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To all faithful, conscientious Christian women, who have respect for the authority and teaching of Jesus Christ, as set forth in the New Testament, who want to know how to appear, and what to do in the worship of God, this book is hopefully dedicated.

THE AUTHOR

July 20, 1942
PREFACE

This book is a review of “God’s Woman” by C. R. Nichol. Brother John T. Lewis has rendered a real service to all truth seekers on the subject of this review. It deals with woman’s dress, her head covering, cutting her hair as well as being teachers of men. I have felt that “God’s Woman” should be reviewed and its fallacies exposed since I first read it. I am glad Brother Lewis has done it. He is thorough, honest, sincere and above all scriptural in his writing. He believes in the Bible on every question that pertains to life and godliness. This review is not only an exposure of the errors of “God’s Woman” by C. R. Nichol, but also a plain declaration of God’s truth on the subject according to the scriptures. 1 Cor. 11:1-16 would not be hard to understand but for the style of today of women coming into the public meetings of the church “bareheaded,” and cutting their hair according to the latest fashion. To support such by the Bible is impossible. It is a fearful thing to try to make the Bible support any practice, or custom it does not teach. This is exactly what the apostle means when he says: “But if any man seems to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God.” Contentious about what? Anything the scriptures do not teach of course. But on the other hand we are exhorted to “contend earnestly for the faith,” that is, the teaching “which was once for all delivered to the saints.” Jude 1:3. The teaching is very plain on the subject, viz.: A man ought not to cover his head in prayer; a woman ought not to pray with her head uncovered; that is, bareheaded, and if she does it is “even all one as if she were shaven.” 1 Cor. 11:4, 5. Also it is said, “If the woman be not covered, that is bareheaded, let her be shorn, and that it is a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven.” 1 Cor. 11:6. Furthermore it is said: “Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering.” 1 Cor. 11:14. Nature, therefore, teaches that a woman should have long hair and a man should have short hair. Since a woman’s long hair is given her for a covering she ought to have some
additional covering on her head to show that she willingly submits to the order of God, which says: “the head of the woman is the man.” Therefore she should have a sign on her head to show she is under the authority of the man. But when she is bareheaded in the meetings she lacks that sign. This is something she is to put on herself and not the hair which is given her for a covering. So, therefore, if she leaves off the covering, let her cut her hair at once; for it is all the same “as if she were shaven.” No practice, or custom can change this locally or otherwise. We must, therefore, contend that “the head of the woman is the man,” she ought to have power (or sign of authority on her head indicated by some covering in addition to her hair) that she should not be uncovered, or bareheaded, and that the man should not be covered. Customs and styles cannot change the Bible teaching on the subject and all who would be true to the word of God must contend for these things. To say this was local and only applied to the Corinthian church is a reckless perversion of the teaching. The apostle said: “We have no such custom, neither the churches of God.” And again: “As in all churches of the saints let your women keep silence.” 1 Cor. 14:34. This means all churches of the saints everywhere and for all time to come. It was wrong to teach unrevealed things—then it is wrong now, but it is right to teach the whole counsel of God. Let Paul speak again: “If any man think himself to be a prophet (that is, a teacher) or spiritual (that is, full of the Spirit) let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.” 1 Cor. 14:37. Here then “are the commandments of the Lord.” “The head of the woman is the man,” the man should not cover his head, the woman should not have her head uncovered, the man should not wear long hair, the woman should have long hair, the women are to keep silence in the church, it is not permitted unto them to speak in the church, that is, in public, they are commanded to be under obedience, not to teach nor usurp authority over the man, etc. All these things Paul wrote and therefore are the commandments of the Lord. The Savior said: “Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments and teach men so, he shall be called the
least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.” Matt. 5:19. It is bad enough to break the least commandment but much worse to teach others to do the same. To write articles and publish books to encourage people to disregard the commandment of the Lord on any subject is an egregious sin. The effort to show that style decreed women should have long hair, and men short hair, and that style has repealed that law so that women may cut their hair, and men grow theirs long, is without foundation in fact. To say Sampson had long hair and so did Absolom proves nothing. In Revelation 9:8 certain creatures are described as having “hair as the hair of women.” Twice in the life of Christ women wiped his feet with their hair. John 12:3. Luke 7:44. Let our women have long hair and cover their heads in obedience to the commandments of the Lord. Let every preacher, teacher and writer be careful to write, teach, and preach only such things as will encourage people to obey God rather than disobey him is my prayer.

—C. M. Pullias
This book is a review of that part of Brother C. R. Nichol's book—"God's Woman," which deals with the head covering, and also with the questions of women leading the prayers, and teaching in the public meetings of the church. It also contains a review of Brother R. L. Whiteside's muddling answers to the same questions, given in the Gospel Advocate.

According to these brethren, 1 Cor. 11:5, 6 gives women the right to lead the prayers, and to teach in the Lord's day worship. They also say that when Paul said: "Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head. But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head," his teaching was based solely on the custom of "that day," and in "that country." I believe such teaching is fatalistic. In Acts 20:7, Luke says: "And upon the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed with them, intending to depart on the morrow; and prolonged his speech until midnight." How would it be to say that what Luke said, was based on the custom of "that day," in the church at Troas? There would be just as much reason (?) in this, as there is in what these brethren are saying about 1 Cor. 11:5, 6.

I believe the editors of Sound Doctrine are rendering a real service to the cause in putting this review in book form for the benefit of all who may be interested in the study of these questions. However, one of the leading preachers, and educators of "our day," says: "I doubt, however, the sale of a book like you mention. Wherever I go, I rarely ever hear the matter mentioned and I believe the brethren are not especially interested in that type of a book." Any Methodist preacher could, and I am sure would say, the same thing about sprinkling, and infant baptism. And anygressive preacher could, and I am sure would say, the same thing about instrumental music in the worship, and women preaching. Even so, error may become so respectable in the church that neither elders, nor preachers will seldom ever
mention it. But I do not believe that error can be galvanized into the truth by the silence of either preachers or elders. To me, Tim. 4:1-5, still reads: "I charge thee in the sight of God, and of Christ Jesus, who shall judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom: preach the word; be urgent in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and teaching. For the time will come when they will not endure the sound doctrine; but, having itching ears, will heap to themselves teachers after their own lust, and will turn aside unto fables. But be thou sober in all things, suffer hardship, do the work of an evangelist, fulfil thy ministry."

Smiting the rock, when God said speak to it, may have been a small matter; but it kept Moses out of the earthly Canaan. A woman attending worship with her hair shingled, and her head uncovered, when God says, "let her be veiled," may not be worth mentioning; but it will be too bad if it keeps her out of the heavenly Canaan. That this review may help interested souls, even after I have quit the walks of men, and my body sleeps amid the dust of the dead, is my prayer, in his name.

—JOHN T. LEWIS
CHAPTER I

CUSTOM VERSUS TRUTH

In the Gospel Advocate of October 31, 1940 Brother Pride Hinton asked Brother R. L. Whiteside two questions about Paul's teaching in 1 Cor. 11:3-16. Brother Whiteside replied that Paul's teaching in the verses was based solely upon custom. I replied to Brother Whiteside's answers in Sound Doctrine July 25, 1941. After my reply appeared in Sound Doctrine, Brother Hinton ordered several copies of Brother C. R. Nichol's book—"God's Woman," and told the congregation where he was preaching that I had taken him for a ride, that he had copies of C. R. Nichol's book, the price was $1.50, but he would sell them for $1.00 per copy. I do not know, neither is it any of my business, whether Brother C. R. was losing the fifty cents, or whether Brother Hinton was donating the fifty cents on a copy, to get the truth (?) before the sisters in his "neck of the woods." In the meantime Brother Cled Wallace gave his unqualified endorsement of "God's Woman" in the September 1941, Bible Banner. It would appear that the boys were trying to "gang up" on me, and smother the truth with "customs."

Brother Rex Turner, one of the editors of Sound Doctrine, has asked me to review that part of Brother Nichol's books which deals with those questions. I have already reviewed those things in the Bible Banner, but for reasons evidently well understood by Brother Nichol, and suspected by many of his admirers, he treated my review with silent contempt. But still being willing for his book to have the benefit of all its endorsers I published Brother Cled's en-
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dorsement in the last issue of Sound Doctrine. Maybe when I get through with this review Brother Cled will be ready to answer the questions I asked him. Let me say that I have just as much respect for Brother Nichol's, Brother Whiteside's, and Brother Cled's opinion in these matters as I have for my own, and when you read this review, if you think I am only giving my opinion in the matter, forget it. That is exactly what the denominations say about "our" teaching on the church, the plan of salvation, baptism, and on all doctrinal subjects. Unfortunately that weasly idea is permeating the churches of Christ today on all living issues. Therefore the average man's opinion is the highest authority he has in religion today. Paul says: "We walk by faith, not by sight." But that can only be when the Word of God is our final appeal in matters of religion.

Custom

Every person with ordinary intelligence knows that customs change; but the truth never changes. In I Peter 1:24, 25, we read: "For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory thereof as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower falleth: But the word of the Lord abideth forever. And this is the word of good tidings which we preach unto you." The word of God therefore is the only unchangeable principle in the world. It is therefore, very necessary to distinguish between custom and truth. If not, you will have an ever changing truth. We will now notice some parts of Brother Nichol's "Woman," which he designated "God's Woman." On page 58, he says: "Custom decreed veil-wearing. Custom has now abrogated the edict. God did not bind the wearing of the veil on Christian woman. The wearing of a head-
covering, made by man, is a custom which has never been by heaven bound on woman.” I like Brother Nichol’s positive way of stating his opinion on these matters, you do not have to guess at his teaching on the subject. We will now listen to another positive teacher on the same subject. In 1 Corinthians 11:3, Paul says: “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.” This knowledge must be very important, since Paul says: “I would have you know” it. Thoughtful reader, do you believe custom has “decreed” this relationship, or do you believe the eternal, the omnipotent, and the omniscient God “decreed” it? You must first settle this question in your mind before you can understand the following from Paul. “Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head” (verse 4). What kind of covering was Paul talking about? Do you believe it was a “covering made by man”? Was Paul telling the men, in the church at Corinth, not to have their heads covered because it was not the “custom of that day”? When men go into the public meetings of the church today, with their heads uncovered, are they simply following a custom of today? Would 1 Cor. 11:4, have any bearing on that subject today? In other words, when you go to the church and take your hat off, do you do it just because it is a custom?

We read verses 5, 6. “But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head; for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven. For if a woman is not veiled let her also be shorn; but if it is a shame to a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be veiled.” Read those verses
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again, and get your mind on what Paul is saying. You will not be judged by Brother Nichol’s, Whiteside’s, Cled Wallace’s, nor Lewis’ opinion; but by your own understanding, and obedience to God’s word. In verses 5, 6 was Paul speaking of a “veil made by man”? Was Paul binding this “head-covering” on woman, in religious services, or was he just telling them about a “custom of that day”? Was he telling them to have their heads “shorn or shaven” was a shame, and to have their heads uncovered, in public meetings, would be just as shameful? Reader, what do you think he was teaching in these verses? Was Paul teaching that the veil and the hair was the same in these verses? Or was he teaching that Christian women should have both on their heads when they go to worship? Remember Brother Nichol says, in his Woman.” “God did not bind the wearing of the veil on Christian women.” Did Paul bind anything on either man or woman in 1 Cor. 11:3-6? If so, what was it? If he did not, what was he teaching? Answer for yourself. Brother Cled says: “I do not entertain your views about women wearing hats in public,” so I have not given my “views” in this article. I have not even told you that I believe these scriptures. I have just asked the readers, if they understand Paul’s teaching in these verses, and if so, do they believe it?
CHAPTER II

The following correspondence is self explanatory. Brother Cled Wallace and I have been close friends for several years. I have heard him, with pleasure and profit, through several meetings. In the September (1941) Bible Banner he gave an unqualified endorsement of Brother C. R. Nichol’s book—“God’s Woman.” Previously I had two articles in the Bible Banner criticizing Nichol’s book. While Brother Cled was in a meeting in North Birmingham he typed one of the articles for me. At that time he did not intimate that he thought I was wrong and Nichol was right. I really thought that he thought well of my article. Therefore when I read his endorsement of Nichol’s book in the Bible Banner, I had the following to say to him in a private letter.

“By the way, Brother Cled, I appreciate everything you said about Bro. C. R. Nichol in the September Bible Banner, and rejoice to know that he is getting physically fit again; but when you got to “his books,” if you included some parts of “God’s Woman,” I think you should have made some reservations. I would consider it very unfortunate for the cause of truth, if “God’s Woman” (?) should have your unqualified endorsement. When Peter did or acted contrary to the truth, Paul withstood him to the face, and before “them all.” C. R. is neither bigger nor better than Peter to me.”

To the above, I received the following. You notice I never mentioned Brother Whiteside; but in his reply, Brother Cled quoted a statement from my article in Sound Doctrine, in which I spoke of a “foul idea” from Brother Whiteside, simply meaning that White-
side had not hit the idea. If I had said a "foul ball," I am sure Cled would have understood it.

Dear Brother Lewis:

Regarding your remarks about my endorsement of Brother Nichol's books, with special reference to his latest, any "reservations" I could make with my present views would fall far short of satisfying you, I fear. I do not entertain your views about women wearing hats in public, and the feminine use of a little rouge and lipstick and nail polish has never worried me greatly. In fact I rather like it.

Both Brother Nichol and Brother Whiteside happen to be very dear friends of mine, and were for years before I ever met you. That does not obligate me to endorse everything or anything they write unless it strikes me as being true. They are both good, clean men and thoroughly loyal to the truth. If disagreeing with you about hats and nail polish makes them disloyal that will disqualify a lot of us, which may be beside the point.

