



The Grace Proclamator and Promulgator

“To testify the gospel of the grace of God.” Acts 20:24

PUBLISHED AS A MISSION PROJECT OF CENTRAL BAPTIST CHURCH

Vol. XXII, No. 4

April 1, 2006

Page 1

WOMEN SPEAKING IN MIXED ASSEMBLIES

Continued from March 1, 2006, issue

By Eld. J. W. Porter

(1863-1937)

(Taken from *The Baptist Debt to the World* published in *The Historic Baptist, Winter Issue 1996-1997*)

Next to the Bible, it is quite natural that we should look to the world's greatest biblical scholars for light on the sacred text. This is even the more natural, in this instance, in which the world's greatest scholars are all agreed. It may be well for us just here to give heed to what the world's greatest commentaries have to say on this subject.

Dr. Hodge says -

In the Old Testament it has been predicted that your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; a prediction which the Apostle Peter quotes as verified on the day of Pentecost, Acts 2:17, and in Acts 21:9, mention is made of four daughters of Philip who prophesied. The Apostle himself seems to take for granted, in 11:5, that women might receive and exercise the gift of prophecy. It is therefore only the *public exercise* of the gift that is prohibited.

The Patrick, Lowth, etc.. Commentary says:

Let your women keep silence in churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak (*by way of teaching or prophesying, but only by joining with the church in prayer and psalmody*) but they are commanded to be under obedience as also saith the law . . . In Corinth the women not only prophesied in the church; but they did it with the head uncovered. I Cor. 11:5; the latter indecency he corrects there, and the first here. See I Tim 2:12. Com. on I Cor. 14:34.

Godet, on I Cor 14.34-

The saints, distributed in churches, locally speaking, yet form only one great spiritual whole: the Corinthians should not isolate themselves from the community of saints by adopting customs rejected by all the rest of the body, such as the speaking of women in the assemblies.

And as the attitude of authority over the man is contrary to that of obedience which was imposed on the woman during the present economy, he draws the conclusion that the speaking of the woman in public is in contradiction to the position assigned to her by the divine will expressed in the law. It is easy to see why the apostle substitutes the general idea; *to be subject*, which relates to the whole life of women for that of *not speaking* in the assemblies: it is because the silence of women in worship is only an application of the general subordination which is imposed on them in relation to man.

Ellicott on I Tim. 2:12-

Every form of *public* address or teaching is clearly forbidden as at variance with woman's duties and destination.

This according to his view, would conflict with modesty and with woman's rightful position, and would lead to many evils. It is an evasion to discriminate between women speaking in *church meetings* and women addressing general congregations. The apostles objection was to the public character of the act, and when

THE GRACE PROCLAMATOR AND PROMULGATOR (USPS Standard Mail Permit Number 876) is published monthly (subscription free) by the authority of CENTRAL Baptist Church, PO Box 876, Grenada, MS. Postage paid at Grenada, MS, 38901.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE GRACE PROCLAMATOR AND PROMULGATOR, PO Box 876, Grenada, MS 38901-0876.

COPYING PRIVILEGES

Any articles or messages in this paper may be copied and used as the reader sees fit unless otherwise specified before or after the article or message. Our desire is to disseminate the gospel of grace as widely as possible.

CO-EDITORS' ADDRESSES, PHONE NUMBERS AND E-MAIL ADDRESSES

Editor, Eld. Wayne Camp, may be reached at the address given above, or at his home address. His home address at present is: 3809 Strider Rd, Scobey, MS 38953.

Home: (662) 229-9578

E-mail address: rwcamp@gpp-5grace.com

Visit our Home Page on the Internet

<http://www.gpp.camps-computer.com/>

Editor, Eld. Bill Lee may be reached at PO Box 876, Grenada, MS 38901-0876.

Editor Lee's phone number is 662-226-2715.

E-Mail Address: billandjan@cableone.net

PLANNING TO MOVE? If at all possible, please notify us three weeks in advance of your change of address so that we may keep your paper coming. It costs us up 75 cents to get your new address from the Postal Service and that may take long enough that two papers are returned at a cost of up to \$1.50 before we get the correction. This will mean you miss one or two papers. Your help in saving us this expense will be appreciated.

IF YOU ARE IN Grenada, MS, we invite you to attend our services:

Bible Study 9:45 A. M. Sunday

Worship Service 11:00 A. M. Sunday

Evening Service 5:00 P. M. Sunday

Mid-Week Service 6:30 P. M. Wednesday

You Are Welcome!

he is speaking of the 'meetings of the church' in this very chapter, he is referring to gatherings to which unbelievers had access.

