Law also says.

35 If they desire to learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is improper for a woman to speak in church.

First in this context we must notice that the word for *women* is the Greek word *gune* {goo-nay'}, which means women, and is gender specific. Men are excluded.

The word for *churches* is the Greek word *ekklesia* {ek-klay-see'-ah} meaning assembly.

Silent is the Greek word *sigao* {see-gah'-o} which means absolute silence; not to utter a sound.

This is the same word that is used in verse 28:

1 Corinthians 14:28 (NASB)

but if there is no interpreter, he must keep silent in the church; and let him speak to himself and to God.

The tongue speaker was to hold his tongue, he was not to utter a sound if there was no interpreter present. Similarly, if a prophet suddenly received a revelation and another prophet was already speaking, verse 30 tells us:

1 Corinthians 14:30(NASB)

But if a revelation is made to another who is seated, the first one must keep silent...

The purpose for this instruction is obvious. One prophet or teacher must not interrupt another during the presentation of the Gospel. God is not the author of confusion. All things must be done decently and in order. Verse 34 tells us that women are not permitted to speak.

Permitted is from the word that means to allow, to give permission (Mat 19:8). *Speak* is the word that means to say or speak.

Verse 35 - tells us that they are to *subject themselves*.

Subject is from the word that means to rank under, it is a military term, meaning to subject oneself to, to obey, to be under obedience. It is the same word used in Eph 5:21,22,24; Titus 2:5,9; 1Pe 2:18; 3:1.

This has reference to the *role* aspect of the woman with regard to the man.

Verse 35 also tells us that it is *improper for a woman to speak in church*.

Improper is from the Greek word that means ugly, shameful, base, disgraceful.

Therefore, from these two verses we are given the clear instruction by God that Christian women are not to speak (preach or teach) in the worship assembly.

Because the Scriptures uses the plural, *churches* in verse 34, we know without any doubt that this is the directive God extends to all congregations. Women are not to preach in any worship assembly.

Verse 35 tells us that women are to *subject themselves*, which represents the characteristic role which is given to women by God. This was not a new concept developed by the Apostle Paul, for Paul appeals to the wider Biblical principle found in Genesis 3:16, *and he shall rule over you*.

What the Scriptures then tells us is that it would violate a Biblical principle for a woman to speak in the assembly because it violates the role given to women by God which is subjection. It is therefore, the Scriptures say, disgraceful for a woman to reject her God-given role by speaking to the assembly.

The other passage we must consider is 1 Timothy 2:8-15:

1 Timothy 2:8-15: (NASB)

8 Therefore I want the men in every place to pray, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and dissension.

9 ¶ Likewise, I want women to adorn themselves with proper clothing, modestly and discreetly, not with braided hair and gold or pearls or costly garments,

10 but rather by means of good works, as is proper for women making a claim to godliness.

11 A woman must quietly receive instruction with entire submissiveness.

12 But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, but to remain quiet.

13 For it was Adam who was first created, and then Eve.

14 And it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression.

15 But women will be preserved through the bearing of children if they continue in faith and love and sanctity with self-restraint.

Verse 8 tells us that God wants the *men* in every place to pray. If God had wanted to use a word that would have included both genders, he could have used *anthropos* as he did in verse one. Here he uses the word *aner* {an'-ayr} which is gender specific, meaning males and males only.

In every place tells us the when and the where of where God wants men to pray. When ever, and where ever men and women are gathered together to pray, men are to do the leading.

In this passage the instruction given to women is *to adorn themselves with proper clothing*, that is dress to please God, and to *quietly receive instruction with entire submissiveness*, which once again speaks to the role of subjection intended by God for the woman's role.

Next the Scriptures tell us, *I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man*. Teach is used in the official sense. She must not teach in the assembly, as has already been seen. She is not to domineer men in the assembly, but she must remain quiet.

And then we have revealed the reason. *For*. The Greek word for *for* is a conjunction. It is used to express cause or reason. Here is the reason that woman is prohibited by God to speak in the assembly. *It was Adam who was first created, and then Eve* (verse 13).

This verse argues, once again, the role of the woman as depicted by God from the beginning of creation. Women were not intended by God to have authority over man. At one point in creation it was utterly impossible, for man existed before woman.

Next, the Scriptures say, *it was not Adam who was deceived, but the woman being quite deceived, fell into transgression*. All women are included here, for Eve is not named.

Here is what we then must conclude:

God desires at all places and times when men and women are gathered for the purposes of teaching and prayer for the men to do the leading. Women are to dress modestly and discreetly. Women are expressly prohibited from leading in prayer, teaching and exercising authority over men on these occasions. The reason why has to do with the characteristic role of women assigned to them by God.

The Apostle Paul did not originate these distinctive roles. God established these roles from the beginning. When women remove themselves from their God-given role by leading in teaching, or prayer, or in any other capacity in the presence of men when they are gathered together for the purpose of the study of God's Word and prayer, they do so without Biblical authority.

When women insist on exercising authority over men in spiritual activities they do so in violation of the Scriptures.

(notes adapted from a presentation by Guy Orbison, Jr., of Durango, Colorado)

Brief Answers

Q: Is it wrong for a man to ask a question to a woman on the Bible? (that is, receive teaching from a woman?)

A: [1Ti 2:12-14](#) says: [But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. \(1 Timothy 2:12-14 AV\)](#)

The Verb of God clearly says that the woman cannot teach the Bible, especially to any man. If she does that, then she disobeys the Bible. Even concerning her own husband the Bible says: [Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; \(1 Peter 3:1 AV\)](#)

In the case of a Biblical study, with man and husband, the woman that presents and teaches is doubly in error because firstly she teaches the men contrary to the Bible, and secondly she overturns the roles established by God for it is the husband that has to teach her and not the contrary, the husband being present. 1Co 14:35 (modern ecclesiastic overturn).

It is of no use for the church elder to say "she is doing the teaching under my authority and I am present" for the elder does not have this authority and besides he is again in error for she is also teaching him. In this case he errs by going against the express order of God and he puts himself against the Lord.

If a man willfully permits a woman to teach him the Bible, then he is opening himself to be deceived as it was in the Garden of Eden. If a man has a question on the Bible he has to approach his pastor or the elders or a man of God. This covers, of course, any other places such as Biblical Schools where today there are quite a few women teachers.

Q: It is permitted to women to speak in the church?

R: In 1Co 14:34-37 there is written: [Let your women be silent in the churches, for it is not allowed to them to speak, but to be in subjection, as also the Law says. But if they desire to learn anything, let them question their husbands at home; for it is a shame for a woman to speak in a church. Or did the Word of God go out from you? Or did it reach only to you? If anyone thinks to be a prophet, or a spiritual one, let him recognize the things I write to you, that they are a command of the Lord. \(1 Corinthians 14:34-37 LIT\)](#)

Some (to avoid the full impact of this directive) try to make it appear that this passage is applicable only to "speaking in tongue" and not to the women themselves, so they can freely speak in the church as they will, except they speak in tongue. But the same context proves that this interpretation is incorrect. Firstly because the command to the women to be silent is based on the the Old testament "[not allowed to them to speak, but to be in subjection, as also the Law says](#)" and this has nothing to do about speaking in "tongues" but to be in silence in front of men in a religious environment. Secondly the context forbids them even to ask question in the church "[But if they desire to learn anything, let them question their husbands at home; for it is a shame for a woman to speak in a church.](#)"

Another passage that treats the same point is in 1Ti 2:11-13, already discussed above.