I do not think either Nichol or Whiteside would take any exception to any vigorous dissent from their views expressed by you, Foy, or me. I think they have some cause to resent the following:

"So long as C. R. Nichol's idea of 'God's Woman' (?) is peddled among the churches, with an occasional foul idea from R. L. Whiteside pitched into their laps through the Gospel Advocate . . ."

"Brother Nichol himself could see this if he had not become so intoxicated on "customs" when
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he was trying to please the sisters by justifying their painting and hair bobbing."

I never saw or heard an idea expressed by Whiteside that I thought was "foul" nor do I believe that Nichol was trying to please the sisters instead of the Lord by what he wrote. I think both Nichol and Whiteside are HONEST men, just as I think YOU are. And as much as I think of you, I'm inclined to think that both of them are nearer right than you are. So, does my father, incidentally, which may also be beside the point.

Most sincerely,
Cled E. Wallace.
October 30, 1941.

Dear Brother Cled:

Your letter from East Liverpool, Ohio, dated October 17, 1941, is before me. First let me say I did not mention Brother R. L. Whiteside in my letter to you. But since you quoted a statement from an article I had in "Sound Doctrine," and seemed to resent it, I will say, I have another article in "Sound Doctrine" October 10, 1941, in reply to some other questions from Pride Hinton, and Whiteside's answers, published in Gospel Advocate September 18, 1941. When Brother Whiteside reads my article, if he wishes to reply, I assure him anything he wishes to say will be published in "Sound Doctrine." If he does not wish to say anything, and you want to take up the cudgel for him, the pages of "Sound Doctrine" will be opened to you.

As to Brother Nichol's book—"God's Woman," I certainly was not prepared for what you said about it. I never dreamed of you giving your unqualified endorsement of everything Brother Nichol said in his.
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book. Therefore, I had no idea or thought of calling forth your resentment in the matter, when I suggested you "should have made some reservations," on "some parts of God's Woman." I suppose now, that the purpose of your unqualified endorsement of "God's Woman," in the Bible Banner, was to counteract what I had said about some parts of the book, in the Bible Banner. But I assure you it will take more than an endorsement from you to satisfy many of Brother Nichol's admirers, on his silent treatment of my articles.

Personally, I had just as soon you would defend his book, as for him to do it. I judge from what you say that you do not consider my articles a "vigorou dissent" from Nichol's "views." However, when you say, "I do not entertain your views about women wearing hats in public," if you mean in public worship, you raise a clear-cut issue between us; but when you add, "the feminine use of a little rouge and lipstick and nail polish," you bring in things that you never heard me discuss through the press, in the pulpit, nor in private. So it makes no difference how well you may like those things, you certainly do not know my likes or dislikes about such frivolous things. Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary says: "Foul play—any conduct that is intended or calculated to take another at an unfair advantage." So don't try to read into my "views" things that would make me appear ridiculous—play fair. Now to the issue. Paul says: "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. Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head." (1 Cor. 11:3, 4.)
Now Brother Cled, what kind of covering was Paul speaking of in Verse 4? Was that covering only for men of “that day”? Is there anything that a man could do to violate that scripture today? If so, what is it? Does the same relationship exist between man and his head, Christ, today, that existed in “that day”? Was the statement of Paul, in Verse 4, based on “the custom of that day,” or on the relationship stated in Verse 3? In Verses 5, 6, we read: “But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head; for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven. For if a woman is not veiled, let her also be shorn; but if it is a shame to a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be veiled.” Was the veil here spoken of an artificial covering—a covering made by man? If it was “the kind of veil the ancient women wore,” was it the “indoor veil that extended to the waist,” or “the outdoor veil that extended to the heels”? Or was it just an artificial covering to cover the head, the part that Paul said must be covered? Brother Whiteside, in his answer to Brother Hinton’s questions, talked very learnedly about the “indoor” and the “outdoor” veils. Does the same relationship exist between man and woman today, that existed in “that day”? If so, what should a woman have on her head in “public worship” to keep from violating that scriptural injunction today? In Verse 7, we read: “For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man.” Now Brother Cled, do you think it was only “the customs of that day” that caused Paul to warn man “not to have his head veiled,” and to warn the woman not to have “her head unveiled” in the public meetings? Do
you think Verse 5 gave the women the right to teach and lead prayers in the public meetings of “that day”? If so, is there any scripture that would prohibit them from doing so today? Did 1 Cor. 14:34, regulate, or restrict the teachings of women in the public meetings, of the church, in “that day”? If so, does it restrict the woman’s teaching in the church today? If I cannot help you, maybe you can help me by giving clear cut answers to the above questions.

As to C. R. Nichol, he and I were born and reared in the same county, and so far as I am concerned we are friends. You have been much more intimately associated with him through life than I have, and doubtless he “happened to be a very dear friend” of yours, “for years before you met me.” But you have not known of his life and teaching any longer than I have. Therefore, all you say about him being a “clean man, thoroughly loyal to the truth,” is beside the issue. On page 64 of his book, “God’s Woman,” C. R. Nichol said: “Sister, to have your hair dressed in the latest mode, your dress well-fitted, clean, pressed, tailored in keeping with the latest fashion; your face painted and powdered, your lips rouged, and attractive ornaments in your hair, and at your throat, is no sin.” When I read that, Brother Cled, I really thought Brother C. R. was trying to please the sisters. But you say: “I do not believe that Nichol was trying to please the sisters instead of the Lord by what he wrote.” My idea about pleasing the Lord is, you have to teach his truth. What scripture do you believe C. R. was teaching in the above? Do you believe he was explaining 1 Tim. 2:9, 10, and 1 Peter 3:1-4, to the sisters when he wrote the above? I have given you my reason for saying he was trying to
please the sisters. Will you give your reason for saying he was trying to please God?

I am sure you are neither afraid, nor ashamed, for anybody to know your "views" on these questions, therefore, I shall be glad to give your answers to the above questions to the readers of "Sound Doctrine." You can thereby give your unqualified endorsement to your "very dear friend's" book—"God's Woman" in that paper too.

Always yours for the "old paths,"

Fraternally,

Jno. T. Lewis.

To the above I have received no reply as yet; but I feel sure that when 90 days are up, Brother Cled will either answer my question, or he will renew his endorsement. The 90 days are up, and Brother Cled has defaulted.
CHAPTER III
CUSTOMS VERSUS TRUTH
No. 2

We are reviewing C. R. Nichol’s book—called “God’s Woman.” In these first two articles we are studying his disposition of Paul’s teachings in 1 Corinthians 11:3-16. We read verses 7-10, “For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man: for neither was the man created for the woman: but the woman for the man: for this cause ought the woman to have a sign of authority on her head, because of the angels.” Paul declares that a man ought not “to have his head veiled;” but the woman ought to have hers veiled. Is there any difference between “ought not to have,” and “ought to have”? What do these terms suggest to you? Was Paul speaking of a “head covering made by man”? Was he binding anything on women in the above statements?

C. R. Nichol says: “The wearing of a head-covering, made by man, is a custom which has never been by heaven bound on women.” Brother Whiteside says: “And so custom controls after all.” Brother Cled says: “I’m inclined to think that both of them are nearer right than you are. So does my father.” This, of course, adds another indorser of Brother Nichol’s “woman”-book. On page 75, of “God’s Woman” (?), Brother Nichol says: “For a woman to appear in a place of public worship with her head unveiled indicated a lack of the womanly modesty
becoming women of uprightness of that day, for it was the custom of women in that day, in that country, to show their recognition of sex relationship by wearing a covering on their heads when in public. The veil was a symbol of subjection." Will Brother Nichol, or one of his indorsers, tell us what "recognition of sex relationship" is shown in this day, in this country, when bobbed haired women, with uncovered heads, "appear in a place of public worship? If "the veil was a symbol of subjection" for "women of uprightness of that day, in that country," what would be "a symbol of subjection" for "women of uprightness of our day, in our country? I think this is what Brother Hinton is trying to find out; but he is doing the wrong thing when he recommends "God's Woman" to his sisters instead of God's word.

It is a law of language that when words mean the same thing, you can substitute them in the same sentence without changing the meaning of the sentence. Let us see how "God's Woman" will fit into God's word. In 1 Cor. 11:7, we will substitute the word "custom" for "image" and "glory," and the passage will read: "For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled, forasmuch as he is the custom and custom of God." Very euphonious. Eh? In verse 10, we will substitute "customs" for "angels," and read: "For this cause ought the woman to have a sign of authority on her head, because of the customs." Brethren, I do not believe she will fit in, do you? I have never been much on working puzzles, and I will admit that "God's Woman" is too much like a Chinese puzzle for me to make her fit into God's word. In Psalms 34:7, we read: "The angel of Jehovah encampeth round about them that fear him, and deliv-
ere them.” In Isaiah 63:9, we read: “In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved him.” In Matthew 18:10, Jesus Christ says: “See that ye despise not one of these little ones: for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven.” In Hebrew 1:14, Paul says: “Angels are all ministering spirits, sent forth to do service for the sake of them that shall inherit salvation,” and in 1 Corinthians 11:10, he says: “For this cause ought the woman to have a sign of authority on her head, because of the angels.” Sister, you may not be able to understand why Paul said the woman ought to have her head covered, “because of the angels;” but you certainly can understand that he said it, and you should believe and obey him. What Paul said is what you should be concerned about, and not about the “views” of Lewis, of “God’s Woman,” nor its endorsers. To keep any one from jumping to the conclusion that the woman has no place in the work of the Lord, Paul continues in verses 11, 12, “Nevertheless, neither is the woman without the man, nor the man without the woman, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, so is the man also by the woman; but all things are of God.” Therefore both “the man” and “the woman” have their places in the work of the Lord; but each should move in his God given sphere. Paul certainly wanted “the woman” to understand how she should appear in public worship. So in verse 13, he asked: “Judge ye in yourselves: is it seemly that a woman pray unto God unveiled?” The native, inborn sense and perception of what is “seemly,” in conformity with their creation, should teach
women to have their heads covered in worship. Is not this the meaning of Paul's question?

In verses 14, 15, Paul takes up the natural covering that distinguishes men and women. He says: "Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a dishonor to him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering." He had said in verse 6, "For if a woman is not veiled, let her also be shorn: but if it is a shame to a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be veiled." That is, if she left off her veil, "a head-covering made by man," she could also divest herself of her hair, her natural covering, because if she violated one living principle, she could violate the other. Good women in many places today are violating both of these divine principles, by appearing in public worship, without either the natural, or artificial covering. And they are being encouraged to do this by "God's Woman," and its indorsers. There are other gospel preachers who do not agree with "God's Woman," and its indorsers on bobbed hair; but declare that the woman's hair, her natural covering, takes the place of the artificial covering in public worship. If this opinion is accepted, you must cut out of your Bible 1 Cor. 11:5-13, do away with the arguments Paul made in those verses, then, and not till then, will your opinion be tenable.

If Paul were not teaching, in 1 Cor. 11:5-13, that a woman should have both her hair, her natural covering, and a veil, an artificial covering, on her head when she "appeared in a place of public worship," how could he have expressed it stronger if he had wanted to teach that? Do you believe Paul was teaching the woman, in verse 15, that the custom had
changed since he wrote verses 5-13, the veil, the artificial head-covering, had been dropped, and her hair, her natural covering, had become the symbol of her "subjection" when she "appeared in a place of public worship"? Or was he teaching, in verse 15, that long hair was a glory to woman, and had been given her for a covering, that showed her "recognition of sex relationship" everywhere? Did he not teach, in verse 14, that short hair was man's distinguishing mark, not only in the place of worship; but everywhere?

You will have to answer these questions for yourself, because C. R. has hibernated, not for the winter, but for life, so far as these questions are concerned. I think he is trying to pull a Lycurgus stunt, he has written a book—called it "God's Woman," and gone into volunteer exile (silence), expecting the women to "keep his laws till he returns." He has succeeded in getting some of his very dear friends to indorse "God's Woman," but so far no one has come forward to defend it. Is there a difference between indorsing and defending? If I indorse a man's note, I will pay it, if he doesn't. If I indorse a man's books, or his position, I will defend it, if he doesn't, because it becomes my obligation.

Is there a single statement made, or an idea expressed in 1 Cor. 11:3-15, from which you could deduce the idea that Paul was only discussing the "customs in that country, in that day"? If so, what is it? In verse 16, Paul says: "But if any man seemeth to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." Brother Whiteside says: "No matter which view of the verse one takes, it puts the matter on the basis of custom." If this is not a "foul idea
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expressed by Whiteside, then it puts Paul in the absurd position of binding upon the church in Corinth "the customs in that country, in that day," then declaring that neither he, nor "the churches of God" had such customs. The simple truth is, "the customs in that country, in that day," did not come in the purview of Paul's teaching, and when the "contentious" ones began to contend for "the customs in that country, in that day," Paul declared that neither he, nor the churches of God had such customs. Thus ends Paul's discussion of how men and women should appear in "public worship." But I am not through with Brother Nichol's book, and its indorsers. In Hebrews 10:24, 25, Paul Says: "Let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works, not forsaking our own assembling together, as the custom of some is," etc. I suppose Brother Nichol, and his indorsers, would say, *No matter which view of these verses one takes, it puts the matter of our assembling together on the basis of custom.* Borrowing one of Brother Cled's phrases, "I'm pretty well fed up on preachers telling the brethren," *and sisters too,* that Paul's teaching was based upon "the customs in that country, in that day."