Dean Stanley, on I Cor. 14:34, says -

One particular instance of confusion growing out of the neglect of order in the control of the gifts was the speaking of women in the assemblies. This custom, like that of appearing unveiled (11:3-16), he condemns on the ground that he forbade it in all the assemblies of the Christians. The speaking of women was also

expressly forbidden in the synagogues.

Webster & Wilkerson -

The prohibition of women to speak in public is explicit, stringent, absolute, universal, and fortified by appeals to the law of revelation, and the law of nature. The apostle reiterates it in various forms, as if to prevent the possibility of being misunderstood.

Barnes -

Let your women keep silent, etc. This rule is positive, explicit, and universal. There is no ambiguity in the expressions, one would suppose, in regard to their meaning. The sense evidently is that in all those things which he specified, the women were to keep silence, they were to take no part . . . It was contrary to all decency and propriety that they should appear in that manner in public. He here argues against the practice on every ground; forbids it altogether, and shows in every consideration it was to be regarded as improper for them even so much as to ask a question in time of public service.

Thomas Scott -

To reconcile these verses with the Scripture referred to (I Cor. 11:2-16), it seems most natural to suppose that some of the Corinthian women were used to speaking publicly, when not under any immediate or extraordinary impulse of the Holy Spirit; and perhaps they interrupted the other speakers by inquiries and objections according to the disputatious spirit which prevailed. The apostle therefore laid down as a general rule (to which the foregoing case was the only exception), women must not be allowed to speak in to public congregation or to assume the office of teachers, or disputants: for this by no means consisted with that subjection to their husbands, which the law of God inculcated.

Beet, (on 33b, 34) -

These verses go together. For whereas verse 33b would add no force to the calm assertion of verse 33a, It introduces suitably, by making it valid for all churches, the strong and strongly confirmed injunction of verse 34. Similar references to other churches in 4:17; 7:17; 11:16. (See **WOMEN Con't. P. 5, L. Col., Bottom**)

I REMEMBER DR. LAWRENCE CRAWFORD

By Elder Royce Smith

I first saw and heard Dr. Crawford in June of 1963. He was introduced to preach the annual sermon at the ABA (American Baptist Association) which met in Oklahoma City that year. I will always remember how eagerly he stepped forward to the podium to speak. He was sharply dressed and his mannerisms were refined. He began to preach with power, capturing my attention. Unlike most preachers in such meetings, he did not tell us how great we were but boldly told us what Baptists had lost. Many were upset by that message and criticized it, but I took it to heart. In fact, I obtained a copy of his outline and preached this message several times myself. It was in my view "right on."

When I moved to Concord, CA. in 1966, I was told by the brethren that Dr. Crawford and the Hayward Church had departed from the faith and had become "Hardshells." Later, I would learn not to believe everything you heard, even if it came from religious sources. The church I pastored had been started as a mission out of the Hayward Church under the leadership of Dr. Crawford. Several people who knew him spoke very highly of him to me, but since he had supposedly departed from the faith, we were not to have anything to do with him. Like a dummy, I listened, thereby missing ten years of time in which I could have been having fellowship with this dear man.

By 1976 it was being said by many of those who had accused Dr. Crawford of departing from the faith that I had also departed from the faith. A splinter group had left the church I pastored, accusing me of various faults, and preachers all over the state were spreading rumors about what I believed. I had been accused of not being a real Baptist, and I began to wonder about that myself, thinking that, if those who were misrepresenting me and calling the truth I professed error were real Baptists, then I was not because I was not like them nor did I believe many of the things they did. To ascertain whether or not I was a true Baptist, I decided I needed to do some thorough studying

of Baptist History and historical Baptist Doctrine. I wrote my good friend, Dr. R. E. Pound with whom I had attended Bible College, and asked him to recommend some Baptist works to me. He sent me a box full of books, and in his letter suggested I call Dr. Lawrence Crawford and get acquainted with him. Bro. Pound said, "He is such a sweet brother and has been maligned and misrepresented by those who do not know him." At that time I thought to myself, "The same thing that is happening to me probably happened to him." I did not know how accurate this conclusion was until I met him and began to compare notes with him over our treatment by brethren in the Cooperative Associations in California.

As Bro. Pound had suggested, I called Dr. Crawford. I will never forget that cheerful voice that answered the phone (the same cheerful voice I would hear hundreds of times through the years when I would call him). When I introduced myself, he responded, "O, yes Bro. Smith, I have heard of you, and I know many of your people in the old Oakdale Church in Oklahoma." From that moment something special developed between us.

I asked if I could come up and meet him, and he invited me to come, saying he would take me out to eat (another pleasant experience that we would share time and time again).

