

Newsletter March 2015

This month we continue our series of newsletters on churchianity by discussing the insurgent female principle that has found its way into the worship services of so many of today's churches through secular feminism. In doing so, we shall utilize various excerpts taken from *Comprehensively Reformed Christianity*, Book III. In Scripture we read that Adam was first created, and then Eve was taken from Adam's own body to be his helper and close companion; whereupon Adam gave her the name "woman" because she was taken out of man (cf. Ge.2:21-23). The Apostle Paul said regarding this precise order of human creation, "For 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" (1Co 11:3). "For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man. For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels" (1Co.11:8-10). This text immediately raises the ire of today's secular-minded feminists as they falsely accuse Paul of being a sexist and attempt to discredit his words as chauvinistic. However, this gender-order was firmly established by God in his creation of mankind as male and female long before Paul wrote these words. Such angry arguments by feminists directly oppose God and his Word (cf. 2Ti.3:16).

Both man and woman were equally created in God's image to be sure, but with two distinct and important roles assigned to them in order to fulfill God's divine purpose for their lives and to bring glory to Himself in that amazing creation (cf. Ge.1:27). It is important to understand at the outset that this natural order does not mean that women have an inferior mental capacity to that of men; women have the same intellectual skills that man has inasmuch as she was taken from the side of man. When a virtuous woman uses her intellect for good it can be quite wonderful (cf. Pr. 31:10-30), but when a wicked woman uses it for evil it can be more reprehensible than any evil that man can produce because it debases her value before both man and God. That said, the natural creation order does not of course mean that a woman is an exact clone of man; in various physical attributes the man is stronger, and in various emotional attributes and intuitive skills, where man is often lacking, the woman is more understanding and compassionate. Moreover, in human procreation man is the initiator, and the woman is the deliverer of their offspring in accordance with the express designs of their bodies. Hence, the man and woman were intended to compliment each other as one indivisible being subsisting in a loving marital relationship that mutually enhances the value of both to the glory of their Creator.

The initially peaceful relationship between man and woman suddenly degenerated into dreadful conflict as a consequence of the fall of mankind that Satan wickedly orchestrated. When Satan determined to subvert mankind to participate in his rebellious cause against God, he did not approach Adam but instead tempted Eve as the more naturally submissive vessel – she having been taken from Adam to be his obedient helpmeet. Eve was readily seduced by Satan to partake of the knowledge of good and evil, whereupon she immediately used her new-found wiles to persuade Adam to partake of it as well (cf. Ge.3:6). Adam disobeyed the express directive of God, his divine Head, when he partook of the fruit of forbidden knowledge (cf. Ge. 2:17). Moreover, in following Eve's lead, he had placed Eve's offer above God's rigid mandate. In doing so, he abdicated his God-given headship over Eve that was intended to ensure her faithfulness and protection.

The loving symbiotic relationship between man and woman was ruined by this fall into sin and was replaced with perpetual conflict. Sex as the means for procreation of the Adamic race became something shameful, and woman would henceforth bring forth children in pain of childbirth and in sorrow that every birth could but bring forth another sinner into the world that was subject to death (cf. Ge. 3:7,16a). Thereafter, fallen woman's natural desire would be for the man – that she could win his favor and gain control over him, and fallen man by reason of his physical strength would harshly rule over her for his own sinful gratification (cf. Ge.3:16b). Ever since Eve partook of the knowledge of good and evil, fallen women in defiance of God's sentence given in Genesis 3:16b, have sought to lead and control men rather than submit to man's God-given authority and responsibility for their well-being. Fallen man's sinful arrogance in opposition has only made this conflict worse resulting in a virtual war between the sexes.