If you are strong enough to teach these Biblical truths, you will surely stir up most women (and not a few men), but in the end it is always better to preach and to teach the Truth of God, independently of how much it is unpopular. One day we will have to render account to God on how we led our congregations. May God grants us wisdom and courage to preach His Truth. *What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? (Romans 8:31 AV)*

Q: Is it wrong for a woman to give a testimony of praise in the church?

R: *Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church. (1 Corinthians 14:34-35 AV)*

Many testimonies given by women end up in them "teaching" and in many cases actually preaching to the whole congregation on what they have learned from some experience of their lives. They get to interpreting Scriptures even with men present in the audience, and this is Biblically incorrect.

D: Is is wrong for a woman to ask a question to the pastor?

R: The woman should not ask a question to the Pastor on the Bible, but she had to ask her husband at home: *And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church. (1 Corinthians 14:35 AV)*

ADJUNCT D: Eve Is Again Listening to the Voice of the Serpent

Eve fell for the fruit, but Adam fell for Eve. There is a replay of the garden incident in the end time.

Satan's plot is to corrupt woman and ruin the race. Womanhood of America is running headlong to harlotry. Instead of the Bible, movie stars set American standards.

The destiny and greatness of a nation lie around the hearthstone.

A nation rises or falls with the virtue of its women. The degeneracy of women marks a nation's fall. As in the beginning when sin entered into the world through the woman, so today she seems bent on finishing the destruction in these last days.

It is exceedingly dangerous for a woman to get out of her orbit. God never created woman to rule man. His whole Word is against it. Because of this broken law the curse of God is on the home, church, society, and nation. About fifty years ago a spiritual writer prophesied that one of the sins of the last days would be women striving for the mastery over men. This has come to pass, and with it ruin; for woman must fight God to gain this place.

Christianity Has Become Effeminate

Eve is surely listening to the voice of the serpent again. God cursed Adam for hearkening to the voice of his wife in the matter (Genesis 3). The Garden of Eden incident is being replayed at the end.

Home, family and husband mean nothing to many modern women. They must rule or ruin. Men too often effeminately coincide with her. This makes possible woman's false position. We are living in an

effeminate age. Christianity has become effeminate. It takes a man to hold the Gospel plough. God made Adam first, then woman for his helper. God is not changing His order.

The early church is our example. Female bishops are an anomaly. A bishop must be "the husband of one wife" (1 Timothy 3:2); the deacons also, and the elders (1 Timothy 3:12; Titus 1:5,6). A bishop is an overseer. "I suffer not a woman to teach, not to usurp authority over the man" (1 Timothy 2:12). Women have their place in the Lord's work, but let them preserve their modesty and their true sphere. Thank God for the decent women in America today. We are amazed at the silence of preachers in the face of present conditions. Where are the John the Baptists today? Has Jezebel got the Elijahs all on the run?

Rebels Against God

'The modern woman with her short skirts and cut hair is an insult to her Maker." A fit type of the fallen church of today is her short-haired, short-skirted women. The spirit evinced among modern women, is one of organized rebellion against God. In Deuteronomy 22:5 we read, A woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, . . . for all that do so are an abomination unto the Lord." What do women today care for God's law? They wear men's clothes, cut their hair, and drink and smoke like men. Their immodest appearance and conduct in private and public are an insult to their Maker, to their sex, and to humanity. The modern woman seems to be bent on trying to see how far she can tempt God and get away with it.

God's commandment for women is that they "adorn themselves in modest apparel" (1 Timothy 2:9). More shameful things are worn on the street now than were worn in the brothels a few decades ago. Modern women seem to have lost all sense of virtue. In their flaunted brazenness, boldness, and nakedness, they are carrying the race down to hell.

The Degeneracy of Mothers Is Suicidal

Wearing so little clothing, women today outrage all decency. Even grandmothers, who ought to be examples of all that is virtuous, are seen tugging at their loincloth, trying to cover their nakedness. A prominent writer has declared that women will soon be going naked altogether. This has meant hell and destruction to every nation that has tried it.

The modern female has lost all sense of modesty. the shamelessness of many young women is appalling. The older women dress and act like girls. From a distance it is difficult to tell the difference between mother and daughter and grandmother. Elder women should set the standard for the younger and be an example. There is no longer any glory in age or motherhood. Women who smoke and swear and drink are not fit to be mothers of men. They are fit only as companions for the devil. God pity the offspring of all such women. What a monstrosity is a cursing, drinking, smoking, painted, cut-haired mother! She is truly a masterpiece of hell.

A few decades ago, women we now see everywhere in our streets would have been arrested for stark indecency and relegated to the red-light district. The morals of Sodom are becoming those of America.

Lewdness Commercialised

Satan has succeeded in commercialising his plot to corrupt women and ruin the race on every side. Semi-naked women are exploited to draw trade. Many businesses have commercialised the nudity of women in their advertising. Vile pictures, that a few decades ago were seen only in the brothels and beer parlours, are now flaunted on billboards. The daily press is filled with pictures of naked and sensual

women; and suggestive movie scenes take up whole pages of our large-city dailies and comprise the main attraction of most magazines. Today few public ceremonies or festivals are sponsored, unless bebies of almost-nude women in micro bathing suits are thrust into the vulgar foreground. Even our little girls are turned out on the streets almost naked. These things are undermining the very foundation of our modern civilisation .

A Type of the Fallen Church of Today

The Lord says, "If a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her" (1 Corinthians 11:15). If long hair is a woman's glory, short hair must be her shame. Mary wiped Jesus' feet with her long hair. What a beautiful, modest act! A short-haired woman professing to be a follower of Christ disqualifies herself for this act of pure devotion to her Lord. She remains a type of a fallen church, with all her glory gone. Long hair is the Scriptural badge of virtuous womanhood.

Woman's fall has wrecked many civilisations in the past. It will wreck America also. If God's Word is true, without national repentance America has nothing left to look for but God's fiery judgements. For America, it is either a quick return to God and the Bible, or it is God's judgement on sin as black as that of Sodom. There is a way to escape wrath. Are we willing to pay the price? "Break off thy sins by righteousness" (Daniel 4:27) .

"If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land" (2 Chronicles 7:14). --

Author Unknown

note - aymon de tiglietem

There is great dismay in realising the strong advance of Islam within and without our "christian" society. But there is nothing to be surprised about it, it is written on the wall, (MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN) for the evil one, using the so called "democracy" and operating through the woman, as in the beginning, having mentally castrated the man, will ensure the fall of our society, if not already done so. Personally, noting how things are going in the western society, I nurture little hope for its future, if any, apart direct intervention by the Lord.

ADJUNCT E: What doe the Greek 5399 says!!!

Before knocking this as rubbish, go and honestly check it out for yourself.

The numbers in-between the words presented as, i. e. **God <G2316>** refer to word from the original languages codified by a Pastor/Theologian named Strong to facilitate the meaning comprehension to those not familiar with the Bible's original languages. He placed all the original words in alphabetical order, numbering them and listing against them the meaning in English and variants together with the number of appearances of that word in the Bible. (In this case the suffix letter G means "Greek" whilst H means "Hebrews").

[Now let s compare G5399 in Ephesians 5:33 and in 1 Peter 2:17 where G5399 appears in an interesting way.](#)

Eph 5:33

Nevertheless <G4133> let every <G1520> one of you in particular <G1520> so <G3779> love <G25> his wife <G1135> even <G5613> as himself <G1438>; and the wife <G1135> [see] that she reverence <G5399> [her] husband <G435>.

1Pe 2:17

Honour <G5091> all [men]. <G3956> Love <G25> the brotherhood <G81>. Fear <G5399> God <G2316>. Honour <G5091> the king <G935>.