On October 5, 1976 (I know the date is correct because on that day he gave me a copy of Gill's Body of Divinity, and I entered the following on the first blank page inside the cover: "This book presented to me, Royce Smith, by Dr. R. Lawrence Crawford on October 5, 1976). I headed to Hayward from my home in San Jose to meet Dr. Crawford. The greeting in person was even warmer and more enthusiastic than the one on the phone. He showed me around the church facility, and then we got into his car and headed for lunch. Since I had begun to doubt I was a Baptist, because I was seeing that the word "church" sometimes seemed to be applied in Scripture to all of the redeemed and did not want that understanding to hinder future

fellowship, I informed Dr. Crawford of my position. I'll never forget how he took his right hand off the steering wheel and extended it to me, saying, "You are in the company of some great Baptists who also believed what you believe." Later I would learn how many Baptists believed the same thing, not in a universal church in the Protestant sense, but that it takes all the redeemed of the ages to make up the church universal in a figurative sense.

That day was such a joyous day to me. I met Sister Ina Crawford, Bro. John Crawford, Bro. T. P. Crawford and Bro. Mark Crawford that day as well. Before I left, Dr. Crawford presented me with Gill's Body of Divinity. As I drove home that day, I rejoiced greatly in the fellowship and love I had experienced. That day began a fellowship which lasted until he was called home. Although communication with him lessened over the last 5 or 6 years, the friendship did not. I continued to check on him through Bro. T. P. periodically, and he was always in my prayers.

I learned so much from Dr. Crawford. He first prepared me for the attacks I would experience from those who wanted to destroy the church I pastored. As he told me, so those who chose to be my enemies did, but the Lord was with me and brought the church through this time, making it stronger. On one occasion, another preacher who was disillusioned with the association accompanied me to Hayward to meet Dr. Crawford. As we visited, this preacher said, "We need to have a fellowship meeting." Dr. Crawford said, "Okay, let's invite several preachers to meet on a certain date and plan a fifth Saturday fellowship meeting." The date was set, and the preachers convened. I met for the first time Elders Leonard Buttram, Jack Green, Richard Cavanaugh, and some others. I already knew Bro. Noel Brown. At this meeting the Fifth Saturday Fellowship in which preachers would preach on the Articles of Faith from the New Hampshire Confession of Faith was conceived and planned. At the next fifth Saturday, we met and the preachers preached on different articles. It was a great meeting. Ironically, the preacher who suggested it got cold feet and did not attend, but rather chose to stay with the group with which he was so disillusioned. How difficult it is for preachers to break with

established groups!

I have always suspected that my adversaries thought I learned the doctrines of grace from Dr. Crawford. Like Apollos who learned the way of the Lord more perfectly from Aquila and Priscilla, I did learn the doctrines of grace more perfectly from Dr. Crawford and the other brethren who preached at the Fifth Saturday Fellowships. But I had already begun to believe the doctrines of grace before I met him. In fact, as he did many times thereafter, Dr. Crawford, just after we got into his car to go to lunch, asked me, "What did you preach Sunday?"

I answered, "Making Your Calling and Election Sure' from 2 Peter 1:10." That was the first time I had preached unconditional election instead of election based on foreseen faith, however.

As you who knew him know, Dr. Crawford was ever the teacher. I learned so much from him. He was always whetting my appetite to learn. We always discussed the Scriptures. He was ever fresh, showing me something he had read in the Greek New Testament. We discussed Greek grammar. He was elated that I read the Greek New Testament and was almost beside himself when he saw I had the same Textus Receptus New Testament edited by Scrivner that he had. I must admit I had not been using it, reading instead from the inferior Nestle Text because I was taught it was superior in Bible College. Dr. Crawford diplomatically steered me back to the Textus Receptus by giving me a copy of "Our Authorized Bible Vindicated," one of many books he gave me over the years.

Dr. Crawford and I traveled together across this country several times, visited the King Tut exposition in San Francisco, visited in each other's homes, and preached in each other's churches several times. On all of these occasions I had an educational experience. My children observed on one occasion that when we were together, Dr. Crawford did all the talking. I said, "That is true, but I determine the subject on which he speaks." I did. I always had a question, and he would expound upon it.

One of my greatest regrets in leaving California in 1984 was leaving behind the close fellowship and opportunity to visit often with Dr.

Crawford. I always felt he, too, was saddened to see me move away. We continued to talk often on the phone and cherish those times we did see each other at fellowship meetings. He preached for me several years in succession here in Choctaw, and I returned to Hayward for meetings several times. My last visit with him was in October of 2001. He had already started showing signs of Alzheimer's disease, but when I spoke of Biblical or historical matters, he was still the Dr. Crawford I had known for 25 years.

Dr. Crawford was such a loving brother, loving others with the love with which His Lord loved him, and a true friend. He would do anything he could to help a fellow preacher. How he loved God's preachers. No Baptist preacher ever had a better friend than R. Lawrence Crawford.