"In God's Woman," page 60, Nichol says: "In Corinth there were some who would dictate the length of a woman's hair, and today there are some who speak as though they were authority, and dictate the length necessary for a woman to have her hair, else she will never enter heaven." I used to be familiar with both Grecian history and mythology; but I do not remember having read in either about those hair dictators. So I wish some of Brother Nichol's very dear friends, and indorsers, would visit his haunts and get the
facts (?) to sustain his assertion. There are still some members of the church “from Missouri.” As to the last part of his statement, there is not an honest man or woman in the church today, that will say they ever met or heard a man that made such claims. Nature is the only thing that can dictate the length of women’s hair. In this connection let us study Whiteside versus Whiteside. In replying to some questions from Brother Pride Hinton, in Gospel Advocate, Oct. 31, 1940, Brother Whiteside says: “If Brother Hinton will consult the American Standard Version he will see that the head covering mentioned is either a veil or long hair. Nothing is said about a hat. A veil is not a hat, and a hat is not a veil. Is it not strange how some preachers can read into a passage of scripture things that are not there, and then severely criticize those who do not agree with their perversion? If a man says that a woman must wear a hat in public, he says what Paul does not say.” In replying to Brother Hinton about the “Eastern Woman’s Veil,” in the Gospel Advocate, Sept. 18, 1941, Brother Whiteside says: “The indoor veil extended to the waist; the outdoor veil, to the heels, or nearly so. . . . A hat is about as poor a substitute for either style as sprinkling is for baptism. But custom now decrees that women wear hats instead of veils; and, as in the case of sprinkling for baptism, it is argued that the hat serves as well as the veil! And so custom controls, after all.” If Paul were teaching, the women in the church at Corinth, that “the custom in that country, in that day” bound upon them veil wearing, as C. R. Nichol, and his indorsers teach, and if “custom now decrees that women wear hats instead of veils,” as Brother Whiteside declares, and if “custom controls, after all,” as Brother
Whiteside says, then why would not that make Paul say, "that a woman must wear a hat in public," now since "custom decrees that women wear hats instead of veils"? Brother Whiteside asked: "Is it not strange how some preachers can read into a passage of scripture things that are not there, and then severely criticize those who do not agree with their perversion?" I will answer this question in the affirmative, with all the emphasis possible, and suggest to the sisters that they shun "their perversions." On page 77, of "God's Woman," Brother Nichol says: "In no place do I find a command of Jehovah requiring women to wear a veil with which to hide their faces, nor did he command a covering for the head of women to be worn in public, or private, as a symbol of her 'subjection' to man." No, Jehovah never "commanded woman to wear veils with which to hide their faces" (Italics mine J. T. L.); but if Paul, in the eleventh chapter of 1 Corinthians, did not "command a covering for the head of women to be worn in public," he commanded nothing in the chapter. The command is not in the imperative mode, neither is "singing and making melody with your hearts to the Lord," nor "singing with grace in your hearts unto God," in the imperative mode; but who, but a digressive would argue that the church is not commanded to sing? Did not Paul teach the strongest lessons ever taught on being "buried with Christ through baptism into death," in Romans 6:3-5, and also in Colossians 2:12, without a command in the imperative mode? Therefore I say that Jehovah has "commanded a covering for the head of women to be worn in public meetings." "Custom" may decree changes in the "covering"; but it certainly cannot do away with "the covering." You now
have Brother C. R. Nichol’s, and Brother R. L. Whiteside’s teaching on 1 Cor. 11:3-16. You also have mine. Brother Cled says: “I’m inclined to think that both of them are nearer right than you are, so does my father.” The right or wrong of a woman appearing in the worship with her hair shingled, and head uncovered, cannot be determined by C. R. Nichol’s views, R. L. Whiteside’s views, nor by Cled Wallace’s, nor his father’s views, neither by Jno. T. Lewis’ views; but by Paul’s teaching in the verses under consideration.
CHAPTER IV
WOMEN TEACHING IN THE CHURCH

We now come to study C. R. Nichol's theories and opinion about women teaching in the church. The first scripture he uses to show (?) that women have the scriptural right and authority to lead the prayers and teach in the Lord's day worship is 1 Corinthians 11:4, 5. C. R. had already given one chapter in his book on "The dress of women," and one chapter on "Custom," but when he began to speculate about women teaching, he said: "I would have you note carefully that Paul recognizes the fact that men, as well as women were to 'pray' and 'prophesy.' (It certainly ought to be encouraging to men, especially to young men, who may want to take part in the Lord's day worship, to know that C. R. Nichol says, they are to pray and prophesy, "as well as women," J.T.L.). He does not discuss the necessity of the Christians engaging in such activities. He does tell them that when engaged in praying and prophesying they were to observe certain customs then in vogue at Corinth, customs touching their physical appearance—men to have 'covered heads', and women 'uncovered heads'". (Page 119.) After Brother Nichol put the women first in "praying and prophesying", he very correctly "uncovered" their heads and "covered" the men's heads. On page 120, he says: "In the days of Paul for a woman to appear in public in Corinth with head uncovered, hair cut short, or face exposed was to declare herself a harlot." Of course "the customs of our day" make it possible for young women to appear at public bathing resorts, in beauty contests, and at
public dance halls, almost as nude as they came into the world, without raising even a suspicion of an evil thought in the minds of men. Fathers and mothers know (?) that customs have made Charlie McCarthy—wooden men—out of all young men, so they are not particularly concerned about how, or where their girls go. If Paul were living today, according to Nichol, he would tell them to observe "the customs in vogue."

We continue to study pages 120, 121. "The thoughtful cannot fail to learn from the excerpt at the head of this chapter (I Cor. 11:4, 5), that women were to 'pray' and 'prophesy.' Paul is not presenting a hypothetical case. He says the women in the church of Christ at Corinth were to pray and prophesy. Some have insisted that though the Christian women at Corinth did pray and prophesy, they confined such activities to private life; that they were not allowed to 'lead' a prayer in public; that in public meetings women were allowed to engage only in silent praying." According to this all the leading preachers of the nineteenth century Restoration Movement have been wrong in insisting that women should not "lead" the prayers, nor make public talks in the Lord's day worship. Not only the preachers of the Restoration movement, but all the leading denominations were against women preaching forty years ago. When I was a young man there was considerable confusion and strife in the Methodist Church because the Bishops would not allow the women to preach. And doubtless the church would have split over the matter, if the "sisters" who were permeated with the truth (?), that Brother Nichol has recently discovered, had not gone out of their own accord and started the "Holy Roller" or "Nazarene" movement. The most astound-
ing thing to me about Nichol's newly discovered truth (?) was the enthusiastic indorsement it received from gospel preachers all over the country. It seemed that C. R. had "brought in a gusher." But fortunately for the cause of truth there has been no stampede among the sisters for the pulpits. It is yet to be seen whether, or not, those enthusiastic indorsers will urge upon the sisters to claim their freedom, and scriptural (?) rights in the public meetings of the church. If so, I predict a large influx to the "Nazarenes," or to the digressives.

We go on with Brother Nichol's meandering. He says: "I can understand how a woman can pray while in an audience, and not be heard by any one in the assembly. (If you can, you can understand the truth on the subject—J. T. L.). Hannah prayed a silent prayer—her lips were seen to move, but the people did not hear what she said (1 Sam.). But Paul says some of the women in Corinth prophesied. The object of prophesying is to instruct. 'He that prophesieth speaketh unto men edification, and exhortation, and consolation. . . . He that prophesieth edifieth the church' (1 Cor. 14:1-4). Since the purpose of prophesying was to edify, and women in the church at Corinth did prophesy, it must follow that they not only spoke in words that could be heard, but words that were understood, else there would have been no edifying." If C. R. Nichol is not here teaching that women have the right not only to lead the prayers, but also to speak, and exhort in the Lord's day meetings, I would like for the indorsers of "God's Woman"—"God save the mark"—to tell what he is teaching. And since this is not "a hypothetical case," do they believe that women in the church today have the scriptural authority to
do what Nichol says the women in the church at Corinth did? If not, why not? And if so, do they propose to teach it? If not doesn’t their endorsement “become sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal?” If however, they do not believe these things then, for the benefit of those who bought “God’s Woman” on their endorsement, they should say so, and say it as loud as they recommended the book. When a gospel preacher today claims that he has delved into the hidden mysteries of revelation and brought forth nuggets of truth, either about the plan of salvation, or about the divine system of worship, that the old pioneer preachers never found, I become suspicious, and would be slow in pushing my pen across the pages of our religious journals to indorse his findings. The issue is clear, C. R. says, that women have the scriptural right to lead the prayers, to teach, and to exhort in the Lord’s day services. I say, they do not have the scriptural right to thus lead in the public worship. Brother Cled Wallace says that he and his father both believe that Nichol is nearer right than I am. I think a great deal of Cled Wallace and his father, and I believe they are honest men, therefore I accept the fact that they too believe in women taking a leading part in the public worship. But friendship will never keep me from contending for what I believe to be the truth. If I did not know the teaching of the New Testament on the subject, I would neither preach nor write on the subject. Neither would I indorse any one else’s teaching on the subject. But if I know the teaching of the New Testament on this subject, and I do, then I will challenge any man’s teaching, who teaches that woman can lead in the Lord’s day worship.
CHAPTER V
WOMAN'S RIGHT TO TAKE PART IN LORD'S DAY WORSHIP

In his "Woman" ("God's Woman"), page 78, Brother C. R. Nichol says: "Frequently some one acts from an impulse, or by reason of some sentiment, and the sentiment crystallizes into a custom, and the custom becomes a fixed law with some, and he who does not observe it is severely criticized, if not dubbed as a sinner. Do not confuse a principle with a custom." Brother Nichol is absolutely right in this. For instance, about a quarter of a century ago, I know not whether she was moved "by impulse, or by reason of some sentiment," a movie star, in New York, had her hair bobbed, and sailed for Europe. That was real news, and so treated by the newspapers. The notoriety she received in the papers over her hair bobbing, swept the feminine species as a fire would sweep over a broom-sedge field. And when the "star" returned to America she expressed her surprise that her act had so quickly developed into a custom among decent women. I say decent women, because bobbed hair had been a custom of prostitutes from time immemorial, and was so considered in Paul's day. Now, if a gospel preacher dares to preach against the custom, he "is severely criticized," and "if he is not dubbed as a sinner," he is "dubbed" as an extremist." In Gospel Advocate Jan. 22(1942 H. Leo Boles says: "There are extremists on woman's dress and bobbed hair." How about giving the readers of the Advocate a middle of the road article on those two customs of "Our Day?" H. Leo. Again he says: "We have the hobby-
ists on woman’s teaching the Bible in classes.” How about women preaching and leading prayers in the Lord’s Day worship? What is your position on these matters, Bro. Boles? Charlie McCarthy could say “extremists,” and “hobbyists.” Gospel preachers who join in this “dubbing,” are those who never preach against the “custom,” and if they have not the courage of C. R. Nichol to defend it, if they even mention it, it is only to apologize for it. I think more of a defender of any position, than I do of an apologist.

When Brother I. B. Bradley was in a meeting in Smithville, Tennessee, some one put a question on the pulpit one day about bobbed hair. Brother Bradley answered it, and passed on to his subject. The wife of one of the elders went home and told her husband that Brother Bradley had scandalized her. She had bobbed hair. A girl from a Baptist family was there; she went home and told her mother that the preacher had scandalized her. Bradley had simply answered a question, and had not mentioned either one of the women. If he had said: “Custom today calls for shorter hair than it did in the days of my boyhood,” possibly the elder’s wife would have gone home shouting, and saying, “I told you so.” The lady where Brother Bradley was staying was getting milk for him from the Baptist family; he got no more milk there.

I told you in my last article that about forty years ago some women in the Methodist church got an urge to preach, and because the Bishops of the Methodist Church would not allow them to preach in their meeting houses, they started up what is known today as the Nazarene or Holiness Church. But since those days, the Bishops have softened on many things, and it is nothing uncommon today for women to preach
in Methodist pulpits. When the digressive progressed beyond the New Testament, and introduced missionary societies, and instrumental music into the work and worship of the church, they opened a flood gate and let in open-membership and every other kind of "ship" that sails the religious seas; and not having a human creed to check or restrain them, they always out do the other denominations. So like the Nazarenes they have women preachers, and "pastors." They have been at these things so long, they have become a "custom." The purpose of the "Murch-Witty Unity Meetings," and the little journeys of Rowe and West through the mountains of East Tennessee, is to get the churches of Christ to recognize "their customs." The only argument (?) that the digressives offer in defense of "their customs" is, God did not say we could not use those things.

Now C. R. Nichol comes out in his latest book, "God's Woman," and boldly defends the woman's right to lead the prayers, and teach in the Lord's day worship. And he uses the same scriptures to prove (?) his assertions that the Nazarenes use to prove the woman's right to preach. On page 123, of "God's Woman," he says: "Joel declared that women would prophesy; Peter affirmed that women would prophesy, and it is recorded that Philip had four unmarried daughters that did prophesy (Joel 2; Acts 2; 21:9). In neither of the passages is there any intimation that there would be limitations thrown around women in prophesying. Paul insisted that when women at Corinth engaged in prophesying they should have their heads covered." Did you ever hear the Nazarenes quote these very scriptures to prove that women have the right to preach? I have. On page 58, of his book,
Brother Nichols says: "The wearing of a head-covering, made by man, is a custom which has never been by heaven bound on women." Therefore according to Nichol when "Paul insisted that when women at Corinth engaged in prophesying they should have their heads covered," it was from man, and not from heaven. Maybe that is the reason the Nazarenes never say anything about the "head covering."

Brother M. O. Daley, in his "Introduction" to "God's Woman," says: "The conflicting theories in the religious world touching the work of women in the church, brought the author face to face with the question: "What does the Bible teach on this subject?" Impelled by his love for the truth he made a long and careful survey of the subject as treated in the Bible; not with a desire to defend any theory extant on the subject; nor to attack any position held, save only as the truth when fully presented uproots any and every error concerning the subject matter treated. To accomplish just that is the author's aim. In anything other than that he is without ambition. After long and patient study the conclusions set forth in this book were reached. In the study it will be clearly seen that the author used his discriminating ability to keep himself free from the clutches of any one's theory." If Brother M. O. Daley is reading my review of "God's Woman," I am sure he can see that bobbed hair, uncovered heads for woman in the worship and the right of women to lead in the worship, the only things Nichol's "discriminating ability" discovered, have been practiced by others for a quarter or half century. Therefore, Nichol's book should have been introduced to the public as a defender of those theories, rather than a discoverer of them. "Honor to whom honor"
is due. It is an ominous fact to me, that no book off the press, by a gospel preacher, in recent years, has had the endorsement of more gospel preachers than "God's Woman." And no one has yet, so far as I know, publicly withdrawn his endorsement.