In a Table format:

Ephesians	1 Peter	Greek	English
G4133		Plen	Nevertheless
G1520		Heis	Let every
G5120		Heis	One of you in particular
G3779		Houto	So
G25		Agapao	Love
G1135		Gune	His wife
G5613		Los	Even
G1438		Heautou	As himself
G1135		Gune	And the wife
G5399		Phobeo	that she reverence
G435		Aner	[her] husband
	G5091	Timao	Honour
	G3956	Pas	All [men].
	G25	Agapao	Love
	G81	Adelphotes	The brotherhood
	G5399	Phobeo	Fear
	G2316	Theos	God
	G5091	Timao	Honour
	G935	Basileus	The king

Every Strong codified word is expanded with all the relevant meanings of the original language. The word **G5399** is presented this way: (the numbers in parentheses represent meanings of the original word with that many appearances)

G5399 phobeo {fob-eh'-o}

- fear (62)
- be afraid (23)
- be afraid of (5)
- reverence (1)
- misc (2)

total [93]

To put to flight by terrifying (to scare away)

to put to flight, to flee

to fear, be afraid; to be struck with fear, to be seized with alarm; of those startled by strange sights or occurrences; of those struck with amazement; to fear, be afraid of one;

to fear (i.e. hesitate) to do something (for fear of harm)

to reverence, venerate, to treat with deference or reverential obedience

fear, dread, terror; that which strikes terror

To note that in 93 appearances the word "phobeo" is translated as "reverence" only once in Ephesians 5:33 .. strange? (see listing below)

To note:

Practically every modern versions traduce the word <phobeo> (G5399) in Ephesians 5:33 as <reverence or respect>. However the American Standard Version of 1901 remains true to the original meaning, as the Darby version does.

(Ephesians 5:33)

Nevertheless do ye also severally love each one his own wife even as himself; and *let* the wife see that she **fear** her husband. ([1901 American Standard Version](#))

But *ye* also, every one of you, let each so love his own wife as himself; but as to the wife [I speak] that she may **fear** the husband. ([Darby](#))

Another version called the "Amplified Bible" that presents the various shadows of meaning for each word uses at least 12 words to express the meaning of <phobeo> for Ephesians 5:33, in trying to come close to its real original meaning, not having the courage to use the actual word (fear), this to circumvent the full strength of its meaning. Instead of <fear> it uses: respect, reverence, notice, regard, honour, prefer, venerate, esteem, defer, praise, loves, admire . Exceedingly.

Well, close , but not the real thing.

Amplified Bible Eph 5:33

However, let each man of you (without exception) love his wife as [being in a sense] his very own self; **and let the wife see that she respects and reverences her husband - that she notices him, regards him, honors him, prefers him, venerates and esteems him; and that she defers to him, praises him, and loves and admires him exceedingly.**

To boot, here is another demonstrative verse:

"While they behold your chaste conversation *coupled* with **fear** <phobos>. (1 Peter 3:2 AV)"

The word G5399 " phobeo " appears 93 times in 89 verses with the usual meaning of <fear>, except in Ephesians 5:33.

Mat 1:20; Mat 2:22; Mat 10:26; Mat 10:28; Mat 10:31; Mat 14:5; Mat 14:27; Mat 14:30; Mat 17:6-7; Mat 21:26; Mat 21:46; Mat 25:25; Mat 27:54; Mat 28:5; Mat 28:10; Mar 5:15; Mar 5:33; Mar 5:36; Mar 6:20; Mar 6:50; Mar 9:32; Mar 10:32; Mar 11:18; Mar 11:32; Mar 12:12; Mar 16:8; Luk 1:13; Luk 1:30; Luk 1:50; Luk 2:9-10; Luk 5:10; Luk 8:25; Luk 8:35; Luk 8:50; Luk 9:34; Luk 9:45; Luk 12:4-5; Luk 12:7; Luk 12:32; Luk 18:2; Luk 18:4; Luk 19:21; Luk 20:19; Luk 22:2; Luk 23:40; Joh 6:19-20; Joh 9:22; Joh 12:15; Joh 19:8; Act 5:26; Act 9:26; Act 10:2; Act 10:22; Act 10:35; Act 13:16; Act 13:26; Act 16:38; Act 18:9; Act 22:29; Act 27:17; Act 27:24; Act 27:29; Rom 11:20; Rom 13:3-4; 2Co 11:3; 2Co 12:20; Gal 2:12; Gal 4:11; **Eph 5:33**; Col 3:22; Heb 4:1; Heb 11:23; Heb 11:27; Heb 13:6; 1Pe 2:17; 1Pe 3:6; 1Pe 3:14; 1Jo 4:18; Rev 1:17; Rev 2:10; Rev 11:18; Rev 14:7; Rev 15:4; Rev 19:5;

But a contentious and rebellious heart says: " Oh Yeah! This Biblical submission to nice believing husbands is hardly done in our western society, imagine "fearing" the husband, absolutely not on, let alone a non believing husband." Everyone can do as they like, and be personally responsible of it in front of God, but let us not kid ourselves that this is not so, for the Word of God is absolutely clear on this. Without exclusions of conditions or circumstances, the woman is commanded to be submitted to, and in fear of her husband, whether a believer or not. This ordinance of God is not based on the husband's behaviour, but exclusively on the sex of the person and the position given to it by God, keeping in mind what has happened in the Garden and the pre-eminence of the man Adam over Eve, [Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. \(Galatians 6:7 AV\)](#)

by aymon de tiglietem

ADJUNCT F: The case of Galatians 3:28

Modernists and feminists and leftists in trying to promote women to the pulpit, present this solitary verse: [There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. \(Galatians 3:28 AV\)](#) as absolute proof thereof. To note that the correspondent verse does not have [there is neither male nor female](#): [Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond \[nor\] free: but Christ \[is\] all, and in all. \(Colossians 3:11 AV\)](#)

They contend that with Gal 3:28 the different roles, relations, functions between man and woman given by God have been abolished because in Christ there is no male or female for we are one (unisex?). This presumed meaning is extracted out of the verse only by reading into it far more than what it says, without taking care of the contextual context. But the Apostle exhorts those who want to be faithful disciples of Christ, to preach the Gospel as it has been given and to defend it from errors: [Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort \[you\] that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. \(Jude 1:3 AV\)](#). We must preach the Gospel in Its integrity, in sound doctrine, not only in what tickles this evil generation and forgetting not: [For I am the LORD, I change not; \(Malachi 3:6 AV\)](#)

Many modernists base their arguments on what man has done since Adam, on feelings and on what they would like to see in action, but not on what actually the Bible says on the subject. Truly, it seems as we actually are in the last days, where the Word of the Lord warns us to be on guard and vigil for the very many heresies around us. [Professing to be wise, they became foolish \(Romans 1:22 \) For a time will be when they will not endure sound doctrine, but according to their own lusts, they will heap up to themselves teachers tickling the ear; and \[they\] will turn away the ear from the truth and will be turned aside to myths. \(2 Timothy 4:3-4 \)](#)

It is interesting to note that [Gal 3:28](#) is usually quoted by itself as a solid proof without also mentioning

these verses, for example:

For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. (Romans 1:16 AV)

[Is he] the God of the Jews only? [is he] not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: (Romans 3:29 AV)

Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? (Romans 9:24 AV)

For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. (Romans 10:12 AV)

For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether [we be] Jews or Gentiles, whether [we be] bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. (1 Corinthians 12:13 AV)

That the Gentiles should be fellowheirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel: (Ephesians 3:6 AV)

Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether [he be] bond or free. (Ephesians 6:8 AV)

Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond [nor] free: but Christ [is] all, and in all. (Colossians 3:11 AV)

All these verses, including Gal 3:8 refer that now, **in Christ**, ALL (male / female, Greek / Jew, circumcision / uncircumcision, Barbarian / Scythian, bond / free) have access to the Throne of God's Grace signifying by this that animal sacrifices are not needed anymore with sprinkling of the blood on the Mercy seat by the High Priest because through the blood of Christ, our Eternal High Priest, all the called one have access to God, the Father (i.e. salvation). Rev 5:9.

where Jesus entered as forerunner for us, having become a High Priest forever, according to the order of Melchizedek. (Hebrews 6:20 LIT)

by which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. (Hebrews 10:10 LIT)

The solitary reference to male / female is obviously given to clarify that also the woman, as the Greeks, the Jews, slaves or free, have access to God through Christ, that is partakers to salvation as anyone else in Christ. Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with *them* according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered. (1 Peter 3:7 AV)

It is clear that Gal 3:28 does not refer to a change in functional relationship between man and woman, but rather to access to salvation of those that God has called to Himself, undependably of sex, race and social position. This was a huge revelation to the Jews as the following verses demonstrated that salvation in Christ is applicable also to the Gentiles: *And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I, that I could withstand God? When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then*

[hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life. \(Acts 11:15-18 AV\)](#)

This was the catalyst from which the Gospel of Christ began to be offered and preached to the Gentile also. The testimony of the Holy Ghost in descending also upon the gentiles in Cornelius' Home was irrefutable proof that could not be denied. The Jews had no intention whatsoever to extend to Good News to the Gentiles for they were considered no better than dogs. Even the great Peter, was reproached by Paul for returning to his old convictions of being separated from the gentiles Gal 2:11. (interesting to note that it was Peter that brought the Good News to Cornelius' household) Paul had to continuously combat the Jews for they wanted to keep the Gospel to themselves or at least they wanted the gentiles to also keep Moses' law. The Jews have always believed to be the chosen people, and they are, but the Scriptures entrusted to them were not only for their own private use, as evidenced by God that He would bless all nations through the Jews' witnessing, a thing they have not done much.

[Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him? \(Genesis 18:18 AV\)](#)

[And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice. \(Genesis 22:18 AV\)](#)

Even in the NT we see Jesus confirming the concept "for all the people": [And he taught, saying unto them, Is it not written, My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer? but ye have made it a den of thieves. \(Mark 11:17 AV\)](#) which refers to: [Even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people. \(Isaiah 56:7 AV\)](#)

[For mine eyes have seen thy salvation, Which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; A light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel. \(Luke 2:30-32 AV\)](#)

[Gal 3:28](#), with the other verses, were Paul's corrections to confirm that salvation in Christ was applicable to all: Masters / Slaves, Jews / Gentiles, men / women through faith in Christ Jesus. In particular, these verses refer to the Jews and the Gentiles where through faith in Christ they are now one people for Jesus has demolished the wall of division as Paul says in Ephesians 2:11-22, specifically in Eph 2:14: [For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; \(Ephesians 2:14 AV\)](#) This unity in Christ is saying that, through Him all those called according to His purpose, in faith, jews/gentiles or masters/slaves, men/women all have access to be joined in His Body. Clearly Gal 3:28 is referring to salvation and not to functional relationship.

Moreover Jesus said that he has not come to change the Law till all is fulfilled: [For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. \(Matthew 5:18 AV\)](#)

And here is proof:

[Servants, be obedient to your masters in all fear, not only to those good and forbearing, but also to the perverse ones. \(1 Peter 2:18\)](#)

[Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit. These things teach and exhort. \(1 Timothy 6:1-2 AV\)](#)

[Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord. \(Colossians 3:18 AV\)](#)

Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. (1 Timothy 2:11-14 AV)

But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman *is* the man; and the head of Christ *is* God. (1 Corinthians 11:3 AV)

As clearly seen, after Jesus nothing has changed in the relations between man and woman.

The whole context of Galatians 3:28, indeed the whole chapter, the whole book speaks of the adoption of those God has called in the family of the Lord, through Christ Jesus in the sense that these are:

Equally justified through faith vs. 24

Equally free from the law of sin vs. 25

Equally sons of god by faith in Christ vs. 26

Equally clothed in Christ vs. 27

Equally saved by Christ vs. 28

Equal heirs of Abraham's promise vs. 29

By adoption, the believer is justified and heir in the family of God, with all the rights and privileges, thus Gal 3:28 simply says that salvation and unity in Christ is by adoption and transcends all distinctions, these being: ethnics, social, sexual as far as it concerns salvation.

For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. (Romans 10:12 AV)

For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. (1 Corinthians 12:13 AV)

Let us be joyful that the Lord has not left Himself without reliable witnesses for He has reserved a residue "seven thousand" men that have not bowed the knee unto Baal, even in the present era of feminism.

Yet I have left *me* seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him. (1 Kings 19:18 AV)

But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to *the image of* Baal. Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. (Romans 11:4-5 AV)

by aymon de tigliettem

ADJUNCT G: Egalitarian Priesthood!!!

These are the verses used to justify women to the "priesthood".

But ye *are* a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light: Which in time past *were* not a people, but *are* now the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy. (1 Peter 2:9-10 AV)

And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him *be* glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen. (Revelation 1:6 AV)

And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth. (Revelation 5:10 AV)

These verses, we are told by the modernists, support women to the pulpit ministry because, they say, women are partakers to the priesthood of all believers. But, practically the same words were used in the Old Testament where women did not partake to the priesthood.

Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth *is* mine: And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These *are* the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel. (Exodus 19:5-6 AV)

But ye shall be named the Priests of the LORD: *men* shall call you the Ministers of our God: ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall ye boast yourselves. (Isaiah 61:6 AV)

The words used by Peter and John are incredibly similar as to those of Exodus and no one can prove that in the OT women were called to the priesthood.

The context of the meaning is that God in the OT called to Himself the Jews to be His peculiar people in order to demonstrate the Kingdom of God on the earth. The NT takes on the same theme in the sense that, in Christ Jesus, all believers (and not only the Jews) are a chosen generation to demonstrate the Kingdom of God on the earth on the same basis of the OT with the only exception, that now the High Priest is Jesus Himself. *Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession.* (Hebrews 4:14 AV)

Is in this a change of roles between man and woman, or even the abrogation of the God ordained functions between the two? Methinks, in no way.

It is important to remember and to understand what the Lord says in His Holy Word about His character: *For I am the LORD, I change not;* (Malachi 3:6 AV)

With this in mind we can in part appreciate that the ways God deals with mankind is essentially the same, perhaps under different forms but fundamentally the same. For example the human priesthood was terminated at the cross, but the sacerdotal intercession of priesthood is still in activity in Heaven, in a perfect way by Christ, but still on, till the end of times. *By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament. And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: But this *man*, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.* (Hebrews 7:22-25 AV)

But there is another example of the unchangeableness of God, which is visible to all, the **Rainbow** the sign for the Nohaic Pact.

And I will establish my covenant with you; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood; neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth. And God said, This *is* the token of the covenant which I make between me and you and every living creature that *is* with you, for perpetual generations: I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth. And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud: And I will remember my covenant, which *is* between me and you and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh. And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that *is* upon the earth. (Genesis 9:11-16 AV)

The sign of the Nohaic Pact is the rainbow. Have you seen some rainbows lately? Of course you have! Is the Nohaic Pact deceased? Obviously not! It is still in function, and why? [For I am the LORD, I change not](#);....