He knew Baptist History and Baptist Doctrine as few do. I referred to him often as the successor to J. R. Graves. His learning and educational achievement, together with his quick mind, placed him in the class with such great men as Graves, Boyce, Pendleton, and others. I fear such a man as he shall not pass among us any time soon.

My heart has been saddened by his passing, though I rejoice he is with the Lord and his mind is clearer than it has ever been. What marvelous things he has learned! What reunions he has had. Surely he has already met all of the great Baptist preachers of the ages whom he read and loved. How well prepared he will be to greet us and teach us again there as he did here.

May the Lord bless his sons and grandchildren at this time, and may they all seek to follow in his footsteps. May the Lord bless the Missionary Baptist Church of Hayward, and sustain it in the blessed truths they learned from their esteemed and beloved pastor of more than 46 years.

(WOMEN, Continued from page 5.)

Of the saints: reminds us that church members stand in a special relation to God. In the churches: general assemblies of men and women. Compare 'over the man,' in the similar prohibition of I Tim. 11:12. Consequently, this verse is not inconsistent with 11:5, where women are tacitly

permitted to 'pray' and 'prophecy,' but limits these exercises to more private meetings chiefly or wholly of women. Notice the coincidence of 11:5. The women who are ready to speak in public would be also ready to lay aside their distinctive female head dress.

Olshausen's Commentary -

The deviation of the Corinthians from the right exercise of the Charismata was further shown in permitting women who were possessed of the gifts (for such alone can be intended to speak in public. This is reprobated by the apostle, appealing likewise to the word of God. Gen. 316). Women were to be submissive to their husbands in all things, and to learn, but not to teach . . . The speaking with tongues on the contrary he rarely permits, and commands under all circumstances, the observance of decency (antithesis of the unseemliness of women's speaking in the assembly, verse 35), and order (in opposition to the irregular speaking all at once, verse 27 seq.) . . . To exhibit more clearly the dependence of the woman on the man, the apostle adds an argument from the second chapter of Genesis. The fact that woman was formed out of the rib of man and was destined to be his helper is employed by Paul for this purpose. This argument would appear singular in these days, but evidently only because we have not accustomed ourselves to make the Holy Scriptures, especially the Old Testament, so literally. Paul, however, proceeds upon the unqualified divinity of the Old Testament, and the more this is generally recognized, the more admissible shall we learn to regard such proofs.

Meyer's Commentary -

Appendix to the regulative section regarding the gifts of the Spirit (verses 26-33), directed against the public speaking of women . . . Therefore it is preferable to connect the clause with what follows, as is done by Cajetan and most modern expositors: as in all church assemblies excludes, in Paul's view, the speaking in the assemblies, inasmuch as the latter appears to him as an act of complying independence. Gen.

3:16 . . . Paul is decided against all undue exaltation as assumption on the part of women in religious things, and it has been the occasion of much evil in the church.

John Calvin, on I Cor. 14:34, speaking of women's addressing mixed assemblies, says-

It is therefore an argument from things inconsistent. If the woman is under subjection, she is, consequently, prohibited from authority to teach in public. And again: Paul's reasoning, however, is simple — that authority to teach is not suitable to the station that a woman occupies, because if she teaches, she presides over all the *men*, while it becomes her to be *under* subjection.

The Bible Commentary (by bishops and clergy of the Church of England) says on I Tim. 2:11 -

Let the women learn in silence, etc. In public worship the men only are to teach as well as to pray. The apostle Paul had given the same injunction to the Corinthians, and had intimated that it was the universal regulation 'in all the churches of the saints,' I Cor 14:33-36. This is from Prof Wall.

The Popular Commentary (edited by Dr Philip Schaff) says on I Cor 14:33-36 -

And that further question comes in most suitably where we find it (ch. xiv), wider the head of how those extraordinary spiritual gifts, which were of local sanctity, but rather to emphasize the fact that the rule laid down was binding in the more private meetings of disciples as well as in the public gathering of the Ecclesia.

On I Cor 14:34-36, and I Tim 2:8-12. Dr. John A. Broadus says -

Now it does not need to be argued that these two passages from the apostle Paul do definitely and strongly forbid that women shall speak in mixed public assemblies. No one can afford to question that such is the most obvious meaning of the apostle's commands. "*Ought Women to Speak,*" etc., p. 4

Conybeare and Howson, in their *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, on I Cor. 16:33-36 -

The women must not officiate publicly in the congregation. On I Tim. 2:9-15, they say: The apostle's meaning is that women are to be kept in the path of safety, not by taking upon themselves the office of the man (by taking a public part in the assemblies of the church. etc.), but by the performance of the peculiar functions which God has assigned to their sex.