Women would thereafter seek to gain an advantage over men through the attraction of their sexuality such that a tendency to worship women as goddess figures developed within the depraved minds of fallen man. In Genesis 10:8-10 we read of a man named Nimrod who was descended from one of Noah's sons named

Ham. Ham begat a son named Cush who according to unreliable secular accounts married a woman named Semiramis. Cush in turn begat Nimrod (cf. Ge.10:8,9; 1Chr.1:10). When Cush died, Nimrod supposedly married his own mother, Semiramis, and became king. An enemy allegedly murdered Nimrod and his body parts were scattered abroad. Queen Semiramis claimed that Nimrod had been taken to the sun and was now to be referred to as Baal, the sun god (cf. Jud. 2:13). She subsequently claimed that she was the daughter of the moon, her mother, and of the sun, her father. She took upon herself the name Ishtar, the goddess of war, love, sex, and fertility. Semiramis is related to Astarte and Diana of the Ephesians (cf. Ac.19:24–35). She was also known in the Greco-Roman era as “Eastre,” “Isis,” “Innana,” “Osiris,” “Isi,” “Iswara,” “Ostara,” and “Cybele,” (cf. *CRC Book III*, page 71). Worship of these “goddesses” promoted lasciviousness and fornication as a religious rite of worship. This worship also led to the creation of sensuous idolatrous art depicting pagan goddesses in pornographic human form (cf. Ac.19:24-27).

As so-called Christian art exploded in volume under the Roman churchianity of the fourth century, this idolatry found its way into the temporal church where it remains in various Roman Catholic art galleries to this day (cf. *CRC Book III*, pages 143-145). This early art often pictured God in direct violation of the Decalogue regarding the making of any physical images of Him (cf. Ex.20:4); the idolatrous crucifix depicting a nearly-nude Jesus hanging on a cross followed in the sixth century (cf. *CRC Book III*, page 124). Nevertheless, much of this “Christian” art was used to promote Mary, the human mother of Jesus, as a universal mother goddess – often depicting her holding Jesus as a baby and accompanied by holy angels. In the early church, Mary, though highly respected, was never looked upon as deity. However, toward the last of the fourth century, Mariology (an intense study of Mary's person) degenerated to Mariolatry as Mary was declared to be the “Mother of God” (*Theotokos*). Although Mary was the mother of Jesus in the sense that through her He was brought into the world in human form, that fact does not in any way translate into her being the “Mother of God” (cf. *CRC Book III*, page 161).

Since it was impossible to think that a mortal woman could become the mother of deity, it was deemed necessary to “deify” Mary herself. Soon, altars and churches were being dedicated to the “Mother of God,” who was also erroneously declared to be the “perpetual virgin” (cf. Mt.13:55,56). Mary had been placed in the same company with all the blasphemous occult “goddesses” of the Roman Empire. The serious consequence of this radical teaching not only denigrated the wonderful humanity of Mary, but it deprived Jesus of his humanity gained through his incarnation – thus rendering Him an unsuitable offering for mankind's sin. By the beginning of the fifth century, as the veneration of martyrs and saints reached a high level of development, Mary was elevated to that of chief intercessor – displacing Christ as the sole mediator between God and man in the minds of many (cf. 1Ti.2:5). Mariolatry remains prevalent throughout the world today within the Roman Catholic Church. While this supposed deification of Mary was rejected by the Protestant Reformation Movement (cf. *CRC Book III*, Chapter 18.1), the female principle had nonetheless become firmly imbedded within the temporal church such that it continues on in the minds of fallen men and women to this very day. As a direct consequence, the temporal church easily accepts various whimsies put forth by today's secular feminist movement as they attempt to make themselves equal or superior in all respects to man from which they were taken.

At a basic level men and women constitute a unified reciprocal relationship as individuals within marriage as God's special creation. Nevertheless, both are in need of God's personal redemption such that they are independently chosen to be found in Christ. As Paul said, “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus” (Gal 3:28). Nevertheless, this oneness in Christ does not mean that the creation-order of man and woman has been dissolved. Rather the mutual bond of that interdependence is restored and strengthened in Christianity: “Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the savior of the body. Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing” (Ep. 5:22-24) This does not mean that women should be considered chattel or treated as slaves, but that women should joyously respond to their husband's overwhelming love for them – as should the Church to the unconditional love of Christ for his bride. (cf. Ep.5:25; Newsletter February

2014; *CRC Book II*, Chapter 16.1). Therefore, we find that peaceful acceptance and true appreciation of the natural creation order of man and woman can only be restored in Christ.