Is then any difference between the OT and NT on this matter? None, only that in the OT it was directed to the Jews and in the NT to both Jews and Gentiles, without changing the functional relationship between man and woman, for God [changes not](#).

by aymon de tigliettem

ADJUNCT H: Dress Symbolism

Ephesians 4:1 says:

I Therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called.

Ephesians 4:17 tells us to "henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk," in verse 22 to "put off concerning the former conversation the old man," and in verse 24 to "put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. 1 Corinthians 11:1-2 instructs us to "be ye followers . . . keep the ordinances."

The next verse, 1 Corinthians 11:3 teaches about headship:

But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.

Ephesians 5:23-33 shows that the husband as head of the wife typifies Christ as head of the church. Verses 4-16 of 1 Corinthians 11 show that part of the vocation whereunto we are called is in teaching by symbolism. A man's hair is to be short and a woman's hair long--anywhere and everywhere. Also according to those verses, when assembled in church capacity for prayer, teaching, preaching, or worship a woman's head should be covered and a man's head uncovered. This symbolises headship and submission (1 Corinthians 11:3).

There is symbolism in actions and attitude of submission and subjection. ["In everything" (Ephesians 5:24)--"As unto the Lord (5:22)]. A "pattern of good works" should be shown "in all things" (Titus 2:7). It is needful to "adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things" (Titus 2:10).

There is also symbolism in clothing and appearance. Proverbs 7:10 speaks of "the attire of an harlot." Clothing of sack-cloth is seen as symbolic throughout the Bible. Jeremiah 2:32 speaks of bridal attire. You may attend a wedding and never have seen the bride before, but the moment she walks in,

everyone knows who she is because of the symbolism of the dress. Uniforms are symbolic of the occupation or rank of the persons who wear them. Police, nurses, military personnel, even store employees are readily recognised by what they wear. Their clothing is symbolic. Consider the difference in the international symbols used world-wide on restroom doors--Dress = woman, Pants = man. Those symbols are used because it is recognised world-wide, regardless of language or culture, that a dress pertains to a woman and pants pertain to a man.

Deuteronomy 22:5 says:

The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the LORD thy God.

Even today in such a time of perversion, a dress or skirt is thought of as a woman's garment and pants as pertaining unto a man. The restroom door placards stand as proof.

The old expression referring to an un-submissive wife as "wearing the pants" is further proof.

Some may object that both wore robes back then, so both may wear pants now. What ever they wore, there must have been a very distinct, clear, and readily visible difference or Deuteronomy 22:5 would not have made any sense.

A survey of all the occurrences of the word, robe or robes in the Bible reveals that a robe was not the common clothing for an ordinary person, but is itself seen to be symbolic in every occurrence. According to Strong's Hebrew Dictionary, the definition of robe in the Old Testament is, "**a robe (i.e. upper and outer garment):--cloak, coat, mantle, robe.**" In every occurrence of the word robe previous to the book of 1 Samuel, it is worn by priests. In later occurrences it is worn by priests, kings, princes, soldiers, or figuratively as a "robe of righteousness." In the New Testament, in Luke 20:45-47, Jesus warned His disciples to "Beware of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes" It is obvious that they were worn by the scribes for the purpose of special recognition. In Luke 15:22 the "prodigal son" was given a robe when he returned, as a symbolic gesture of special status. All other occurrences of robe previous to the book of Revelation is the robe that was placed on Christ in mockery, saying, "Hail, King of the Jews!" In Revelation 6:9-11 "white robes" were given to "the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held." In Revelation 7:9-14, "white robes" are worn by the tribulation saints. In every occurrence in the Bible, a robe is used symbolically to show special recognition, honour, or status. There is no Bible reference to a robe as being either a primary or common garment.

We should seek to please God rather than to see how far we can go. What if your son wanted to wear a dress? Or wear a cap in the church-house? Is there a double standard?

Man and woman is symbolic of Christ and church. We are teachers of each other, the world, and the angels. Does your manner of dress as a woman symbolise a church in subjection to Christ or a harlot church in rebellion toward God? Men, what kind of a Christ do you symbolise?

Has un-christian dress contributed to moral decline? There has been a progression from men wearing a woman's haircut--to women wearing men's clothing made for women-- to men wearing women's jewellery made for men--to men's haircuts for women--and then we wonder why there is so much homosexuality and lack of natural affection.

Has disregard for God's divine order of the sexes and its symbolism contributed to the falling away of many churches? First the woman's head-covering was abandoned and their hair cut short--next women

were speaking out in the assembly--then leading in public prayer--wearing pants--now there are over 1200 women ordained as preachers among the Southern Baptists and who knows how many as deacons! Let us learn from others' mistakes rather than follow the same paths.

The clothing of a Christian should be unquestionably decent and modest. In the Bible, the showing of nakedness is always considered shameful and symbolic of sin. Clothing and covering are symbolic of honour, glory, and of righteousness. There should be little doubt that the un-ashamed nakedness so popular in clothing styles today has contributed greatly to the moral decline we see all around.

Shouldn't a child of God's want to look like a child of God's. Does our actions speak so loudly that people can't hear what we say? 1 Corinthians 6:20 says:

For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.

I therefore . . . beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called" (Ephesians 4:1).

(Based on an article of an American brother.)

ADJUNCT I: The Head Covering A Biblical Perspective

The women's "Liberation" movement in society today is sadly behind the times. It has been one of the distinctive characteristics of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ that, wherever it has been preached, it has elevated womanhood from the degradation of heathenism to a place of nobility beside the man. Heathenism almost always has debased the woman; the gospel liberates her and entrusts to her a God-given ministry, uniquely fitted to her design and characteristics.

Of course, every flourishing fashion or movement in the world tends to overflow into the Church. The evidence of this may be seen in the styles and patterns of behaviour that are becoming more common among believers. One of the most general of these is the increasing number of women who appear at assembly meetings without a head covering.

Some believers were discussing this one day and an "elder" happened to join them. When he heard their conversation had to do with the head covering, he dismissed the matter with the remark, "It's inconsequential." One can hardly blame many of these women who go with uncovered heads into an assembly of believers when they have not been taught by their spiritual leaders what is scripturally correct.

The question arises, "Is it tradition or truth?" Putting aside personal preferences for a few moments, let us try to find from Scripture what is taught on the subject, specifically from 1 Corinthians 11. It will be a help to the interested reader to have the Bible open for reference.

Some suggest that the first section of the chapter actually belongs with chapter 10 and is not church truth at all. Paul's discussion of matters that affect assembly gathering, they assert, does not begin until verse 17, "when ye come together." But this is missing the design of the chapter. The first section (vv. 1-16) begins with "Now I praise you." The second begins with "I praise you not" (v. 17).

There are three symbols in this chapter: the head, the bread, and the wine. The first portrays our

relationship in the mystical Body, the last two teach us concerning the sacrifice of His physical body. Can we take the liberty of saying that one of these is inconsequential? If so, which one? Can we omit the bread or wine next week at the Lord's Supper? Such a flagrant departure would not be tolerated. Then by what principle of interpretation can the other symbol be relegated to the growing list of "inconsequentials" we hear about these days?

A reading of 1 Corinthians 11 readily shows that there are two distinct lessons in the first section of this chapter which deal with the head. First, there is a lesson in headship; second, a lesson in glory.

Verse 3 sets the foundation for the lesson in headship. It teaches the divine order of authority. It is significant that even here the Spirit of God does not put the woman first, although that would be the logical order in the ascending scale of authority in the spiritual realm. "The head of every man is Christ: and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God."