Lange's Commentary, on I Tim. 2:9-15, this part being written by Dr. Van Oosterzee, says:

As the apostle thus reverts to public prayers just commanded, he now states more exactly when, how, and through whom these should be conducted, and with this he adds his special counsel to the women as well as the men. The latter, in express distinction from the women, are alone to direct public prayers. It thus appears that, in the assembly of believers, this duty was not given exclusively to the presiding officer, but was performed without limitation by the members of the church. The apostle does not object to this, but only orders that the women shall abstain entirely from it, which, perhaps, in more recent times, they had not always done.

To this list from our Southern Zion may be added such names as Fuller, Hackett, Boyce, Broadus, Hawthorne and Eaton. If these Baptist worthies have all lived and died in such painful, if not sinful, ignorance of the Scriptures, we may well ask if there is any truth held by Baptists that may be considered a closed question. For nearly two thousand years, Baptists have been practically united on this question. It is worthy of note that only since the launching of the suffragette movement has there been any division of sentiment among us on this question. This movement, whatever may be its merits, has had a tendency to discount Scriptural authority. To such an extent is this true that the noted leaders in this movement have, with remarkably few exceptions, been known as neutrals or belligerents in their attitude to the New Testament. In fact, not a few of them publicly repudiate the teaching of Paul concerning women.

Unfortunately, those who claim that Paul did

not mean to forbid women's speaking in the churches fail to tell us what he really did mean. They deny that he meant what the consensus of the world's scholarship claims that he meant, yet they persistently refuse to tell us what he did intend to teach. An attempted exegesis by some of those who claim that Paul did not mean what he said, or did not say what he meant, would certainly be refreshing, and perhaps amusing.

Since the objections to the plain teaching of Paul are few and well defined, it may be well to consider them just here.

The first, and possibly the most common objection to Paul's teaching, especially among advanced women is "that he was a disgruntled old bachelor, and hence prejudiced against women." Were it not for the fact that this claim is so often made, and seemingly with all seriousness, it would seem useless to refute it. It is hardly necessary to say that such a contention discredits Paul's authority as a New Testament writer, and completely invalidates his claim to be inspired. If Paul's prejudice constrained him to misrepresent the will of God in one instance, why not in many, yea, every instance? According to this contention Paul's writings are inspired in spots, and anyone who objects to any part of his teaching is permitted to determine the spots. It is impossible, therefore, for one holding this objection to believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures. From the standpoint of the Christian, this objection automatically and axiomatically works its own destruction.

Another very common objection is that Paul's instructions in this regard were given only to the church at Corinth, and only to this church on account of the peculiar conditions existing. This objection is clearly and emphatically answered in the text. In verse 34, the language is, "Let your women keep silence in the **churches**." The plural form "churches," and not church, is used. The reasons assigned in his letter to Timothy, "For Adam was first formed and then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression," obviously pertains to all women. The prohibition, like the reasons given for it, beyond doubt, makes his injunction of universal application. In this connection, Paul further says:

"If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." This, unequivocally, implies that those who will not acknowledge the things Paul wrote was, ***"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."*** It will be observed that Paul affirms that what he commanded the churches concerning women was according to the law and the Gospel. It will be observed, therefore, that the command "to keep silence in the churches," has, if possible, behind it even more authority than the command to be baptized, since baptism was not enjoined by the law. The claim, then, that Paul's words were applicable only to the church at Corinth, is not only grotesquely gratuitous, but consistently contrary to the rule "in all the churches," and the teaching of the law and the Gospel.

Dr. Broadus well says:

"Why will not the Baptist people see the gross inconsistency of vehemently asserting the necessity of conforming to the New Testament in regard to church membership and the ordinances, while they coolly disregard express prohibitions in respect to another matter? Will our honored brethren and sisters please open their eyes, take their latitude and longitude, and see which way they are drifting?"

"'Ah, but,' some will say, 'this is a great movement; and it is going to grow. Shall we let the Methodists get all the benefit of it? Grant for the sake of argument that it seems expedient and will give denominational power. We let the Methodists get all the benefit of infant baptism, of Arminian theology, and of centralized organization because we think these things are contrary to the New Testament. If Baptists are going to abandon New Testament teachings for the sake of falling in with what they regard as a popular movement, the very reason for their existence has ceased.'"

Still another objection is that the injunction applied only to "married" women. This is a cool

assumption that Paul did not know how to express himself so as to be understood. Alas, poor Paul! how lamentable his lack of perspicuity!