On pages 121, 122, Brother Nichol says: "The passage we now study has given commentators no end of trouble; and theories and theories have been advanced in an effort to make the passage speak in harmony with some position advanced on another passage. The effort should be to learn what the passage teaches, without regard to what you may have concluded about some other passage. The position has been advanced that 1 Cor. 11:4, 5 gave women the right to pray and prophesy; but that the privilege was revoked in 1 Cor. 14:24, 35. It seems to me that such a position would be disgusting to a man of reverence, if he knows the truth about the knowledge of the Holy Spirit. (I think Brother Nichol has put up a straw man here. I have never heard a gospel preacher take such an absurd position. J. T. L.) Paul was giving utterance to the words of the Holy Spirit in 1 Cor. 11:4, 5. The Holy Spirit did not reverse himself within a few minutes and make a statement in 1 Cor. 14:34, 35 contradicting what he had said in 1 Cor. 11:4, 5." Again, I ask: If C. R. Nichol is not teaching that women have the spiritual right to lead the prayers, and teach in the Lord's day meetings, what is he teaching? As further evidence of this fact, I quote from page 124. "The 'silence' enjoined in I Cor. 14:34., 35 was in a meeting such as is not now had, and has not been since the days of spiritual gifts. To attempt to make the prohibition there expressed applicable today is a misapplication of God's word. There is no intimation
that the meeting of 1 Cor. 14 was the meeting which came every Sunday; it was not the meeting at which the early Christians ate the Lord’s supper. The meeting made reference to in 1 Cor. 11 is the very meeting at which the Lord’s supper was eaten, and in that meeting the women were instructed to have their heads covered (at Corinth) when they prayed or prophesied. The silence enjoined in 1 Cor. 14:34, 35 was in a meeting in which spiritual gifts were being exercised; and the silence was enjoined because of the law. What ‘law’? There it is brethren, according to “God’s Woman,” every gospel preacher that has ever used 1 Cor. 14:34, 35 to enjoin women from leading the prayers, and teaching in the Lord’s day meetings has made “a misapplication of God’s word.” And that is not all, according to Brother Nichol, if the women do not pray and prophesy they are ignoring God’s instructions. Brother Nichol warns: “Be very sure you get into your heart the fact that the silence enjoined did not interfere with women prophesying.” Remember that Brother Nichol said on page 121, “since the purpose of prophesying was to edify, and women in the church at Corinth did prophesy, it must follow that they not only spoke in words that could be heard, but words that were understood, else there would have been no edifying.” And this edifying was done in “the very meeting at which the Lord’s supper was eaten.”

In the Gospel Advocate October 31, 1940, Brother Prydê E. Hinton asked Brother R. L. Whiteside several questions. The following is Brother Hinton’s 3rd question:

3. I assume that you believe that 1 Cor. 14 forbids a woman’s prophesying—that is speaking unto
edification and exhortation and consolation when “the whole church be assembled together,” and when the prophets are speaking “in turn.” If women are forbidden to prophesy in the church, how can the veil wearing of 1 Cor. 11:5 refer to deportment in the assembly?

It seems from Brother Whiteside’s answer Brother Hinton “assumed” too much. Read Brother Whiteside’s reply.

3. The question presents a difficulty. Did Paul here give the woman the right to pray and prophesy in the assembly, providing she were veiled, and then in chapter 14 prohibit her from doing so? That seems unreasonable, and yet that in substance, is the explanation given by some commentators. It does not seem right to use verse 5 to prove that a woman should have a hat on her head when she attends public worship, and then not allow her to prophesy. The prophesying and praying of verse 5 must be of the same nature as the prophesying and praying of verse 4.

If Brother Whiteside is not teaching here that I Cor. 11:5 gives the woman the same right to pray and prophesy, in the Lord’s day meetings, that verse 4 gives the man, and “the same nature” of “prophesying and praying”—that is, public praying and prophesying, he is teaching nothing. Yet Brother Cled Wallace says: “I never saw or heard an idea expressed by Whiteside that I thought was ‘foul.’” And all this was beside the issue because I had not mentioned Brother Whiteside’s name in the short reference I made in my letter about him endorsing some parts of “God’s Woman.” After he had introduced Whiteside, and expressed himself so strongly in defense of Brother
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Whiteside's ideas, I asked him the following questions:

Do you think Verse 5 gave the women the right to teach and lead prayers in the public meetings of "that day?" If so, is there any scripture that would prohibit them from doing so today? Did 1 Cor. 14:34 regulate, or restrict the teaching of women in the public meetings, of the church, in "that day?" If so, does it restrict the woman's teaching in the church today?

To these questions I have received no answer. I do not believe a Nazarene preacher could do a better job beclouding these scriptures than Brethren Nichol and Whiteside have done. This I cannot understand, because these brethren have been considered outstanding Bible teachers for years. Brother Whiteside has been head of the query department of the Gospel Advocate for several years, and his answers to questions through the Advocate, naturally carry the influence of that paper with them. And that it is quite a difference from some young fellow popping off, off the record. Fifty years from now preachers may be quoting the Gospel Advocate to show that verse 5 gave women the same right to lead the prayer, and teach in the Lord's day worship, that verse 4 gave men. Then too "God's Woman," with its endorsers, could be produced to show that all the outstanding gospel preachers of this generation endorsed those principles. And the most prolific feeders to these tendencies are "our young people's meetings," where young girls are taught, or trained, to conduct the meetings, and make public talks. But some one may ask, why don't you tell us what Paul teaches in 1 Corinthians 11 through the 14 chapter. That is what I will do in the next...
chapter. Just remember if you cannot understand Paul’s teaching in 1 Corinthians 11:3, through the 14th chapter, you can cut those chapters out of your Bible. If you can understand his teaching, and you can; but do not believe it, then you are an infidel on that part of the Bible. How much of an infidel can one be, and be saved? May be, after all, those who do not believe Mark 16:15, 16 can be saved (?)
CHAPTER VI
WOMEN LEADING PRAYERS AND
TEACHING IN THE WORSHIP

Does Paul's teaching in 1 Corinthians 11:5, 6, give woman the right to lead the prayers, and teach in the Lord’s day worship? C. R. Nichol, in “God’s Woman,” says it does, and that there are no restrictions on her teaching or praying. We will now study Paul's teaching from the eleventh, through the fourteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians. From verse 3 of the eleventh chapter through the fourteenth chapter is all one subject. Paul did not divide the book up in chapters and verses as we have it, that has been done by man, for the convenience of man. The book was written on a scroll, just as we would write a letter, therefore when we read a chapter, we need not conclude that the writer had finished his subject, that must be determined by the arguments made by the writer.

In 1 Cor. 11:3, Paul states the divine unchangeable, and eternal relationship, that will always be observed by those who know and respect this relationship. In verses 4-7, he gives the regulations to govern men and women when they appear in public worship, where praying and teaching are to be done. Because of the divine relationship, men are to have their heads uncovered, and women are to have their heads covered. In these verses Paul places no restrictions on the teaching of either men or women, he takes that subject up later in his discussion. There was nothing out of the ordinary in this procedure. Gospel preachers, and writers frequently will state a general subject, analyze
it, and discuss it under different headings. That is exactly what Paul did in the scriptures under consideration. In verses 8-15, Paul discusses the relationship of men and women, and the natural covering that recognizes, and distinguishes that relationship. In verse 16, he declares that if a contentious person should contend for the abolition of the recognition of this divine relationship, he should know that neither Paul, nor the churches of God, had “no such custom” as he was contending for. In verses 17-22, he was rebuking the church for the mess, or mockery, they were making out of the worship when they came together. He even tells them that their coming together was for the worse, and not for the better, as it should have been. It is hard to get people to realize today that when they come together in a religious capacity, they may act in such a manner as to vitiate the worship.

Paul was a vile, vindictive persecutor of the church before his conversion, and call to the apostleship, therefore he was not present with the other apostles on the night the Savior instituted “the Lord’s supper.” In verses 23-24, he tells them that he had received the divine system of worship from the Lord, and had put it in the church at Corinth. He also tells them how each one should observe that supper, and because they had made a mockery out of the worship “many among you are weak and sickly, and not a few sleep.” To my mind, to say this weak, sickly, was anything other than spiritual would be absurd. Who can doubt that the same condition, and for the same reason, exists in many congregations today? In Ephesians 5:14 Paul says: “Wherefore he saith, awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee.” There are many in the church today that are
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spiritually weak, and spiritually dead, and don't know it. But we go on with our study. The apostolic age was a miraculous age. Peter said, they preached the gospel "by the Holy Spirit sent forth from heaven," and as they preached it, it was confirmed by miracles. Read Mark 16:20; Acts 14:3, and Heb. 2:4. When people obeyed the gospel in that age, before the New Testament was written, many of them, through the imposition of the apostles' hands, received spiritual gifts to teach, edify, and build up the church. Some of them in the church at Corinth were puffed up, or inflated over their gifts, and were misusing them. From chapter 12 on into the fourteenth chapter, Paul was not only trying to correct their misconduct, and misuse of the gifts; but he gave the regulations to control the use of spiritual gifts. He tells them there were "diversities of gifts," diversities of ministration," and "diversities of working;" but all came from the same Spirit, the same Lord, and the same God, and were for the same purpose to build up the church in love. God not only "set the members each one of them in the body, even as it pleased him," but he distributed the gifts as it pleased him, "that there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another." Therefore there was no reason for one being puffed up against another.

Some had the gift of tongues, and were evidently abusing the use of their gift, because Paul says: "I thank God, I speak with tongues more than you all: howbeit in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue." If the modern jabberers were not crazy, or religious fa-
natics, this statement from Paul would keep them from making fools of themselves.

In chapter 14:20-36, Paul gives the restrictions, regulating the use of tongues, and the teaching of both men and women. In verse 27, 28, Paul says: "If any man speaketh in a tongue, let it be by two, or at the most three, and that in turn; and let one interpret: but if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church, and let him speak to himself, and to God." I wonder why Paul did not say: "If any woman speaketh in a tongue . . . let one interpret: but if there be no interpreter, let her keep silence in the church, and let her speak to herself, and to God?" Let Paul answer this question. In verses 32-35, Paul says: "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets; for God is not a God of confusion, but of peace. As in all the churches of the saints, let the women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law. And if they would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church." From verse 23, we know Paul was talking about the public meetings, "when the whole church was assembled together." Therefore, in the 14th chapter, Paul gives the restrictions, regulating the praying, and prophesying (teaching) of both men and women in the public meetings; but he says nothing about how they should appear before God in the public meetings. In chapter 11, Paul tells both men and women how to appear before God in the public meetings; but he gives no restrictions, regulating the praying or teaching of either men or women.

In verse 37, Paul says: "If a man thinketh himself
to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are the commandment of the Lord.” I wonder again, why Paul did not say: “If any woman thinketh herself to be a prophetess, or spiritual, let her take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are the commandments of the Lord?” Notice Paul is talking about “the thing which I write unto you,” the church at Corinth. It is a pity that many gospel preachers, will not take knowledge of, and preach, “the things,” Paul wrote “as the commandment of God,” instead of preaching them as “the custom of that day in that country.” In our next, we will study what Brother Nichol says about 1 Cor. 14:34, 35.
CHAPTER VII
SPEAKING WITH TONGUES

Under the above caption Brother C. R. Nichol delivered himself on the fourteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, and if you endorse his delivery, you can cut that chapter, along with others out of your Bible, as I will show you. Remember I am reviewing some parts of C. R. Nichol's book—"God's Woman," and when I refer to a page, I am speaking of that book, unless otherwise stated. On page 135, he says: "If a man do what? 'Speak with a tongue.' To speak with a tongue was to speak in a language (Acts 2:4-8). There were those in the church at Corinth who were enabled by the Holy Spirit to speak in languages they had not learned. In this the fourteenth chapter of the first Corinthian letter, are given all such some instructions. The order he gave them was surely timely, and applicable in every place where speaking in tongues was possible."

I wonder if Brother C. R. Nichol does not know that this "timely order" Paul gave here in "this the fourteenth chapter of the first Corinthian letter" was to regulate, and restrict the praying and prophesying spoken of in 1 Cor. 11:4, 5? That praying and prophesying were certainly done "in languages they had not learned." The power of "speaking in tongues," wherever, and whenever done, was from the same God, by the same Spirit, and for the same purpose. "In this the fourteenth chapter of the first Corinthian letter" Paul gave "his timely order" to regulate the teaching of both men and women; but he said nothing about their head covering. In the eleventh chapter of 1 Cor-
inthians, Paul gave the "timely order" regulating the head covering of both men and women when they come into the public meetings; but he gave no "order" to regulate their praying and prophesying. Therefore to fail to consider 1 Cor. 11:3 through the fourteenth chapter inclusive, as one argument is to make nonsense out of Paul's teaching. You have him giving a "timely order," and with the next stroke of the pen he revokes the "order," and thus becomes the outstanding exponent of contradictory teaching. One who would thus deal with Paul's argument must be hopelessly blinded with customitis. We go on with Brother Nichol's logic (?). He says 'It should be remembered though that the power to speak in language you have not learned is not yours, nor is such power possessed by any one on earth today! For that reason the effort to make the instructions given by Paul applicable under any conditions other than those contemplated and described in the chapter, is a misapplication of the scripture; it is wrestling the scripture.' "Wrestling the scripture" is a serious matter, because it might send many honest, but misled souls to hell. I wonder if Brother C. R. Nichol, with his "discriminating ability," does not know that Paul's timely order was to regulate the use of tongues, and not the reception of tongues? If he does not know this, he may obtain mercy for "wrestling the scripture" in "ignorance and unbelief." Would it be "a misapplication" of Paul's "timely order" to apply it to men today who have learned to speak in different languages? If so, why?