Obviously there is no thought here of inferiority-superiority. The statement "the head of Christ is God" stands directly beside "the head of the woman is the man." We know that Christ is not inferior to God -- He is God. The issue is order, just as we have alphabetical order. Names beginning with the letter "A" in the telephone directory are not more important than names beginning with any other letter. So in His universe God has established order -- world order, home order, and assembly order. "Let all things be done decently and in (according to the) order" (1Co 14:40).

In Ephesians, the headship of Christ is related corporally to the whole body of the Church. In 1 Corinthians, His headship in the assembly is related individually to the believer. In verse 4, the covered head of the praying or prophesying man is seen to be dishonouring to his head ("and the head of every man is Christ"). Here the simple words "to cover" are used. Thus Christ must not be dishonoured by His symbolic concealment, the covered head of the man.

The woman is warned in verse 5. The uncovered head dishonours her figurative head ("and the head of the woman is the man"). The reason the man is not to be held in dishonour will be developed in the lesson in glory: "Forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God" (v. 7). The word "dishonour" is a superlative, "to thoroughly put to shame." In the context, when a man appears with his head covered, or a woman with her head uncovered, it is an implicit denial of the divine teaching regarding headship, whether intentional or otherwise.

Now the Spirit leads Paul to press the issue and to show its solemn overtones by giving a lesson in glory, and strong reasons for compliance with this word of instruction. Glory might be said to be a visible manifestation of inward nature. The glory of a rose bush is the rose. That is not all of the rose bush, but the bloom is the manifestation of its nature. By the rose we learn the nature of the bush. The reason for the uncovered head of the man is given: "Forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God." Image is not likeness; these are distinctly different ideas. Likeness is similitude, being like; image is representation, whether like or not. The Lord Jesus is never spoken of as "being in the likeness of God." He cannot be "like" God since He is God.

Man must not, then, cover his head in the assembly because he represents God as His image. Further, he is the glory of God. If image is representation, then glory is manifestation. God's authority must not be hidden. This is the twofold reason for the uncovered head of the man.

The woman is not spoken of as the image of man, but as his glory. Here it is not representation, but manifestation. The glory of man must not be manifest in spiritual exercises, therefore that glory must be covered. No glory but God's is to be seen in the spiritual realm. Thus when the man sees the women's

heads covered, he is reminded that his glory is covered there too. His public ministry is to be done so God alone receives the glory.

The reason for the woman's covering is also twofold. First, it is a natural one. Verse 8 shows that the man had precedence in the natural realm and is therefore an image of God, "for Adam was first formed" (1Ti 2:13). The woman, as steward of the coverings, aids the man in his responsibility.

Second, a spiritual reason is given in verse 10. "For this cause ought a woman to have power (a sign of submission to authority) on her head because of the angels." Why is this? Ephesians 3:10 gives a clue as to the importance of angelic observation. God uses the Church to teach them something of His manifold wisdom. How can these spirit beings learn the significance of the Lordship of Christ, the place of the Church and of the individual believer? Such things are an utter mystery to them. God shows them by object lessons or symbols.

Just as Aaron is a type of Christ in certain ways, though completely unaware of it himself, and just as the Lord used a little child to teach the disciples a lesson on entrance into the kingdom, although the child was oblivious to his role, so now, though we may be unaware of it, we are under the scrutiny of spirit beings. We are being used by God as object lessons to make known the glorious truths of authority and submission which otherwise would be unintelligible to them. How solemn! Yet Abraham grasped a higher truth when he said, "The Lord before whom I walk."

When a woman comes into a church gathering with her head covered, she performs a ministry to the hosts of heaven. She becomes to angels an object lesson of submission to divine headship. What a rebuke she is to the wicked angels! Their sin is that of rebelling against divine authority. What a delight to the obedient angels, as they see also the man's head uncovered portraying the unshielded glory of God and His accepted authority!

However, there is an assurance in verse 11 that positionally there is no thought of superiority because of gender. Paul states in verse 12 that even though the first woman came out of the man, ever since every man has come into the world by a woman. We are together, "in the Lord."

Some excuse their uncovered heads by citing verse 15, "Her hair is given her for a covering." Since she has hair, these assert, that is enough. Surely a careful reading of the text would show such an interpretation to be a weak avoidance of the truth as it is set out. Notice that for the woman there are two glories involved. She is a glory: "The woman is the glory of the man" (v. 7). But she also has a glory of her own. Her hair is a glory to her (verse 15). For the glory that she is (the glory of the man), God has given her a natural covering, her long hair. For the glory that she has (her hair), she must submit her will to cover that with another covering which she places over her own glory.

For all who can receive the ministry of the Word, there is a responsibility to obey. Elders and ministers of God's Word are also accountable to give needed instruction and not to shun to declare the whole counsel of God. If we fail to address ourselves to these matters, we should not be surprised when aberrations appear regularly, even brazenly, among us.

Long-haired men are not left out of these solemn verses (1Co 11:1-16). In this day when even some believers follow this fashion, a word might be timely. Verse 14 teaches that it is contrary to the natural order for a man to have long hair. Why is this? Verse 15 shows us. Long hair is a glory for the woman. Therefore, for a man to be wearing this glory is a paradox in the sight of God and of the angels. The glory of the woman must not be seen in the Church, whether displayed by women or men.

To raise this subject usually calls forth some argument. Some say that the Lord Himself had long hair. Did He? How would we know from Scripture? Of this we have no certain knowledge. In any case, if those who so argue really desire conformity to Christ, it is clearly taught in Scripture that for the present it is moral likeness to His Son that God desires, not physical. The Spirit is working in our lives to transform us in heart and conduct to the Lord. Speculation is no excuse to contravene the clear instruction of the Word of God.

From where does this fashion of long haired men come? Not the Beatles, as many think. In Revelation 9, the hordes of hell erupt from the pit. They are seen as having the "faces of men and . . . the hair of women." Just as the Lord is transforming His saints into a moral likeness to Christ, so the arch-enemy seeks to conform a multitude into a likeness which portrays a confusion of God's natural order. Confusion of the sexes has always been a mark of depravity through the ages. It frequently has called forth the judgment of God.

Whatever long hair on men may have meant to our grandfathers or early brethren, we cannot say, but in our day it is the badge of rebellion. We must remember, too, that when men wore their hair longer a century ago, the hair of women was much longer, thus maintaining the distinction between male and female.

This is not to say that every man who wears his hair long is rebelling against God. Many are not consciously doing so, but in the light of Scriptures under consideration, they may be, all unwittingly, making themselves object lessons for the adversary against Scripture's standards.

Some questions naturally arise out of the examination of this subject. Man's penchant for rules would have him prefer that the Lord lay down in inches "how long is long." The Lord wisely has not done so in this case, nor in many areas that affect our lives. The great principle of the Christian life is "faith." If a sincere desire is present, together with a submissive will, it will not be long before the exercised soul will know if the Holy Spirit is being grieved or not.

Is this for today? The relevance of these verses (the bread and wine symbols do not suffer from this argument) is sometimes brought into question. It is implied that this was a Corinthian problem and applied only to that church. However, all the teaching of this epistle is clearly directed in its introduction. It was written to the Corinthian saints "with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord." Paul is not afraid to address cultural problems in Corinth. But in this chapter there is no mention of culture. Instead, he takes us back to creation to show us the basis for the order being discussed.

Chapters 11-14, which form a unit, close with the warning, "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord."

Sometimes the size of the head covering for women is the question. The word used to describe this covering is a superlative, and means to "amply cover." Tiny bows and almost invisible nets cannot be said to "amply cover." They may enhance her glory, not cover it.