Let us note for a moment the meaning of the word “women,” as used by Paul in this regard. The word translated “women” is *gunee* (gunaike) and according to Thayer, means “a woman of any age, whether a virgin or married, or a widow”

We know of no greater authority than Thayer, nor do we know of anyone who knows Greek that will be disposed to deny his definition. It is worthy of notice that some of the best MSS. omit “your” in verse 34. This fact, if possible, further weakens the case of those who would limit the meaning of the word to “wives”. Paul’s appeal to the law and his statement that Adam was first formed, and that the woman was first in the transgression demand that the injunction be applied to all women, and not restricted to wives. There are many places in the Scriptures where the word cannot mean wives. Translators, commentators and lexicographers are united as to the meaning of this word. The effort to limit the meaning of the word to married women is not only unscriptural, but contrary to common sense. If any woman should speak in mixed assemblies, good taste would suggest that it should preferably be married women. Modesty, which is more than becoming in all women, is especially commendable in the unmarried woman. There is neither Scripture nor reason in limiting the prohibition to married women. As a matter of fact, those who try to maintain this distinction have never been known to object to a married woman’s speaking in church. In the last analysis, the argument is made to discredit Paul and to hush the mouths of those who are earnestly contending for the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

In this regard, **Dr. Eaton sounded the following timely warning:**

“It may be well to bear in mind how women’s public speaking has been connected with various recent heresies. Spiritualism was started by women—the Misses Fox. Theosophy was started by a woman—Madam Blavatsky. The so-called Christian Science was founded by Mrs. Eddy. All of these sects have favored

women’s public speaking. The only safety for women and their only true progress lie in strict conformity to Bible teaching. This is not degrading women, it is honoring them. Their work in the world is no less important than men’s, and is no less honored of man and of God. God knows what is best for women as for men, and for us to assume that what He has told us in His Word is not suited to these ‘advanced’ times, and therefore we must act differently, is blasphemy. It is the same as saying that God does not understand the world and therefore has made a mistake in the principles He has given us for our guidance. It is not so great blasphemy to say there is no God, as to say there is a foolish God who does not understand what He is about in governing the world.”

Another, and unusually foolish objection is that because some women can speak well, therefore they should speak. This imaginary argument has been offered as a justification for the Asheville episode. In its last analysis, the argument amounts to this—because a man is a successful gambler, therefore he should gamble; because God has given one the power to kill another, therefore he should exercise his gifts to murder. It goes without saying that God has given us the power to do many things that He has commanded us not to do. What right have we to disobey God, because we can disobey Him in a felicitous manner? A mere statement of this objection should be sufficient for its refutation.

Yet another objection to Paul’s teaching is that it is not applicable to our age. This, if true, is indeed deplorable. If it be a fact that the New Testament was only adapted to the age in which it was written, Christians of today should, of all people, be most miserable. This contention adapts God’s words to the age, and not the age to the Bible. The Bible is truth for all people, and all time, or it is not inspired, and therefore not the Word of God. And just here, comes much of our trouble in this connection. There is a determined effort upon the part of the enemies of the Cross, to discredit the Bible as being inconsistent with our Twentieth Century civilization. It is tragically true that much of our boasted civilization is contrary to the express teaching of the Bible. Probably it has not

occurred to the satellites of our civilization that it might be well to change our civilization to meet the demands of the Bible, rather than repudiate the Bible to meet the demands of our civilization. In other words, to make man subject to God, rather than God subject to man. Whenever, and wherever, any civilization comes in conflict with the Scripture, it is then and there that it gives conclusive evidence of its own corruption. The Bible is supposed to establish a standard for the age, and not the age for the Bible.

As has been well said, "The advocates of this fad are simply following the trend of the age, which is an offshoot of that dangerous, unscriptural thing known as "feminism", whose avowed goal is the abolition of marriage, and destruction of the home." As Dr. Eaton once remarked: "The advanced woman will never be satisfied until she can become the father of the family."

It is not a matter of surprise that a great majority of the leaders in this movement to disregard the teaching of the bible are both childless and Christless. As a rule, they have not been known as homemakers or church members.

It is insistently urged that Paul's language cannot mean what it clearly appears to mean, because if it is so, it would conflict with other Scriptures. The particular case of supposed conflict that is offered in evidence by those who are determined to disregard Paul's prohibition is that of women's prophesying on the day of Pentecost. Concerning this, it is hardly necessary to say that Paul's teaching cannot conflict with other Bible teaching. To so assert, is equivalent to denying his inspiration and making Christ a contradiction. This is an impossible surmise with the Christian.

Whatever prophesying was done at Pentecost by the women was evidently not of a public nature, nor in mixed assemblies. It will be recalled that a portion, at least, of Peter's sermon is recorded, but no part of one delivered by a woman on that day. As is well known, much of the prophesying, even of the greatest prophets, was addressed to individuals, and not to assemblies. As a matter of fact, but comparatively few of the prophecies of the Bible

were delivered to public assemblies. The fact, then, that one prophesied, does not imply that he or she prophesied in the presence of either a public or mixed assembly.