Some Brother told me, several years ago, about Brother Nichol holding a meeting out from Lewisburg, Tennessee. He said Brother Nichol got up on
Sunday morning, made a bow, and said: "I am C. R. Nichol from Clifton, Texas; I am here to teach you, and if you want to know anything while I am here ask me, if you want to know anything about Hebrew ask me, if you want to know anything about Greek ask me," etc. I doubt that Brother Nichol’s audience would have known a Hebrew or a Greek letter from a turkey track in the sand. Suppose Brother Nichol had begun to speak in the Hebrew tongue, a language he had learned (?), there being no interpreter present, would not Paul’s “timely order” have restrained him? If not, why not? But we will go on with “God’s Woman” since that is a later delivery than the Tennessee meeting.

"MEN COMMANDED TO KEEP SILENCE"

As the church in Jerusalem, as well as the church today assembled for a ‘teaching service;’ assembled on other days than the first day of the week (Sunday), so also the church at Corinth did likewise. In the church at Corinth when they were assembled for study there was in the number those who could speak with tongues. But to speak in an unknown language would not have met with the desired end, that of teaching, unless there was some one present who could interpret—translate into a language the ones present understood, that which was spoken. If there was no interpreter present, the speaking in tongues was forbidden, and the prohibition is thus expressed: “Let him keep silence in the church” (1 Cor. 14:28). If the conditions under which these men were commanded to keep ‘silence in the church’ existed today, then the prohibition here laid down would be applicable. But there being on earth today no one who is able to speak in ‘tongues,’ the effort to make the prohibition here de-
manded applicable is clearly an effort to twist the scriptures, or ignorantly make a misapplication of the passage.”

If C. R. Nichol can speak the Hebrew and Greek languages, he can speak in “tongues” so far as the masses of people he tries to teach are concerned, and he is “on earth today,” and “of the earth, earthy.” Therefore, for him to speak either in the Lord’s day meeting or any other meeting of the church, in either the Hebrew or Greek languages, there being “no one present who could interpret—translate into a language the one present understood, that which was spoken,” I insist, would be to flout Paul’s prohibition, which says: “Let him keep silence in the church.” I know Brother Nichol had to learn the Hebrew and Greek languages, if he can speak them. I also know that the teachers in the church at Corinth “were enabled by the Holy Spirit to speak in languages they had not learned;” but Paul was not regulating the way they received the tongues, he was restricting the use of the tongues after they had received them. Maybe, after all, it is Brother Nichol “twisting the scriptures, or ignorantly making a misapplication of the passage.”

The apostolic age was a miraculous age. The New Testament had not been written; but was then in the making. When the gospel was first preached, it had to be preached to all nations, and the apostles being “ignorant and unlearned men,” so far as the language of the nations were concerned, the Holy Spirit took possession of their tongues, and so spake “that every man heard them speaking in his own language.” I doubt that Peter could have learned, in a life time, the different languages the Holy Spirit spoke through
him on Pentecost. God certainly would have been a “respecter of persons,” if he had had the gospel preached in only one language when it was first preached by “the Holy Spirit sent forth from heaven.” For the same reason, many who obeyed the gospel in the apostolic age “were enabled by the Holy Spirit to speak in languages they had not learned,” that they might teach, edify, and build up the church, made up of men speaking different languages. Of course those miraculous tongues, with all other miraculous gifts ended with the apostolic age. But there was not a regulation or restriction given to regulate the use of “tongues” in the miraculous age of the church, that would not regulate and restrict the use of tongues in the church today. Just remember “tongues” are languages you do not know. Suppose God would enable me, “by the Holy Spirit,” to speak the Hebrew language, a language I have not learned. Then suppose Brother C. R. Nichol had learned to speak the Hebrew language. Do you think Paul’s “timely order” would prohibit me from teaching or speaking to an audience that did not know the Hebrew language; but give Brother Nichol the right to speak to the same audience in the Hebrew language, because he had learned the language? As Brother C. R. would say: “Bosh.”

On page 137, Brother Nichol quotes (1 Cor. 14:34, 35), and delivers himself as follows: “Is the silence here imposed on women to be observed in all meetings of the church? Yes, in all meetings such as were being described by the apostle. The women are not to disturb the meeting by even a question when revelations were being made. Such conditions existed, and the grounds on which the ‘silence’ of men and women was commanded in the church at
Corinth, do not exist in any place on earth today. Let no one be guilty of perverting the scripture by trying to make the prohibition described in that church binding on any congregation today!” If C. R. Nichol is right, you can, and ought to cut 1 Cor. 14:34, 35, out of your Bible, because to apply those scriptures today is to “be guilty of perverting the scripture.” Then the denominations, including the Nazarene, and Digressive churches are right in letting the women lead the prayers, teach, and preach in public meetings. And the churches of Christ have been, and are wrong in using 1 Cor. 14:34, 35, to restrict the women’s teaching, and leading prayers in the public meetings of the church “today.” And since Paul was correcting the abuse of the use of “tongues” in the twelfth chapter of 1 Corinthians, you may cut that chapter out too. Brother Cled Wallace says he believes Brother Nichol is nearer right than I am, and some one said that was, in itself, an exception to Brother Nichol’s position, so I will let Brother Cled use the scissors, maybe he can save some of these scriptures.
CHAPTER VIII

"NOT A WOMAN CHOSEN AS AN APOSTLE"

On page 151, "God's Woman," C. R. Nichol delivers himself on the above subject, as follows: "Some insist that since there was not a woman chosen from the disciples to be an apostle; nor was there a woman in the company of seventy, such must have some weight; for, it is declared, had it been the will of the Lord for women to preach as did the apostles, and the seventy, surely the Lord would have chosen at least one woman in the number. I hold that it is not within the rights of a woman to preach as did the twelve, and the seventy; but the fact that there was not a woman in either of these groups is no proof that she may not do teaching, even public teaching." On page 123, he says: Joel declared that women would prophesy; Peter affirmed that women would prophesy; and it is recorded that Philip had four unmarried daughters that did prophesy (Joel 2; Acts 2; 21:9). In neither of the passages is there any intimation that there would be limitations thrown around women in prophesying." If women are to prophesy—teach or preach—and if there is not even an "intimation that there would be limitations thrown around women in prophesying." If women are to prophesy—teach or preach that it is not within the rights of a woman to preach as did the twelve, and the seventy?" There were only two ways that the apostles taught. They taught publicly, and privately, "night and day." If Brother Nichol would condescend to send me a few lines, explaining in what sense the apostles preached that
women cannot preach, since he says there are no restrictions or "limitations thrown around women in prophesying," I would appreciate it, and I am sure the readers of Sound Doctrine would appreciate it too. This is a vital question, and I think the churches have a right to know what preachers and religious papers stand for. Churches should not back either preachers or papers because of their age, but for what they stand for, and teach. We go on with Brother Nichol's imaginary philosophy, he asked: "Had it occurred to you in this connection that there was not a Gentile in the group of seventy, nor was there a Gentile in the school of the apostles! (Yes, that had occurred to me, Brother Nichol. Had it ever occurred to you that there were Jewish women, with Jesus and the apostles, that Jesus could have put in either group if he had wanted women to become public teachers? J. T. L.) Is it lawful to insist that because there was not a Gentile in either of the groups, it is therefore wrong for a Gentile to do teaching? (No, Brother Nichol, that would not be "lawful." It would be just as "lawful" to argue that because there were no Gentiles in either group, there should be none in the church. Such reasoning would be an insult to the intelligence of all Bible students. J. T. L.) Is it insisted that there were Gentile men who did do teaching in the days of the apostles, and for that reason Gentiles may teach today? True. There were women in the days of the apostles who taught too." True, Brother Nichol, and what I want you to do is to get off the pinnacle of your dignity, and tell us just how the women taught "in the days of the apostles."

In 1 Timothy 2:12, Paul says: "But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over man, but
to be in quietness.” Brother Nichol comments on this verse as follows: “Have you studied the passage carefully? (Yes, I have studied the passage enough to know that the questions you asked about it are absolutely childish. J. T. L.) There are two things prohibited: (1) “Teaching.” (2) “ Dominion over a man.” Is the prohibition against women teaching an unlimited proscription? I read that it is God’s will that the aged women teach the younger women (Titus 2:1-3). (I have read that too, Brother Nichol; but what has that got to do with women teaching or having dominion over man?” J. T. L.) Is this passage in conflict with 1 Tim. 2:12, where it says: “I suffer not a woman to teach?” (Certainly not, Brother Nichol. J. T. L.) If mothers teach their children the word of God today, do they do wrong, are they refusing to respect the demands of this verse, which says: “I suffer not a woman to teach?”

There is absolutely no conflict between 1 Tim. 2:12, and Titus 2:1-3. Mothers can not only teach “Their children, but they can “teach the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, to be sober-minded, chaste, workers at home, kind, being in subjection to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.” (Titus 2:4, 5) And they can do this without violating Romans 12, or without “operating under God’s authority in another realm.” But when you try to pervert these scriptures to justify women leading the prayers, and teaching publicly in the Lord’s day meetings, you are “operating in another realm,” and without “God’s authority.” The only way your indorses can help you in this matter, is to get you to delete these perversions of God’s word from your book, mis-named “God’s Woman.” On
page 153, Brother Nichol gave a wonderful explanation of Acts 4:18, he says: "If you will give attention to the passage you cannot fail to see that there is a qualifying clause, and that clause is 'in the name of Jesus.' They were forbidden to speak 'at all'—in the name of Jesus! The term 'in the name of Jesus' qualifies the words 'speak' and 'teach.' The ban was on speaking and teaching—'in the name of Jesus.'"

This is the most illuminating passage in Brother Nichol's book, he must have given much study to it. If I ever find a man so ignorant of God's word, and of the English language that he thinks the apostles "were not allowed to acknowledge a greeting;" nor "to converse with each other," it will be a pleasure to refer him to "God's Woman."

Finally, on page 150, Brother Nichol says: "My wife has a very fine collection of iris. She taught me how to hybridize—how to take the pollen from one flower and pollenize another flower. Did she do wrong in teaching me how to produce a hybrid?" No Brother Nichol she did not do wrong. She could have even taught you how to work the iris bed, without getting out of her realm of operation. But if you have taught your wife, or any other woman, to lead the prayers, and to teach, or preach, in the Lord’s day meetings, you have thrown more flies in the scriptural ointment, than your indorsers will ever be able to fish out. The End.

I have given this review of "God's Woman" solely in the interest of the truth, and I hope I have not become Brother Nichol's enemy for telling him the truth. On the hypothesis that a friend is not necessarily one that always agrees with you; but one that tries
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to teach you the truth, I am a better friend to C. R. Nichol, than his "very dear friend" Cled Wallace is.
Dear Brother Whiteside: I often read your answers to questions in the Gospel Advocate, and am thankful to God that we have a man in the Lord’s service like you. I have a question that has arisen in our services here that I would like for you to answer through the Gospel Advocate for me as soon as possible. The question is whether it is scriptural for a woman to call the dismissal in worship, or to pray in public worship. Some of the church leaders have been admitting this in service, and I do not believe in it. I want some light on it. If be my error or the other brothers’, I only want the truth.—C. B. JOHNSON.

I suppose the brother wants to know if it is right for women to take the lead in public prayers, for surely there is no dispute as to whether a woman should pray with the rest of the church. The thing most noticeable about public prayers is that generally no one leads, for the congregation does not follow. Frequently the leaders in prayers do not speak so that others can hear them. Pretended leaders who pray in a low, mumbling voice are merely praying an individual prayer in a public place. So far as the congregation is concerned, it is a secret prayer! It is a great evil. If a man cannot pray so the congregation can hear him, he should not be called on to lead in prayer.

Usually writers and speakers who talk about what a
woman can do begin and end by telling what she cannot do, and so give no light on what she can and should do. It is not always easy for a thoughtful person to draw the line. Miriam was a prophetess; she was, therefore, inspired—God spoke through her; but her activities may have been mainly confined to teaching the Hebrew women. (Ex. 15:20, 21.) Except in rare instances, God has placed the burden of leadership on man; but there have been times when the men became so spineless, flabby, and worthless that the leadership fell to women. In Isaiah's day the men became so helpless that children oppressed them and women ruled over them. (Isa. 3:1-12.) A similar condition prevailed earlier in the nation of the Hebrews. For twenty years the children of Israel had been oppressed by Jabin, king of Canaan, "the captain of whose host was Sisera." Apparently there was no man in Israel to take the lead, and that task fell to a woman. "Now Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lappidoth, she judged Israel at that time . . . . And the children of Israel came up to her for judgment." When Jehovah through her called on Barak to raise an army and make war on Sisera and his hosts, Barak refused to go unless Deborah would go with him. When the battle was over and the victory won, Deborah and Barak sang a song of victory, a song which Deborah composed, in which are found these words: "The rulers ceased in Israel, they ceased, until that I Deborah arose, that I arose a mother in Israel." And thus does Deborah deal a severe rebuke to Israel's men. (Judg. 4:1 to close of chapter 5.) It all amounts to this: If men will not take the lead, women must. And yet there does not seem to have been any such emergency in the case of Anna, the prophetess. (Luke 2:36-38.)
She was evidently acting in her capacity as prophetess in making that speech in the temple to all who “were looking for the consolation of Israel,” when the child Jesus was presented in the temple. To say the least of it, that was a rare occasion and as public a speech as one could well make. If God, on rare occasions, departed from his usual plans of operations, who am I to speculate about it?

