

ise it everywhere. The gift of prophecy was not, as a regular dispensation of the gospel, confined to men. The only restriction was, that she "be covered" in token of her acknowledged subjection, and which subjection forbids the place (as pulpit or stand) as well as the work of a Minister of the gospel. See 1st Cor. 11: 5, 13.

This gift in that day was accompanied with the power to tell future events; whether ever in this day, I do not know. But every sound gift is not measured to all alike. But "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy," Rev. 19: 10. So every one, man or woman—who has been enabled by divine revelation to testify of Jesus Christ, has the spirit of prophecy—even that he is their Saviour.

Some men and women we see have it to a greater extent than others, and transcending a mere knowledge of Jesus Christ as their Savior; and that to the edification, strength, and comfort of the Church. And may be exercised in any lawful way, whether as at home or abroad; with the tongue or pen; and without the shadow of usurpation or confusion. And that a sister under the sound of the gospel in the house of God, in answering spirit to the same, testifies aloud to Jesus Christ in praises, &c., is not that she has infringed that special silence. Nor could she do so except as usurping its authority, or by a disputatious or enquiring disturbance.

And that the Spirit of Jesus in any man or woman, who reads the above return witness, and who is sweetly held in the comforting, edifying or strengthening assurance, is proof that it is all of the same Spirit, and that the spirit of prophecy is subject to prophets.

Otherwise, how dare a woman sing, or praise, or vote, or even tell her experience, or speak at all in Church? How dare those women to "labor in the gospel"—not for, but *in* the gospel—with Paul? And others to be called "fellow-laborers" with him? Phil. 4: 3. How came Priscilla his "helper in Jesus?" Rom. 16: 3.—And if women must not teach, in neither speaking or writing—not even "to write out their experience"—by what usurpation of authority and right did Priscilla take Apollos aside and "expound to him the way of God more perfectly?" Acts 18: 26. And by what rule were women to be "teachers of good things?" Tit 2: 3. Why did Paul say that "every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head," if they may not speak or teach at all in the Church? Jesus revealed himself risen first to woman and told her to go and declare it to the brethren. And they went and were the first to proclaim a risen Jesus.

That a woman should never presume upon the gift of a public ministry, or any position in Church as *head* in the regulation of any system, in any department, and so far from it that she was there passive or silent component; and that her subjection to God and man be implied by all

her words and acts, I firmly believe to be her place and duty.

But the subjection mostly, or perhaps, entirely as direct injunctions, enjoined by the Apostles upon women professing godliness, refers more particularly to private, domestic relations; and are enforced more strongly because, however good in themselves, they imply by their force and figure that higher parallel principle of subjection as contained in the gospel as of the Church to Christ as to her own husband: hence, "wives be in subjection to your own husbands" is no Church relation referred to at all; but by it, as a forcible figure' one—and none so well as a wife—may see, and know, and feel, her true relative position, spiritually, to Jesus Christ—as husband—as head over all things to his Church. And as such the Church should be in subjection.

So should a woman, to her own husband, not only according to God's original law and order, (which was itself a figure of him that was to come and take the government upon his shoulder) but also as unto the Lord in obedience to the principles involved in the gospel system regulating the relative positions of Christ and his Church.

The Apostles so refer to, and enjoin thus upon women so often, and strong, because she, in the relation of wife, is a perfect figure of the Church in that relationship in which they would enjoin silence and subjection, without usurpation of law-making, or law-interfering power; but to receive the law in matter from him and so learn in all things of Jesus Christ.

Hence, a woman, by marriage compact, professing herself lost or hid in her own husband, (in a legal sense) becomes passive as a power to dictate in law, or to rule: her own personal head is covered, that is, her personal authority is silenced. Law makes the stipulation binding but honorable: and love makes the bondage and subjection sweet and willing. And her great glory is her covering of head in token of subjection to her own husband, and her own silenced authority; that she may be seen and known as exalted in her husband.

And this woman, also professing godliness—which is to profess Christ as her Spiritual husband in whom she is lost—hid—and thus understanding and respecting the same principles, will the more meekly enter the Church of the living God and be in silent subjection to men, as the ordained of God to fill this high place, indicative of law and rule, and receive its exposition from men, as representing the Head, or law-power of a system. And Heads must be as Husbands, and these men. And here also glory in her covering that subjects her in silence, and is as her crown reflecting the image and glory of God in the face of her husband—her own legal Head. And thus she strengthens the figure with a double fold. And becomes a living type of the Church in subjection and obedience to Christ, her Head and Husband, bearing rule by right of law and love. Thus she learns at his

feet.