Paul said that "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," but he did not say this of the women, because public speaking was not their mission. At best, those who affirm the speaking of women before a mixed assembly can only urge an unwarranted inference which conflicts with an unequivocal command. It is identically the argument that is offered by the advocates of infant baptism, and Baptists, of all people, should be the last to offer such an argument.

It is true that there is an instance in the New Testament of a woman's speaking in public. This is found in Rev. 2:20: "**Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication and to eat things sacrificed unto idols.**" It will be observed that both the fact of teaching and the character of the teaching is condemned. This was condemned in the church at Thyatira, as in "all churches."

Now, then, the prohibition against women's speaking in the churches is as plain and explicit as it is possible to make it. Indeed, we defy anyone to make a statement forbidding women's speaking in the churches in language that can be more easily understood than that used by Paul in this regard. We confidently venture the assertion that no one will make the attempt and if not, why not?

It is somewhat remarkable that not one of those who deny the age long interpretation of Paul's words will even attempt to give us an exegesis of these passages. The truth is, they cannot and dare not, and are therefore forced to content themselves with a simple negation without a particle of proof. If Paul did not mean what he said, in the name of common sense and fairness, why do they not tell us what he did mean? We kindly challenge them to the test.

Paul not only gives the command in language that is well nigh impossible to misunderstand, but goes further and specifically states the reasons upon which the command is based, as

follows:

1. Priority in creation; or as Paul puts it - **"For Adam was first formed, then Eve."** *I Tim. 2:13*. By creation, man has the precedence, and is the Scriptural head of the home, masculine women, feminine gentlemen, and a few excellent brethren to the contrary notwithstanding. It is a matter of small moment, who may, or may not like it. This is God's appointment, and we cannot deny it without repudiating the Scriptures.

"Indeed, we defy anyone to make a statement forbidding women's speaking in the churches in language that can be more easily understood than that used by Paul in this regard

". . . If Paul did not mean what he said, in the name of common sense and fairness, why do they not tell us what he did mean?"

It is just as true that woman is forbidden to usurp spiritual authority over man in the churches. Leadership in the churches has been given to man, and cannot be scripturally relinquished. To reverse the God-ordained order will mean the ultimate destruction of our homes and churches.

2. The second reason assigned is, **'Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.'** *I Tim. 2:14*. It is not gallantry, as sometimes suggested, that ignores this Scripture, but ordinary infidelity. The only possible question that can arise is one concerning the truthfulness of the account of Creation as given in Genesis. We regret to state that many of those who are striving to descripturalize and dewomanize woman, laugh to scorn the history of Creation as given in the book of Genesis.

3. A third reason is found in the law given at this time of the fall as contained in Gen. 3:16: **"The determination of thy will shall be unto thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."**

These reasons were given by Paul as the ground of prohibition for women's speaking in the churches, and we can only invalidate his prohibition by invalidating his reasons; and this can be done only by denying his authority and impeaching his character. Such a task can hardly be coveted by the Christian.

Not only does Paul give a command, and the reasons for the command, but further urges

obedience to the command by telling them that **"If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual. let him acknowledge the things I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord."** *I Cor. 14:37*. There is probably no command in all the Bible that is more clearly stated, more strongly sustained with unanswerable argument, and the observance of which is more insistently urged, than the one that the "women keep silence in the churches."

In the past, **"Thus saith the Lord,"** has been to Baptists an end of all controversy, and it is a sad comment on our generation that it is not true of today. Baptists are, essentially, strict constructionists, and the moment they begin to seek authority by inference and implication, they will forever forfeit their age-long contention. May the God of all grace help us to be true and steadfast in these perilous times. To this end, let us heed to His words:

"For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book. If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life and out of the holy city and from the things which are written in this book." *Rev. 22:18, 19*.

"WHAT'S YOUR QUESTION?"

QUESTION: Since you teach that one is saved through faith, do you believe that Satan was saved when he believed? (James 2:19).

ANSWER: Let me first point out that James 2:19 has reference to demons believing. Contrary to what is often preached it does not say that Satan believed. He did believe, however. This is clearly set forth in Isa. 14:12-14 where Lucifer said: "I will exalt my throne above the stars of God . . . I will be like the most High."

Satan, in the form of a serpent, asked Eve: "Hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? (Gen. 3:1). He also said: **Genesis 3:5 For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and**

ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. Even though James 2:19 has reference to demons, we can know that Satan did believe in God.