I do not know the conditions in the church where Brother Johnson worships. If there are no men in that church who can, or who will, take the lead, then it seems that the women must do so. If the men can take the lead, and will do so, it seems to me that they should not put the burden on the women. It is safest to be safe. Call it prejudice or conviction, just as you please, but all my preaching days I have been opposed to women’s taking the lead in politics and religion, or in any other matters. Part of that may be due to prejudice, for I find that God did sometimes put women in the lead as prophetesses. I have learned not to be overly dogmatic in some matters.—Issue-July 9th, 1942.

Late Saturday afternoon, on July 4, Brother Rex Turner, and Joe Greer, came by my home, and we were discussing my review of Brother C. R. Nichol’s book—“God’s Woman.” Brother Greer asked me if I knew of any place where the women were taking the lead in worship, in the church of Christ. I told him I did not know of a single case. But on July 9, just five days after our conversation, the Gospel Advocate gave a definite answer, in the affirmative, to Brother Greer’s question, as the above article from the Advocate shows. The article does not give Brother C. B. Johnson’s place of worship; but it does show
that the women are called on, not only to dismiss the audience; but also to lead the prayers where he worships. Brother Nichol’s “Woman,” therefore, is bearing fruit sooner than I thought it would. The church of Christ, in the last few decades, has grown with a rapidity that has astounded the denominational world. But unfortunately the church has become one of the most fertile fields for every ism under the sun, and the tragedy is, that “our” outstanding gospel preachers “have learned not to be overly dogmatic” in these matters.

Brother Whiteside, being editor of the Query Department of the Gospel Advocate, his evasive, and indefinite answer to Brother Johnson’s questions, definitely places the Gospel Advocate in an apologetic position on women taking the leading part in the worship of the church. Brother Whiteside says: “Usually writers and speakers who talk about what a woman can do begin and end by telling what she cannot do, and so gives no light on what she can and should do.” When I read that I thought surely the readers of the Advocate would be flooded with the light of truth, on what women “can and should do” in the church. But imagine my chagrin when I read his next statement, which follows: “It is not always easy for a thoughtful person to draw the line.” If this is true, Brother Whiteside is among the outstanding thinkers of “our day.” He knows that Miriam and Deborah were prophetesses, and what they did; but he does not seem to know what a Christian woman “can and should do.” He is too “thoughtful” to draw the line between What a Christian woman can and cannot do.

I do not know that Brother Whiteside, or the Gos-
pel Advocate, would consider Peter and Paul “thoughtful persons”; but they drew the line between what Christian Women “can and should do,” and what they “cannot do” by the authority of Christ. Peter said: “In like manner, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, even if any obey not the word, they may without the word be gained by the behavior of their wives; beholding your chaste behavior coupled with fear. Whose adorning let it not be the outward adorning of braiding the hair, and of wearing jewels of gold, or putting on apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price.” (I Peter 3:1-4.) Paul said, in Titus 2:1-5, “But speak thou the things which befit the sound doctrine: that aged men be temperate, grave, sober-minded, sound in faith, in love, in patience: that aged women likewise be reverent in demeanor, not slanderers nor enslaved to much wine, teachers of that which is good; that they may train the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, to be sober-minded, chaste, workers at home, kind, being in subjection to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.” I know, according to the opinions, and “customs of our day,” Paul was a crank(?) because he said women should be “workers at home.” *Home* in many places today, is four walls, where, after the day’s work, and part of the night in “revellings, and such like,” the husband and wife may meet, quarrel, and sleep a few hours before day, and if they happen to have children, furnish a place for the maid to sleep, and feed them. Thus, the home, the oldest, and most sacred institution in the world, where “marriage should be had in
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honor among them, and the bed undefiled,” is being disrupted, and abandoned, by the vain and foolish philosophies of “our day.” If a gospel preacher dares to speak out against these things, which are becoming the “customs of our day,” if he is not stigmatized as a crank, he is branded as an extremist. We will now read some from the fifth chapter of 1 Timothy. In verses 3 and 4, Paul says: “Honor widows that are widows indeed. But if any widow hath children or grandchildren, let them learn first to show piety towards their own family, and to requite their parents: for this is acceptable in the sight of God.” According to the “customs of our day,” this means that children should put their parents, or grandparents, into some “Old folks home,” and possibly pay a little board, if they are getting an “old folks pension.” We now read Verses 5-8, “Now she that is a widow indeed, and desolate, hath her hope set on God, and continueth in supplications and prayers night and day. But she that giveth herself to pleasure is dead while she liveth. These things also command, that they may be without reproach. But if any provideth not for his own, and especially his own household, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an unbeliever.” Some of “our” outstanding preachers, who have had strokes of customitis, would say: “Custom decreed those things in that day, and custom has revoked the decree in our day.” Borrowing one of Brother Cled Wallace’s phrases, when he gets het up, “I am fed up” on this, “the custom of that day,” and “the custom of our day,” stuff, with which “God’s Woman” is replete. There are other outstanding preachers, and teachers, who doubt the wisdom of publishing these things because “our” peo-
people have become accustomed to these "customs," and never say anything about them; because these customs have become their practice. But we go on with Paul's teaching. We read verses 9, 10, "Let none be enrolled as a widow under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man, well reported of for good works; if she hath brought up children, if she hath used hospitality to strangers, if she hath washed the saints feet, if she hath relieved the afflicted, if she hath diligently followed every good work." Certainly "every good work" that Paul mentions here had been done in the home.

We will now let Luke tell us about the good works of another woman. In Acts 9:36-39, we read: "Now there was at Joppa a certain disciple named Tabitha, which by interpretation is called Dorcas: this woman was full of good works and almsdeeds which she did. And it came to pass in those days, that she fell sick and died: and when they had washed her, they laid her in an upper chamber. And as Lydda was nigh unto Joppa, the disciples, hearing that Peter was there, sent two men unto him, entreating him, Delay not to come on unto us. And Peter arose and went with them. And when he was come, they brought him into the upper chamber: and all the widows stood by him weeping, and showing the coats and garments which Dorcas made, while she was with them." It was evidently not the custom in "that day," to give the name of the president, secretary, and treasurer, of the ladies' class, or organization that Dorcas belonged to, or to tell who was running the "Old Ladies' Home" from which those widows came. We now go back to 1 Tim. 5:14, 15, "I desire therefore that the younger widows marry, bear children, rule the household, give
no occasion to the adversary for reviling; for already some are turned aside after Satan.” You now have what Peter, Paul, and Luke said Christian women “can and should do.” I will now let Paul give a “dogmatic” answer to Brother Johnson’s question. “As in all the churches of the saints, let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law” (I Cor. 14:33, 34). If the church where Brother Johnson worships is one of “the churches of the saints,” he has the answer without a quibble, to his question.

You now have the line drawn, and the light given in the New Testament, as to what a Christian Woman “can and should do,” and how and where she should do it. You also have what she cannot do, in the public meetings of the church. The line is straight; but plain, and I hope Brother Whiteside and the Gospel Advocate may henceforth walk the line without wabbling on it, or stuttering, and apologizing for it.
CHAPTER X
MUST WOMEN WEAR HATS IN PUBLIC?

Under the above caption, in the Gospel Advocate of October 31, 1940, appeared two questions from Brother Pride Hinton, and Brother R. L. Whiteside’s answer. Judging from Brother Whiteside’s reply to the questions, he does not know what Paul was teaching in 1 Cor. 11:1-16. His answer may have been the help Brother Hinton was calling for, but it was not the truth. Soon after these questions and Brother Whiteside’s answer appeared in the Advocate I wrote a reply, and sent it to the Bible Banner, but for some reason and in some way, my article was misplaced—lost and was not published. I later learned that the editor of The Banner never intended to publish it. Just yesterday I got hold of the Advocate of the above date, re-read Brother Hinton’s questions and Brother Whiteside’s answer. Brother Whiteside’s dissertation, on Paul’s language in 1 Cor. 11:1-16, is such a glaring perversion of the truth, I am writing this article to help those who want to know the truth on how men and women should appear in public worship. Brother Hinton’s questions and Brother Whiteside’s sophistry follows:

*Must Women Wear Hats In Public?*

1. Does 1 Cor. 11 teach that it is sinful for a woman to attend public worship without her hat on?

2. Does verse 16 teach that the custom of short or long hair is not a permanent law of the church? or, as some interpret it, does it teach that the custom of short hair was, and always will be, sinful?

You have answered these questions before, no doubt; but there are whole sermons devoted to this
subject by many around here, and I want some help, if you please—Pride Hinton.

1. If Brother Hinton will consult the American Standard Version he will see that the head covering mentioned is either a veil or long hair. Nothing is said about a hat. A veil is not a hat, and a hat is not a veil. Is it not strange how some preachers can read into a passage of Scripture things that are not there, and then severely criticize those who do not agree with their perversion? If a man says that a woman must wear a hat in public, he says what Paul does not say. A woman can look as pert and enticing with a hat on her head as she can without a hat, but not so with a veil. Whether the wearing of a veil is required for a covering, or not, might be a matter for a difference of opinion; but wearing, or not wearing a hat is not even hinted by Paul. A man has a strange idea of things when he can put in a whole sermon trying to make Paul say a thing that he did not even hint at. When the Lord says a thing, let us not substitute something else; there is already too much of that in the denominational world.

2. No matter which view of the verse one takes, it puts the matter on the basis of custom. I can see how custom may become a law; but it is hard to see how a law based on custom can be permanent, for customs usually change. However, the custom for men to wear short hair and for women to wear long hair has been all along down the ages almost a universal custom, even in countries and times where and when the Bible had no influence. Personally, I have never liked to see women with their hair shingled; neither have I believed that a violation of a custom is a mortal sin. But if a woman wears long hair for
a covering, why does she twist it up into a small knot? Surely there is not much covering in that sort of arrangement. I have seen bobbed hair that furnished more covering. Be your own judge as to whether I speak the truth. I have no disposition to upset anyone, nor to engage in any argument concerning the matter. R. L. Whiteside.

It seems that the long sermons that have been preached on 1 Cor. 11:3-16, have thrown consternation into Brother Hinton’s camp and he says: “I want some help if you please.” If Brother Hinton had wanted the truth on 1 Cor. 11, he could have gotten it nearer home. If Brethren Hinton and Whiteside will lay aside their preconceived notions about “covered” and “uncovered heads,” and will study with me 1 Cor. 11, I can help them, and through them help others who may want to know the truth on this subject. In verse 3, Paul says: “But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.” A surveyor must establish a corner before he can survey anything, so the reader must understand what Paul says in the above, before he can understand what follows, because the corner of Paul’s argument is in the third verse. Before going further let us settle the following questions. Was Paul stating a relationship between God, Christ, man, woman, that was only “a custom” in that day? Or was he stating a relationship that is as eternal as God himself? If you think he was stating a mere “custom” of “that day,” you may get out of the class, because you know (?) too much to begin with. In Ephesians 5:22, 23, Paul says: “Christ is head of the church,” and “the husband is the head of the wife;” but in 1 Cor. 11:3,
Paul was not talking about “the church” nor “the wife,” man and woman are used in the generic sense. Last January I was lecturing on 1 Cor. 11, at Freed-Hardeman College, a young man, who is a preacher, editor, and who has been dubbed as a “radio beggar” cried out, “I am the only man that is the head of my wife.” Of course I knew his bucket was full, and running over; but not with Bible ideas. Therefore, because of this relationship and not because of a custom, Paul says: “Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head,” Verse 4. If Paul was not talking about an artificial covering in this verse he was talking about nothing, and it does not take a Solomon to understand this. The same may be said about Verse 5, which reads as follows: “But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head: for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven.” Brother Whiteside says: “Whether the wearing of a veil is required for a covering, or not, might be a matter for a difference of opinion.” I emphatically deny that Paul’s statements in these verses are so vague that they may be placed in the realm of opinion. Furthermore a man that can see through a ladder can see that Paul was speaking of artificial coverings in these verses. In Verse 6, Paul says “For if a woman is not veiled, let her also be shorn: but if it is a shame to a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be veiled.” If Paul did not know that the church at Corinth knew that it was a shame for a woman to be shorn, or shaven, he was speaking to them in an unknown tongue, because he was teaching them that it was just as shameful for a woman to have her head uncovered in the worship as it was for her to have her head
shorn or shaven. For a woman to have her head shorn or shaven was a badge of infamy, and the church at Corinth knew it and Paul was telling them that it was just as bad for a woman to have her head uncovered. And he tells the woman if she is going to do one, she could do both, because either would be a total disregard for the God prescribed distinction that recognizes the eternal relationship between the sex,—no custom here.