Another query is sometimes raised regarding wigs. Do they cover? Yes, they cover the woman's natural glory, but they obviously defeat the spiritual purpose by providing an imitation glory. The onlooker sees a facsimile of her glory uncovered, and not a badge of submission.

At what age should a girl be expected to wear a covering over her hair? Should teenagers? Perhaps this could be easily resolved by asking how young should a boy be before he does not wear a covering? Perhaps it has been argued that these youngsters do not pray or prophesy and are therefore exempt.

However, none can gainsay the exhortation to fathers to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Submission to the Lord is to be taught our children by example, by precept, and when necessary, by chastening. All parents would agree that it is easier and happier for all if this be learned at the earliest age.

On what occasions this scripture applies presents a more difficult problem. Obviously it includes church gatherings where the elders would be held accountable before the Lord. A meeting of the local church is not determined by geography, however. It is possible to have church order in a house (as the early church met), or to have home order in a church building (as with a wedding). Church order could be in effect in a field or forest, as with many during times of oppression. What determines the order is who God would hold responsible if anything went wrong. In world order, God holds government to be responsible. In home order, it is the husband or parent. In church order, the elders are held to account.

There are, however, other occasions when a woman may exercise an oral ministry by prayer or testimony from the Scriptures. The principles laid down here would apply to such. Further instructions are found elsewhere in Scripture; for instance, in 1 Corinthians 14, governing the woman's silence in the assembly. Chapter 11 must be read in the light of these subsequent controls. But remember that devotion to Christ, not mere duty, is our guide.

When there is uncertainty as to the wearing or not wearing of the covering, it would seem, in the light of 1 Corinthians 11:10, that the exercised sister will not wish to risk grieving her Lord. Private home situations are clearly distinct, since in the home and family context the order of rule is not directly through the elders, but through the husband and father in the home.

It is a strange thing that there are few Scriptures that stir up the fire in some saints like this one. This may be the reason why the earlier part of 1 Corinthians 11 is taught less than the remainder of the chapter. Likely the apostle also felt the ire of some when he refers in verse 16 to the possibility of contention. It was the custom of the Jewish men of that day (and today) to cover their heads in the synagogue. It was also the custom of the Greek women to enter the temple with their heads uncovered. But, says Paul, "We have no such custom." The New Testament Church was distinct from the heathen temple; consequently, it stood in contrast to social and religious customs of the day. Christians were to behave differently in these matters.

The rebellious spirit can always find an argument and present picayune excuses which seek to discount both the relevance and personal application of this section of the Scripture. When we know that godly Moses suffered a soul-grieving loss as a result of spoiling a type of the glorified Lord, it should make us all tremble lest we too should be guilty of presenting to the eyes of believers, unbelievers, and the watching spirit world a distorted picture of our beloved Lord, His authority and glory.

In conclusion, let it be clearly understood that while outward form should convey inward condition, it is not always necessarily so. A woman, with the most adequate head covering and modest apparel, may be as cold as an iceberg in her devotion to the Lord, and all the while proud of her conformity to a set standard. Likewise, a short-haired man may be greatly grieving the Lord in other significant areas of his life. The long-haired youth, or the girl with uncovered hair may, in their hearts, be devoted to the Lord to the measure of the biblical light they have. They may be deeply committed to His cause and living blameless lives in the wicked society around them, but through spiritual infancy, or the failure of the elders and the teachers, have never learned the solemn implications of 1 Corinthians 11.

While the outward sign does not necessarily convey spirituality, nor the absence of it bespeak carnality, it is axiomatic that the submissive heart, willing to learn and to please the Lord who bought it, will be

brought into the light of the Word of God suddenly or little by little, and will never risk a compromise.

by J. Boyd Nicholson, Sr.

ADJUNCT J: What About Women Wearing Pants?

For I have not shunned to declare unto you ALL the counsel of God. -Acts 20:27-

"And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread, AND WEAR OUR OWN APPAREL." -Isaiah 4:1a-

What does the Bible say about a saved woman wearing pants? Is it even an issue with God? Or is it merely a matter of preference or opinion to be left up to individuals to do what is right in their own eyes? Since we believe the Bible, more specifically, the King James Bible, to be the FINAL AUTHORITY (not tradition, opinions, or how one "feels" led), let's start there.

Deuteronomy 22:5 - "The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord thy God." After reading this verse, what things pop into your mind? Earrings and necklaces on men, long hair on men, short hair on women, dresses on men, and of course, pants on women. Notice the word "abomination" is used to describe how God feels about cross-dressing.

I looked it up in Webster's Dictionary. "abom.i.na.tion"= 'extreme disgust and hatred' : LOATHING! That's pretty strong language, wouldn't you say?

While most church members react in disgust to Sodomites who parade down the street in dresses, they readily accept and even defend women wearing pants. According to God's Word, it is no more of an abomination for a man to wear a dress than it is for a woman to wear a pair of pants. "Yeah, but that's in the Old Testament, so it doesn't apply to Christians today." Ah yes, the battle cry of the liberal and the carnal church member. Let's deal with this objection by considering some other abominations found in the Old Testament.

Leviticus 18:22 - Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination.

Leviticus 20:13 - If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them.

Would anyone care to argue that sodomy is no longer an abomination unto God? This principle is repeated in the New Testament (Romans 1:23-32 and 1 Corinthians 6:9.)

Proverbs 6:16-19 - These six things doth the LORD hate: yea, seven are an abomination unto him: A proud look, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, An heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, A false witness that speaketh lies, and he that soweth discord among brethren.

Do we now have liberty to sow discord among the brethren? To be prideful? To lie? To kill innocent people? Of course not! It would be absurd to think so. These principles are also repeated in the New Testament (Matthew 5:22; 15:19, Mark 7:21-22, Luke 1:51, Acts 5:3, Romans 1:25; 1:30; 12:10, 1 Corinthians 8:12-13, Galatians 5:21, Ephesians 4:25, Colossians 3:9, 1 Timothy 1:9; 3:6; 6:3-4, 2

Timothy 3:2, James 4:6, 1 Peter 3:5; 4:15, 1 John 2:11; 2:16; 2:21; 3:4; 3:15). People seem to be playing "pick-n-choose" with Old Testament verses. They want the twenty-third Psalm, the hundredth Psalm, and all the OT verses that won't affect their lifestyle, but then they try to explain away any OT verse that would have any effect on how they live.

2 Timothy 3:16 - "ALL SCRIPTURE is given by inspiration of God, and IS PROFITABLE for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."

Is not Deuteronomy 22:5 scripture? If so, then it is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness. Preachers, will you be like so many of the liberals of today and cut these verses out of your Bible as Jehoiakim did? Or will you stand like Paul and be able to say, "And how I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have shewed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, " Acts 20:20

"Yeah, but I thought all guidelines for how a Christian is supposed to live were in the New Testament"

Let's look at 1 Corinthians 10:1-11. "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; 2 And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; 3 And did all eat the same spiritual meat; 4 And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ. 5 But with many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness. 6 Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. 7 Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them; as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play. 8 Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand. 9 Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents. 10 Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer. 11 Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come."

Throughout this passage Paul continually uses the Old Testament to prove something. Focus on verses 6 and 11. Paul tells us that those OT writings are for us today. I suppose Paul would be called a legalist or a Pharisee by today's liberals. Just because something is in the OT does not negate it from being applicable for us in the church age. Any commandment or teaching in the OT that is repeated in the NT is for us.