The first problem lies in the fact that Satan did not believe enough for salvation. **"Thou believest that there one God,"** wrote James to these Jews. **"The devils (DAMONIA-demons) also believe, and tremble."** Demons believe that Jesus is the Son of God. **"What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?"** (Matt. 8:29). Unclean spirits **"fell down before Him, and cried saying, Thou art the Son of God"** (Mark 3:11). **"Devils also came out of many, crying out and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God"** (Luke 4:41). Other demons cried? **"I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God"** (Mark 1:24). An evil spirit declared: **"Jesus I know"** (Acts 19:15).

These demons believed many things about God and they knew Jesus Christ. They knew Him to be the Christ, the Son of God. Yet, these demons were not saved.

WHY DEMONS, DEVILS, UNCLEAN SPIRITS, AND FALLEN ANGELS CANNOT BE SAVED

Believe as much as they may about God and Christ, these evil spirit beings can never be saved: Were one of them to cry out in repentance and faith, he still could not be saved.

1. God has not willed and purposed the salvation of fallen angels. God quickens into Spiritual life whom He will (Jn. 5:21) and He has not willed to quicken fallen angels, demons, etc. God **"hath mercy on whom He will have mercy"** (Rom. 9:15-18) and He has not chosen to have mercy on fallen angels and demons. Christ came and has given **"eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him"** (John 17:2) but fallen angels were not given to Him to save. **"All that the Father giveth shall come to Me,"** declared Jesus but demons and devils do not savingly come to Him because they were never given to Him to save. All whom

God **"did predestinate"** to salvation, **"them He also called: and whom He called, them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified"** (Rom. 8:29-30). No demon, devil, or fallen angel will ever be glorified because God did not choose one of them nor predestinate one of them to be conformed to the image of His Son. Since they were not of His elect and predestinated sons, He has not called, justified, nor glorified one of them. The **"elect angels"** (I Tim. 5:21) did not fall and therefore did not need salvation provided for them. The other angels fell and no salvation has been provided for them.

2. The fallen angels are appointed to destruction and ordained to condemnation. They asked Jesus: **"Art thou come to torment us before the time?"** (Matt. 8:29). These devils knew that at an appointed time they were to be tormented in the fires of hell which were **"prepared for the devil and his angels"** (Matt. 25:41). God was unsparing and unmerciful in dealing with fallen angels. **"God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment"** (II Peter 2:4). **"The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day"** (Jude 6).
3. The devil is a fallen angel and angels were not represented by Christ in the covenant of redemption. Therefore, when Christ came to this earth to **"die and give His life a ransom for many"** He **"took not on Him the nature of angels; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham"** (Heb. 2:16).

Since Christ did not take on the nature of angels He did not pay their sin debt. They will one day be **"cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever"** (Rev. 20:10) and the smoke of their torment will ascend up for ever and ever.

ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER CHANGES

The address, e-mail address, and phone number of Wayne Camp, Editor, have changed. My address is:

Wayne Camp
3809 Strider Rd
Scobey, MS 38953-9519

My new phone number is:
(662) 229-9578

My E-mail addresses are:
rwcamp@camp-computer.com
rwcamp@gpp-5grace.com
rwcamp@bellsouth.net
camp_wayne@hotmail.com

MUST A PREACHER ALWAYS WEAR A SUIT?

By Wayne Camp

TEXT: Matthew 3:3-4 For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. 4 And the same John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins; and his meat was locusts and wild honey.

When I was in seminary one teacher suggested that we should always wear a suit when on our church field unless it was our day off or we were working in the yard, etc. I recently heard that a preacher preached at a Bible Conference that a pastor should always wear a suit. When I heard it in school I tried to abide by it for several years. When I heard it recently my mind went a different direction. The first thing that crossed my mind was that mal-dressed preacher called named John who was the forerunner of Jesus Christ. Notwithstanding that Jesus himself rated John very highly he never wore a suit or tie. Matthew 11:11 Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. This poor dresser "had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins."

Then I thought of those first disciples whom Jesus called into a full-time ministry. Matthew 4:18-20 And Jesus, walking by the sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea: for they were fishers. 19 And he saith unto them, Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. 20 And they straightway left their nets, and followed him. Now notice that they "straightway left their nets, and followed" Jesus. He did not tell them to go buy some more suitable clothing—a suit and tie and wing tip shoes—and then they could follow him and be fishers of men.

All this leaves this writer wondering. Where do those who say the preacher must wear a suit all the time get their authority, Biblical authority, for such proclamations? Scripture please.

The Grace Proclaimator & Promulgator
PO Box 876
Grenada, MS 38901-0876

Non-Profit Org.
 Presorted Standard
 U. S. Postage Paid
 Grenada, MS 38901
 Permit No. 876