In Verse 7, Paul says: “For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man.” This is from “the American Standard Version.” I suppose Brother Hinton “consulted” it. After advising Brother Hinton to consult “the American Standard Version,” Brother Whiteside says: “Nothing is said about a hat. A veil is not a hat, and a hat is not a veil. Is it not strange how some preachers read into a passage of scripture things that are not there, and then severely criticize those who do not agree with their perversion?” Yes, and it is equally as strange “how some preachers can read out of a passage of scripture what is there and accuse those who will not accept their deleted version of “perversion.” Brother Whiteside by his learned dissertation on “a veil” and “a hat” has read the head covering out of 1 Cor. 11:3-16, the very thing Paul was discussing. Of course, “a veil is not a hat, and a hat is not a veil;” but a veil is a covering, and a hat is a covering, and Paul says a man ought not to have his head covered in the worship. Therefore a man with a “hat” on his head in the worship would be just as much a violation of Paul’s injunction as if he had a “veil” or a turban on his head. The custom of a
country may regulate or influence the kind of covering; but the custom of no country, neither the profane babblings and oppositions of any preacher can change the divine teaching that a woman ought to have her head covered, and a man **ought not** to have his head covered in the divine worship. Changing therefore from “a veil,” or a turban, to a hat would only be a change in a custom, and Brother Whiteside himself says: “I have never believed that a violation of a custom is a mortal sin.” A woman may with propriety decide the style of covering that she may have on her head; but she cannot abandon her covering without flouting the divine decree. Does Brother Whiteside think that would be “a mortal sin?” I think what Brother Whiteside says about “a woman looking pert and enticing with a hat on her head,” is placing her presence in worship on rather a low plane, and if that is what she goes for, she had as well park before she gets there. In Verses 8-12, Paul discusses the creation of man and woman, and their relationship to each other, and to the Creator, based upon their creation. In view of this relationship, Paul asked the question, in Verse 13: “Judge ye in yourselves: is it seemly that a woman pray unto God unveiled?” That is, in view of her relationship to man, would the natural feeling of good sense and decorum suggest that a woman pray unto God with her head uncovered, thus denying any inferiority of her relationship to man? We read Verses 13, 14, “Doth not even nature itself teach you that, if a man have long hair, it is a dishonor to him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering.” Thus Revelation, and nature speak the same language. Brother Whiteside
agrees with this when he says: "However, the custom for man to wear short hair and for woman to wear long hair has been all along down the ages almost a universal custom, even in countries and times where and when the Bible had no influence." Why? Because of the instinctive and natural perception of what is right or wrong. It is therefore a duplex presumption for a woman to flout both Revelation and nature. This she does when she shingles her hair. Man with shingled hair recognizes his created relationship to Christ, and woman with unshingled hair acknowledges her created relationship to man. If only Christian woman would recognize their created relationship to men and move in their God given sphere, the world would be better, and the church a greater power for good today. But this, many of them will never do, so long as C. R. Nichol’s idea of "God’s Woman" (?) are peddled among the churches, with an occasional foul idea from R. L. Whiteside pitched into their laps through the Gospel Advocate.

Brother Whiteside asked: "But if a woman wears long hair for a covering, why does she twist it up into a small knot? (God has left the twisting, or fixing of ‘long hair’ to woman—J. T. L.) Surely there is not much covering in that sort of arrangement. (She still has the covering God gave her, and it is on her head.—J. T. L.) I have seen bobbed hair that furnished more covering." Yes, I saw a sister recently attending church, without an artificial covering on her head, her hair shingled short, behind like a man’s but a little bushy on top, as Brother Whiteside suggests; but she looked like a double rose comb rooster to me. Now Verse 16 and we are through. "But if any man seemeth to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." That is, "such custom"
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as men wearing long hair, or women wearing short hair, was not tolerated by the apostles, nor practiced in the churches of God. “Such custom,” therefore was from the world or the devil, and Paul wanted those who contended for it to know that neither the apostles, nor the New Testament Church taught, or practiced it. I hope this may at least get Brother Whiteside and Brother Hinton to study 1 Cor. 11:3-16. If they will, they will have no trouble in understanding it.
CHAPTER XI
BROTHER HINTON AND EASTERN WOMAN'S VEIL

Brother Pryde E. Hinton seems to be having trouble about the woman's head covering these days; but he doesn't seem to be disturbed about the rest of her apparel. Paul says: "In like manner, that woman adorn themselves in modest apparel ... (which becometh women professing godliness.)" I wish Brother Hinton would ask Brother Whiteside if he considers stockings just covering the ankles, dresses cut above the knees, with no backs and not much front, "modest apparel?" Ask him, if it should ever become the custom for men and women to dress as the American Indians used to dress, would that be "modest apparel?" And should they thus dress?

In the Gospel Advocate October 31, 1940, Brother Hinton asked Brother R. L. Whiteside the following question

Must Women Wear Hats In Public?

Of course we have Brother Whiteside's answer in the same issue of the Gospel Advocate. This we studied in the previous chapter. His answer seemed to have knocked the woman's hat into a "cocked hat," and the sky will be clear to Brother Hinton if he can get the "Eastern Women's Veil" out of the way. Therefore, in the Gospel Advocate of September 18, 1941, we have the following questionings from Brother Hinton, and Brother Whiteside's answers. Read them.

Several Questions
1. Would wearing a veil such as the Eastern women wore be decent now?
2. Does wearing a hat, or even a veil, indicate the
relationship between man and woman today?

3. I assume that you believe that 1 Cor. 14 forbids a woman’s prophesying—that is, speaking unto edification and exhortation and consolation when “the whole church be assembled together,” and when the prophets are speaking “in turn.” If women are forbidden to prophesy in the church, how can the veil wearing of 1 Cor. 11:5 refer to deportment in the assembly?


1, 2, As to whether we should say that it would not be decent for a woman to appear in public wearing the kind of veil the ancient women wore, depends on the meaning of “decent” which we have in mind. It is certain that she would not be “conforming to standards of what is fitting.” Such garb would not be “proper,” nor “seemly.” But we would not say that such garb showed her not to be “free from immodesty or obscenity.” But what were the veils of the Eastern women? Rebekah “covered herself” with her veil. (Gen. 24:65.) The veils worn then were not face veils, such as were worn here by women some years ago. We are told that there were two styles—namely, an indoor veil and an outdoor veil. The indoor veil extended to the waist; the outdoor veil, to the heels, or nearly so. The head part in both styles was a sort of hood that completely covered the head, extending down over the forehead, but not usually over the face. No, it would not be seemly for a woman to appear in public wearing either style. A hat is about as poor a substitute for either style as sprinkling is for baptism. But custom now decrees that women wear hats instead of veils; and, as
in the case of sprinkling for baptism, it is argued that the hat serves as well as the veil! And so custom controls, after all.

3. The question presents a difficulty. Did Paul give the woman the right to pray and prophesy in the assembly, providing she were veiled, and then in chapter 14 prohibit her from doing so? That seems unreasonable, and yet that, in substance, is the explanation given by some commentators. It does not seem right to use verse 5 to prove that a woman should have a hat on her head when she attends public worship, and then not allow her to prophesy. The prophesying and praying of verse 5 must be of the same nature as the prophesying and praying of verse 4.

4. I do not happen to have a copy of B. W. Johnson’s work. But the passage does not prohibit all teaching by women, for Paul commands women to teach certain things. (Tit. 2:3-5.) The connection seems to indicate plainly that Paul was setting forth what the woman would not be allowed to do in the public assemblies. She must not teach in such a way as to dominate the men, but she must teach; God has laid that obligation on her. Every Christian in a reasonable length of time should be able to teach others.

Brother Whiteside has made this so plain (?), that women with uncovered heads in the worship, yea, if they have their hair shingled “shall not err therein.” Isaiah said: “The way of holiness” would be so plain that “the wayfaring men, yea fools, shall not err therein.” (Isa. 35:8.) I am sure women can see as good as “wayfaring men, and fools.” Here is the picture (the predicament) that Brother Whiteside
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presents for the sisters. After discussing the veils the "Eastern women" wore, he said: "No, it would not be seemly for a woman to appear in public wearing either style. A hat is about as poor a substitute for either style as sprinkling is for baptism. But custom now decrees that women wear hats instead of veils; and, as in the case of sprinkling for baptism, it is argued that the hat serves as well as the veil; And so custom controls, after all."

Now if "such garb," as the Eastern Woman wore, "would not be proper, nor seemly," and if wearing hats is as great a perversion of God's word as sprinkling for baptism, and since "custom now decrees that women wear hats instead of veils," what are women going to wear? It seems to me that Brother Hinton, by his questions has got the sisters where they will be damned if they do, and damned if they don't. That is about where Brother W. G. Roberts left Brethren Whiteside and Hinton when they pray. He said it was only bald headed men that did not have their heads covered and Paul said: "Every man praying or prophesying having his head covered, dishonoreth his head"—Christ. Brethren who believe and teach, as Brother Whiteside does, that Paul was binding heathen customs upon the church at Corinth, remind me of the man who pulled his pants on hind part before, and jumped out the window when his house was on fire. When he hit the ground some one ran up and asked him if he was hurt, he said, "No, but I am powerfully twisted." Brother Whiteside is so twisted in his reasoning on I Cor. 11, that he says Brother Hinton's "question presents a difficulty," then he asked: "Did Paul here give the woman the right to pray and prophesy in the assembly, providing she were veiled,
and then in chapter 14 prohibit her from doing so?" No, Brother Whiteside, emphatically no. Paul was telling men and women how to appear in public assemblies, recognizing that divine relations between God, Christ, man, and woman, without prescribing any restrictions on the teaching of either. In chapter 14 Paul says nothing about the head covering, nor this divine relationship; but prescribes the limitations of their teaching. In verses 27, 28, Paul says: "If any man speaketh in a tongue, let it be by two, or at the most three, and that in turn; and let one interpret; but if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church." It would be absurd to argue that he could have done this in the 11th chapter, because Paul did not prohibit it. It verse 34, Paul prohibits woman speaking at all in the public assembly. It would be unreasonable, and unscriptural just plain nonsense, to argue that a woman could teach, if she was veiled. Yet, Brother Whiteside says: "It does not seem right to use verse 5 to prove that a woman should have her hat on her head when she attends public worship, and then not allow her to prophesy." Shades of Aristotle. Of course I shall not expect the "know all" young preachers among us to hand this issue of "Sound Doctrine" to their bobbed haired sisters. I heard of one young preacher who refused to distribute Sound Doctrine, and even stopped the bundles of Sound Doctrine from coming to the congregation where he preached, because of my articles on these subjects. Of course he knows (?) all there is to be learned on these subjects.
CHAPTER XII

BOBBED HAIR AND CUSTOM, AGAIN

About the time Brother Pride Hinton was calling on Brother R. L. Whiteside for help to counteract the influence of “long sermons” that were being preached in Alabama on 1 Cor. 11:3-16, some brother in Kentucky was calling on Brother W. G. Roberts for help up there.

Brother Whiteside and Brother Roberts both admit, possibly to the discomfort of their querists, that, “personally, they like long hair on a woman, but not on a man.” But since they both declare that Paul was discussing only a “custom,” I cannot understand why they would “personally,” or otherwise, like the “custom” of that day, either in hair or clothing, better than the “custom of our day.” Brother Whiteside was not certain whether Paul had in mind a covering additional to the hair, in verses 4-7, or not; but Brother Roberts was cocksure that the hair was the only covering Paul was talking about in the verses. Both declare, however, that preachers who teach that men ought not to have their heads covered when in the worship, but women ought to have their covered, are false teachers. Brother Roberts says: “If we don’t keep the false teachers out we may expect trouble.” Read his letter.

Hammond, Ill.
Dec. 20, 1940.

My Dear Brother:

Your letter of the twelfth received in due time, but I have been so very busy. Could not answer sooner, or thought I could not. I have about 24 unanswered letters lying here before me now. I am teaching a
six weeks Bible reading here, and have had company every day since I came home, too, having as high as 35 for meals on two occasions. Good part of the time we had company day and night. We sure enjoy having them though.

So you are having some trouble over the bobbed hair question? I was fearful you would when I heard that Brother L. P. Hall was working with you so much. I have been told he is a hobbist on that question, the re-baptism question and others. I'm sorry. If we don't keep the false teacher out we may expect trouble.

You refer to Wallace teaching it to be wrong to bob the hair, but he taught it away over in Huntington. Personally, I like the long hair on a woman, but not on a man. But that man is yet to be born, and his mother is dead, who can take the New Testament and prove it a sin for a woman to bob her hair, or for a man to let his grow long. Paul in 1 Cor. 11 is talking about customs and not about commands. When speaking of the man's and the woman's hair. We will now notice the statements in that chapter they use to prove (?) it to be a sin to cut the hair, but say absolutely nothing about what Paul says about the man having long hair. Ver. 7: “For a man indeed ought not to cover his head,” etc. Verse 6 shows Paul is talking about the hair, so it is a sin, if their interpretation be true for a man to have his head covered, and a sin for a woman not to have her head covered. Verses 5 and 6 say if she has her head uncovered it is as if she were shaven. Showing the hair is the covering. Instead of Paul saying he was giving that as a command, he said it is a “shame,” etc. But all we men have our heads covered all the time, except those who have lost their hair and are bald. Yes,
Paul says a man ought not to have his head covered. In Verse 14 he says it is a “shame unto him” to have long hair. But he says “nature” teaches it is a shame for a man to have long hair. “Nature” here does not mean something we inherit, but it does mean “custom” or “practice.” It was not the custom for men to have long hair. It was not the custom for women to wear short hair, either, in that age. It is a custom and not command Paul is talking about. When I was a young man it was the custom for a young man to grow a mustache, and he looked odd without a mustache. It was also a custom for elderly men to wear long beard. In fact, there were but few men that ever shaved. I never saw my father shave. Men looked just as odd then without beard as they do today with beard. The young men looked just as odd without a mustache as they do today with a mustache. Customs change, but the Lord’s commands never change.

“Power,” in verse 10, is from the Greek word (exousia) and means “authority.” Marginal reading in your Bible says this: “A covering, in sign that she is under the power of her husband.” Women wore their hair long and instead of allowing it to hang down their backs when in prayer, etc., they allowed it to hang down over their face as evidence they recognized their husbands as being in authority, or as the head of the family. A woman who refused to do that was looked upon as a woman that cared but little for her husband. That was the custom in that day.

Verse 13: “...Is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?” Is a question that Paul asked, knowing it was a custom for them to throw their hair forward over their face. The word “comely” is
from a word which means "pleasing" or "good looking." That is, does a woman look pleasing uncovered or is she good looking that way? Is the question Paul asks, but why? Because it was not the custom, or practice for women to pray uncovered or without having her hair thrown forward over her face to show that they respected their husbands enough to admit them in authority in their home, or head of their family. It looked disgusting to see a woman praying to God without practicing that custom of covering her head as evidence she considered her husband in authority. Some preachers seem to know nothing about the history of the case, and but little about the Bible either.

Verse 15: "But if a woman have long hair it is a glory to her." They tell us that if she cuts her hair she destroys her glory, and then I have to smile. "Glory" is from the Greek word doxa and means opinion, judgment, view; estimate, good opinion concerning any one, praise, honor, glory."