But for a woman professing godliness to assume to rule her husband by a usurpation of his position and office in the domestic system and household, is to do violence to the principles of the law of God which have established so securely here as in the household of Christ:—it is to uncover and find herself from being hid in her husband;—it is to make void her subjection and silence, or passive law position and hiding in him. To uncover her own personal head as law-power (usurped) to rule by her own independant authority is to ignore and dishonor her own husband. Which not only does violence to the law of God regulating the private domestic compact, but also to the corresponding principle in the gospel system and regulation, of which this is a given figure. To do violence to the law and principle in one system implies a violence to it in any and all. One that respects them at all, respects them in all, and that as unto the Lord, and as set by the hand of God.

And as a woman must be the representing figure of this position of silent subjection, so it is so often enforced, "wives be in subjection to your own husbands." A woman thus violating is a striking figure of the Church ignoring and dishonoring Christ in the assumption of her own independent personal authority to teach; which to assume is as to uncover ones head, and find and produce personal authority, after being swallowed up—silenced—hid—in Christ by the legal compact of marriage, ignoring and dishonoring him. And, which involves her original state and position, which is natural or earthly, and in which interpret, teach and expound the law of government and life. This usurpation is gross, and in unseemly violence to the law and order of God, more particularly in that the woman would assume, by the unlawful usurpation, to fill the place and office of the husband; in that the husband must be Head, and the Head must rule, nor be in subjection.

So we see the silence of the woman in the Church of God is, according to the given metaphor, and by what is implied from the coupling injunctions of the Apostles, synonymous with her subjection to her own husband. One implies the other. Violence to one is to violate the other.—The principle respected and held sacred and inviolable at all, is so respected and held everywhere. And so the Apostle says "Let the women learn in silence with all subjection: But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence."

But that a woman is bound to her husband so long as he lives, and that her personal authority is swallowed up in his, and legally silenced by the covering; and by which she acknowledges her subjection—her husband as Head in the law or governing department, is not that she is lost entirely in every sense, and swallowed up and silenced in every department, nor must we speak, or be heard, or seen, or known at all. No indeed! But

with the restriction only that she acknowledges by word and deed—in all things—her own husband as her legal head and sole authority in law, or as filling the office of first and higher principles of governmental laws, she may in like manner with himself be seen and heard in all things of their common life. Nothing but this usurpation of higher power, which includes the other forbidden principles, displaces her.—Respecting this, she may proclaim the system of laws held in his own hand, and taught her by him; and that to his own glory and her comfort and honor.

So a woman in the Church of God, or professing godliness, while she may not fill the first position in Church, or any position implying a usurpation; yet, according to the ability the Lord gives her by a revelation of his gospel, she may, in like manner with the males, be heard in any way and anywhere.

Now the question arises— is it a usurpation of authority over men or to deny subjection to her own husband, for a woman to write out her experience of grace? or for her to speak or write of the salvation by Jesus Christ according to the gospel? Not according to the scriptures, nor scriptural examples. David's representation was not confined to men when he said, "come near, all ye that fear God, and I will tell you," &c., Neither did Peter when he said "always be ready to give the reason of the hope within you." Jesus was too good to woman for that; and took too much pains to leave them as hardly responsible.

Then my view is that a woman has the same privileges that men do, except as infringing the above, or as filling the position as Heads of any system in Church, or Church regulation or government.

Let's hear from others.

Affectionately,

R. ANNA PHILLIPS.

RETREAT, VA., November 18, 1870.

Elder P. D. Gold:—

AFTER my kindest regards to you, I desire to ask your permission to publish in the LANDMARKS, the following explanation:

More than five years ago I wrote a letter to Elder A. J. Cassell, through ZION'S LANDMARKS, then edited by Elder L. I. Bodenhamer. The letter was published November 1st, 1870. The publication of it greatly offended Elder Cassell. Sometime after it appeared in print I met with the Elder at brother Joseph France's, and he asked me to walk with him: he asked me why I had published him, and told me that I had treated him worse than he would treat an African, and said that I had put him in the paper and he wanted me to take him out; said that he was hurt and that many of the brethren were offended at my actions—that brother Charles DeHart was mortally wounded at the course I had taken—and that I had done it to place him low in the estimation of the brethren, &c. I assured him that I had no intention of injuring his character; that I had written to him merely through