"Yeah, but Deuteronomy 22:5 is not repeated in the New Testament"

Wrong. In fact, the New Testament is even more specific. 1 Timothy 2:9 says, ". . . that women adorn themselves in modest apparel . . ." "Apparel" today is a very general term that means "any article of clothing." But did you know that in 1611 the word "apparel" meant "loose, long flowing garment?" Look it up in an old Oxford English Dictionary that has the archaic meanings of words. Furthermore, the Greek word is *katastole* which is an EXACTING WORD, and it is the ONLY place in the Bible where it is used. There are lots of words for clothing, attire, etc., but this word comes from a verb form which means "to lower." It denoted a loose-fitting outer garment, which was LONG. Paul used this word specifically to tell women that they are to wear long DRESSES. Pants, miniskirts, tight dresses, etc. can not fit the definition of this exacting word. Consult your Vine's Dictionary for verification of this word definition. The fact that God wants a CLEAR distinction between the appearance of a man and a woman is also repeated in 1 Corinthians 11 when Paul deals with the issue of hair length. God is very concerned with the outward appearance of a saved person. To believe otherwise is to profess ignorance of the Word of God.

"Yeah, but what makes you think that pants are a man's garment?"

Good question. I have a four part answer to this which demonstrates that pants always pertain to men, even today.

1. "Breeches" were an article of clothing designed by God for the priests who were all men. The word does not occur very often in scripture, but in every case it's men's apparel (Exodus 28:42, Leviticus 6:10; 16:4). According to my Hebrew lexicon, "breeches" means "trousers that extend to the knee, below the knee, or to the ankles." This would include pants, shorts, or culottes.

2. Until the advent of Hollywood and the movie screen, everyone (including lost people) knew that pants were men's apparel and dresses were women's apparel, and they dressed accordingly. Our culture's (and sadly most churches') acceptance of cross-dressing has resulted largely from the influence of television, the placement of women in the workforce, and the pressures of twentieth century feminism.

3. The universal symbol for designating a men's bathroom is a stick figure wearing a pair of pants. The universal symbol for designating a woman's bathroom is a stick figure wearing a dress. Coincidence? Hardly. Even our sinful society recognizes that there is a difference in a man's and woman's clothing.

4. Pants are a symbol of authority, as evidenced by the saying "I'm the one who wears the pants in the family." Sadly, most women might as well wear the pants, since they rule their homes anyway!

"Yeah, but pants are not really that immodest"

The following is from *What in the World Should I Wear?* by Mrs. Cathy Corle:

"A friend of mine told me that her decision to restrict her wardrobe to dresses and skirts came as a result of a ladies' class. All the arguments and reasons that could be given were unheeded until the lady who was speaking said, 'Let me just demonstrate something to you.' She asked the ladies in the audience to close their eyes momentarily. She held up a large picture of a woman in an attractive, modest feminine skirt and blouse. She asked the ladies to open their eyes. Then she inquired, 'What is the primary focal point to this picture? Where did your eyes first fall naturally?' The audience agreed that their eyes were first drawn to the face of the woman in the picture. "She once again asked the ladies to close their eyes. When they opened their eyes they were looking at a large poster of a woman in a sport shirt and blue jeans. She asked, 'Now, be honest with yourselves, and tell me where your eyes first fell naturally when you looked at this picture?' Many of the ladies in the crowd were surprised to find that most people's eyes first focused upon the hips and crotch area that were so vividly emphasized before they ever noticed the woman's face. "If this happened in a crowd of ladies, how much more would it be true of men? For my friend, Joetta, this was all the 'evidence' that was needed."

To this I say, "AMEN!" Christian women should always be aware of Matthew 5:28, "**But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.**" "Yeah, but wearing pants may be wrong for some saved women, but I'm not 'convicted' about it." So you're not "convicted" about wearing pants? Big deal. Does that give you permission to rebel against the Word of God? You must ask yourself, "What is the FINAL AUTHORITY on deciding what I believe and how I live? The Bible? Or how I 'feel' convicted?"

Jeremiah 17:9 - "**The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?**"

Proverbs 14:12 - "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."

Human feelings are very deceptive. We cannot rely on them. Any "leading" you may feel to do or not to do something that is contrary to the Word of God is not of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit NEVER leads contrary to the Bible, but He always leads according to the Bible.

Ephesians 6:17 - "And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."

1 John 5:7-8 - "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one."

Many people claim not to be "convicted" about forsaking church attendance, drinking alcohol, smoking, gambling, cursing, fornication, adultery, and all manner of activities clearly forbidden in the Bible, but that does not make it all right for them to do these things. 1 John 4:1 warns us, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." To try and say that wearing pants may be wrong for some saved women and not for others is to engage in moral relativism which strips all authority from God's Word.

God does not have two sets of standards. He is no respecter of persons. Acts 10:34 - "Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons."

Wearing pants is either wrong for ALL saved women, or it is wrong for none. In deciding if something is right or wrong, our first consideration must ALWAYS be what the Word of God says, not how we may "feel convicted."

Ecclesiastes 12:13-14 - Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil. Follow the Bible, and you'll be doing what is right. Follow your feelings, emotions, leadings, etc. , and who knows what you'll be doing?

"Yeah, but wearing pants is not really that big of an issue, and they are much more comfortable and practical to wear"

It's kind of funny that for nearly **6000 years**, women always wore long dresses, but only since the last 40 years, a dress is suddenly "impractical" to wear. You cannot change history to validate what you want to make acceptable for today. Nowadays, women think that they cannot so much as rake a few leaves without adorning themselves in a pair of pants. If you saw a man wearing a dress, what would you call him? Uh-huh, you would have *no* trouble knowing that it was wrong, and an abomination to God (even if his dress had a fly). But we have been conditioned by the world and erring brethren that a pair of pants is a good and acceptable thing for a woman to wear today. Just because it is common does not make it right. In fact, I believe that it is all part of Satan's plan to further defile mankind by mixing the genders.

Have you noticed how wimpy the boys are getting and how masculine the girls are getting? Women's sports are becoming the rage. We would rather have our girls learn how to "Kill 'em on the court" than to learn to be chaste and skilled at homemaking. This is how we have come to put women in military combat positions. We would have never even considered this 20 years ago, but now we are eliminating the difference in the sexes that God made. Oh there will always be a difference in gender, because

there HAS to be. But now, the emphasis is not on the beauty of a girl's femininity (which brings out the masculinity in a man). NOW the emphasis is the difference in BODY PARTS! There is no longer the striking difference between a beautiful woman in feminine attire, long pretty hair, and a masculine man that practices chivalry. (Put a real feminine woman around a man and see how chivalrous he becomes.) Now the difference is emphasized in her physical body difference, which leads to lust and a degradation of womanhood! (and manhood too). A feminine woman is in her rightful place of an elevated position. But as soon as she steps down off her pedestal to wear pants and be "equal" to a man, it drags everybody down, which is exactly what Satan wants. The devil is still whispering in Eve's ear to destroy mankind. If you look at it, you'll find it was usually the woman that led in the matters of sin and error. You can begin at the garden, through Israel's idolatrous apostasy and even into recent history, with cults, Charasmania, and other errors. *Now the boys are wearing earrings and have long hair, while the girls are wearing pants and chopping their hair off*, even though this is forbidden in scripture (1 Corinthians 11). To top it off, most preachers will not preach against short hair and pants because this would affect a majority of the women in his congregation including his wife and daughters! (Say amen right there.)

Although I am a man, I have testimonies of women who say that an ankle length dress is far more comfortable than a pair of pants. But the ultimate question that you are going to have to ask yourself is this, "What's more important? Being comfortable? Or obeying the Word of God?" I think we all know the answer to that one.

In the end It does not matter where you go in life; What you do in life; Or what you have in life. It's Who you've got living inside you! Rom 8:9: *But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.*

by Christopher T. Flourney