Now you can see that Paul is absolutely speaking of the praise they would get from men if they followed the custom. But if they did not that glory (praise from mankind) would be gone. The word "glory" there has reference to the "opinion," "praise" and "glory" she would get from mankind if she did as other women in this respect, but if she refused to do so, they would look upon her as one who did not respect her husband, hence her glory would be gone. This same verse says: "... for her hair is given her for a covering." So we absolutely know the hair is the covering, though some, like the "Dunkards" tell us it means a man-made covering and she should always, in public, have her head covered if nothing
but a handkerchief over her head. That is all foolishness, for Paul emphatically tells us what the covering was.

You especially wished an explanation of Verse 16: That verse simply means what it says hence they who become contentious over the hair cutting question are transgressing this verse and John says the transgressing of the law is sin. So they who cause contention over the hair question are guilty of sin. The word "contentious" in that verse is from the Greek word Philonikos and means "Full of strife, contentious." So Paul in using that word, showed that he had reference to just such religious characters. A person "Fond of strife, contentious" is the character Paul includes in his statements, and gives us to understand the church has "no such customs," hence persons contentious concerning the women cutting the hair, or the men letting their hair grow long, are condemned by this verse. Paul also make it very plain in this verse that he is speaking of "customs" instead of commands. There is neither a specific nor a generic command concerning the hair. It is simply the custom Paul has reference to here and tells us so.

The word "shame," in Verse 14 simply means "disgrace, impropriety, dishonor or humiliating," and it was just that to all who followed that custom if some one in the crowd refused to follow it, for it meant she did not respect her husband. And would as soon have another man, etc. I think I have explained enough and hope it will be of some use to you. At any time you feel that I can assist you feel perfectly free to command me. Your brother in faith, hope, love and prayer.

W. G. ROBERTS.
I am sure you have already said, the letter needs no reply; but there are some good honest women who are affected by customitis, that really want to do God’s will. It is for them that I write. Brother Roberts personates L. P. Hall of Speight, Ky., and Foy E. Wallace. He intimates however, that Wallace would only teach the ancient “custom” of long hair and covered heads for women “away over in Huntington.” Brother Whiteside was a little more considerate of the Alabama preachers, who preach the ancient “custom,” in that he did not personate us. Using one of Brother Roberts’ elegant phrases, I will say, “the sectarian preacher is yet to be born, and his mother is dead,” who can make a bigger mess out of Mark 16:15-16 and Acts 2.38, than he has made out of 1 Cor. 11:3-16. And we wonder why denominational people cannot understand the plan of salvation. When he says: “Paul in 1 Cor. 11. is talking about customs and not about commands,” he is absolutely wrong. Paul was talking about the recognition of the created relationship between the sex. He is wrong again when he declares that “Verse 6 shows that Paul was talking about hair in Verse 7.” It shows just the reverse. The climax of his absurdities follows: “But all we men have our heads covered all the time, except those who have lost their hair and are bald.” Paul says: “The head of every man is Christ,” and “every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered dishonoreth his head.” Therefore, according to Roberts, it is only the bald headed men who can pray to God, and not dishonor Christ. That would keep Brother Whiteside and Brother Hinton off their knees if they ever kneel, because I do not believe that they would knowingly dishonor Christ by praying
with their heads covered. I believe they would have their heads shaved first, even if there is a doubt in Brother Whiteside’s mind as to whether Paul was talking about the hair or an artificial covering.

Since Brother Roberts was so cocksure that he knew what Paul was talking about, I cannot understand why he introduced the medieval “custom” of mustache” and “a long beard,” because Paul was not talking about something under the nose, or on the chin; but what ought, or ought not to be, on the head. After telling the meaning of the word that “comely” came from, Brother Roberts says: “Paul knew it was a custom for women to throw their hair forward over their face” when they prayed, and when Paul asked: “Is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?”, he was simply asking if they thought a woman “was good looking” when she did not throw her hair over her face. If it were not for the scholars among (?) us today, who can tell us what the apostles knew, and did not tell us, the church would be about as helpless as the Roman Catholic Church would be without the priest to tell the masses what the inspired writers meant. I am sure Brother Roberts knows as much about what Paul knew and did not tell us, as any Catholic priest knows, and that is absolutely nothing. Evidently to impress his friend with his much learning, Brother Roberts says: “Some preachers seem to know nothing about the history of the case, and but little about the Bible either.” I agree with this statement, and suggest Brother Roberts as our outstanding example of the fact, and hereby offer his letter as prima facie evidence. I hope this will not take the “smile” off his face, because he deserves
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some "glory" for telling us what the "Greek word doxa means."

In Verses 14 and 15, Paul speaks of the natural instinct that recognizes shingled hair on man, and unshingled hair on women, as the mark God has given to distinguish the sex. In Verse 16, he says, the "custom" that would ignore that distinction does not come from inspiration nor the churches of God. I consider Brother R. L. Whiteside, and Brother W. G. Roberts the outstanding exponents of the "custom" of uncovered heads among the women of today, both in the worship and in every day life. So if you will keep this issue, and the issue before this of "Sound Doctrine," you will have about all the help you can get in defending the "custom," and in stigmatizing gospel preachers who teach the truth, instead of the customs of that day.
CHAPTER XIII
POSTURE IN PRAYER

The following question from a Canadian brother was published in the Gospel Advocate, Nov. 28, 1940, with Brother Whiteside’s answer. Read the question and answer.

Posture In Prayer And Communion

From a long letter from a brother in Canada I glean the following questions: 1. Is any special posture in prayer demanded by the Lord? In other words, is kneeling in prayer commanded? The church where the querist worships had no trouble on this matter till a preacher from the States came there and taught that kneeling in prayer was demanded, using Acts 21:5; Eph. 3:14; 1st Tim. 2:8 as proof.

1. It is a pity that visiting preachers sometimes stir up trouble in churches, and it is a pity that churches will allow them to do so. Paul speaks of certain men whose mouths must be stopped, but what church now undertakes to stop anybody’s mouth? Kneeling in prayer is more expressive of humility; standing, more expressive of respect. Yes, Paul kneeled in prayer on certain occasions, but certainly not always. On the way to Damascus he prayed while prostrate on the ground; he and Silas did not stand or kneel when they prayed in the Philippian jail. The querist may also read Gen. 18:22; 19:27; 2 Chron. 20:9; Luke 18:13. When a preacher or anyone else says that people must always kneel when they pray, he is laying down a law of his own making. Eph. 3:14 merely expresses the idea of submission to authority, and does not refer to prayer any more than to
our daily lives. It expresses a permanent attitude of the Christian toward the Lord. It is a pity that a man will pervert such an expressive passage of Scripture to support his notions. In most meeting houses that I have seen, the seats are so close together that people cannot kneel between them, and so they just sit during prayer. But some ragged notions will soon wear out if they are not continually patched. Why fuss and be disturbed about such matters? Let the leader for the occasion say: "Let us pray." Everyone can then kneel or stand, as he sees fit. Unity of action will gradually come."

Brother Whiteside was rather severe in his castigation of the "preacher from the States," who wanted the Canadian brethren to kneel in prayer. He classed him with "unruly men, vain talkers and deceivers; men who overthrow whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake." That is the class of men, "whose mouth," Paul said, "must be stopped." I agree with Brother Whiteside "that visiting preachers sometimes stir up trouble in churches." But I think it a rather dangerous suggestion that churches should stop the preacher's mouth if he tries to correct any of their practices, without considering the right or wrong. Suppose "a visiting preacher" should go to a congregation to hold a meeting where sin was running rife, as it was in the church at Corinth when Paul wrote his first letter to them. Should he "stir up trouble" (?), or just preach on love, brag on the congregation, accept a good fee for services (?) rendered, leave with the ungodly element singing his praise, and an invitation to return for another meeting? Suppose a gospel preacher should go to a congregation and find women preaching and
leading in public prayers, as they are doing in the
digressive churches today. What would Brother
Whiteside suggest?

Now back to "Posture in Prayer." I recently heard
a peppery young preacher, speaking before an audi­
ence of several hundred people, and more than a hun­
dred of them young preachers, say, he recently held a
meeting for a congregation that kneeled in prayer, he
stood and led the prayer. One of the elders ex­
pressed surprise that he stood while leading the
prayer, he said, he asked the elder if he was "peeping
in prayer?" By this jest, he caused quite a laughter
in the audience, and possibly some of the other young
preachers thought they had learned how to deal with
a congregation of fanatics, if they ever found one.
Brother Whiteside says: "Kneeling in prayer is more
expressive of humility; standing more expressive of
respect." *Humility*—"The quality or condition of
being humble; a modest sense of one's own merit; a
state of mind without arrogance of self-assertion; self­
abasement." My idea is, this is about the attitude
man should have when he approaches the throne of
grace in prayer. If he did, he certainly would not
feel like jesting about kneeling in prayer. *Respect—
"A just regard for an appreciation of excellence,
especially moral worth, whether of persons or things.
Respect for men, respect for laws, respect your hon­
or," etc. If I were in an audience and the President
of the United States should enter, I would feel that
every man should *stand* out of "respect" for the chief
magistrate of our great nation; but kneel before him
—*never*—nor before any other human being or thing.
This is my conception of "kneeling" and "standing."
I have never called on a congregation to "stand" in
prayer, and never expect to, unless I get a different revelation from what I have.

Again Brother Whiteside says: “Yes Paul kneeled in prayer on certain occasions, but certainly not always.” He then gives the example of Paul praying on his way to Damascus, while “prostrate on the ground,” before the Lord, and also Paul and Silas praying in the Philippian jail, with their “feet fast in the stocks,” where they could neither “stand” nor “kneel.” But what was Brother Whiteside trying to prove by these examples? Was he trying to make it appear that he knew some who taught that God would not hear man’s prayers unless he was on his knees? The question he was answering was about praying in public meetings. I do not believe in handling the scriptures deceitfully to make those who differ from us appear ridiculous. If Brother Whiteside had dealt fairly with the examples of Paul praying, the only examples that had any bearing on the question he was answering, he would have told us that Paul kneeled when thus praying. Luke telling us about Paul’s meeting with the elders of the church at Ephesus says: “And when he had thus spoken, he kneeled down and prayed with them all.” (Acts 20:36.) When Paul left Tyre, Luke says again: “And they all, with wives and children, brought us on our way till we were out of the city: and kneeling down on the beach, we prayed and bade each other farewell.” (Act 21:5.) For the benefit of our Canadian brother I would like to say that Paul was not “from the States,” yet he kneeled before God in prayer. If “the querist” has read Gen. 18:22 and 19:27, as Brother Whiteside advised, he doubtless learned that it was “three men” before whom Abraham stood, the spokesman was
called Jehovah, because Jehovah had sent them. As to 2 Chron. 20:9, when the temple was dedicated, Solomon prayed to Jehovah, that if such things as spoken of in 2 Chron. 20:9 should come upon the people, if they would pray with their hands stretched forth toward the temple, he would hear them. In his dedicatory prayer Solomon gave us an example of how to *stand before* Jehovah. In 1 Kings 8:22, we read: “And Solomon stood before the altar of Jehovah in the presence of all the assembly of Israel, and spread forth his hands toward heaven.” In the 54th verse, we read: “And it was so, that when Solomon had made an end of praying all this prayer and supplication unto Jehovah, he rose from the altar of Jehovah, from kneeling on his knees with his hands spread forth toward heaven.” Is this the way the Canadian brethren are *standing before* Jehovah? It is not the way Brother Whiteside is encouraging the brethren in “the States” to *stand before* Him.

During the Babylonian captivity Darius set Daniel over the Presidents, and Satraps of his kingdom. Those rulers hated Daniel, and connived with each other, and got the king “to establish a royal statute, and to make a strong interdict, that whosoever shall ask a petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of thee, O King, he shall be cast into the den of lions.” The king was deceived and signed the decree, “And when Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house (now his windows were open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, and he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime.” (Daniel 6:10.) If some of our preachers “from the States” had been with Daniel they could have told him that he did not
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have to "kneel upon his knees" to pray. Daniel could have stood before his window and prayed with his face toward Jerusalem, and his enemies would have never suspected him praying, and possibly he would never have been thrown into the den of lions. Paul said: By faith "the mouths of lions were stopped." We would have more reverence in the church today, and more power with God, if we had more Daniels in our pulpits. Brother Whiteside asks the "querist" to also read Luke 18:13. When you are teaching on the "posture in prayer," and some fellow asks, "what are you going to do with the publican?" It is about like denominational preachers asking "what are you going to do with the thief on the cross?" When you are teaching on baptism. When we kneel in prayer we are following the examples of Jesus Christ, Peter, and Paul, unless we are in extreme mental anguish, then we fall on our faces before him, as Jesus did in Gethsamene, and as Paul did on the Damascus road. Read Matt. 26:28-39; also Luke 22:41-44; and Acts 9:40. Will Brother Whiteside say: "He is laying down a law of his own making? There is not enough money in the world to get me to speak of kneeling in prayer as "some ragged notions." I believe our prayers, and songs are becoming too much like fillings in a program. We are "holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof." "When I got to a place to hold a meeting where they stand while praying, and the preacher says: 'Let us stand in prayer,' I stand with them; but if the preacher calls on me to lead the prayer, I kneel before God. If I am reading and calling on some one to lead the prayer, I always say: let us kneel before God in prayer." In Psalms 95:67,
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David said: "Oh come, let us worship and bow down; Let us kneel before Jehovah our maker: For he is our God." I suppose Brother Whiteside would call David a patcher of "ragged notions."

If Brother Whiteside will give just one example of Jesus Christ, his apostles, or other inspired men, standing on their feet while praying to God, I will say: *Enough.* Till then put me down as a patcher of "ragged notions."

I have added this chapter to show how even gospel preachers will twist, or "handle the scriptures deceitfully," if they contravene some popular *custom* of "our day."