For that reason, this orderly arrangement in the marriage relationship inevitably carries over into the worship of Christ in the greater church family of the redeemed. As the Apostle Paul stated, "...I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence (1Ti.2:12). This prohibition most certainly excludes women from ordination into the pulpit or engaging in expository teaching of Scripture where men are the recipients. "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also sayeth the law" (1Co.14:34;cf. Ge.2:20-24). Women should refrain from any emotional outbursts or ecstatic speaking in the congregations lest they dishonor their head and offend God. Nor should they engage in theological disputations, but should discuss any matters of misunderstanding or disagreement with their husbands at home (cf. 1Co.14:35a). Unmarried young women should seek the council of their parents. This presupposes that the husband or parents are in the Lord. Failing that prerequisite, women should seek council from godly Christian women in the church or humbly appeal to deacons or elders of the church for assistance, but they must do so appropriately outside the church assemblage – not by disrupting worship services.

At the beginning of the Protestant foreign missions movement women played a significant role in organizing missionary societies, collecting funds, and supplying the needs of overseas workers. At first, all missionaries on the foreign field were men in keeping with the traditions of the church regarding church offices. However, men often took their wives and children with them to the missions field where they aided in the work. Some women continued the work when their husbands died leaving them alone in a foreign land. The contribution that those women made to the missions effort did not go unnoticed. Soon missionary societies began to send single women into the field, and other Protestant women, pointing to that as a precedent, began demanding the opportunity to do the same both abroad and within local churches. It can be said, with a great degree of credibility, that the modern feminist equal-rights movement as well as its encroachment into the temporal church has its roots in early missionary societies (cf. *CRC Book III*, page 391).

The female principle as we see it being injected into worship services today is a part of the overall neo-pagan movement (cf. *CRC Book III*, page 430) which largely emulates the earlier paganism of the pre-Christian era. Much of this occult practice in the temporal church came about because of the failure of redeemed men to step forth to exercise their God-given responsibilities. In their absence, women eagerly stepped forward to fill that gap. Many Christian women did so with godly intentions, but in doing so they began a slide that would have harmful effects in future years. Soon other women came forth with a devious intent to overthrow God's natural order instilled in mankind at creation. Women who were seduced by the charismatic movement and by their attraction to glossolalia further added to the corruption of Christian worship through personal pride and baleful ignorance (cf. Newsletter January 2015). Paul said that "...it is a shame for women to speak in the church" (cf. 1Co.14:35b). That is, women should never preside over worship for the congregation exhorting others to join in with them. Some women today unwisely serve as "praise leaders" in worship services through recitation and by utilizing various musical enticements – disregarding the clear Scriptural warning and admonition against such activities. All such practices are shameful both because of their association with earlier pagan worship and because of their reversal of the God-mandated roles of men and women before the face of God (cf. Ge.3:16b).

The modern militant feminist movement rapidly infiltrated churchianity during the World War II era as women not only replaced men in the workplace to support the war effort through their labor, but also replaced men in the running of temporal churches in the homeland as well. Today, godly women do well to teach young children the basics of Christianity, and through various women's ministries aid other women to accept their proper position in the family, the church, and their faith. Although such godly Christian women seek to exert a positive influence within the church, radical feminists attempt to use those same opportunities to liberalize the church into a secularized organization of their own making. In today's churchianity, women exercise considerable influence by serving on various committees and church boards. Admittedly, many of these committees are limited to the social activities of the church, which can nevertheless become elevated to an

excessive level of importance. Moreover, some women improperly serve on important Christian education committees, community outreach and missions boards. Others are unwisely chosen to serve on ministerial selection committees, through which feminists can greatly influence doctrinal teaching from the pulpit to fit their radical agenda. Many otherwise conservative churches have unwisely ordained women as deacons in an attempt to better supervise and control their activities by placing them under direct male headship of church elders. Although many women unofficially serve in various churches through humble godly service, official ordination of their efforts opens the door to the ordination of women elders and pastors as well. Many liberal Protestant churches and denominations today have already ordained women as pastors, counselors, teachers, and elders in direct defiance of clear Scriptural prohibitions against such actions.

Therefore, we find that the female principle is now deeply imbedded in the churchianity that has overwhelmed much of today's temporal churches such that the feminist agenda is readily accommodated if not outright approved by most of them. Not being satisfied with the modification of worship practices and slanted Bible interpretations, militant feminism has directly targeted the Bible text in order to erase all remaining opposition to their radical agenda. Many texts of Holy Scripture refer to man or men in a generic sense that includes women through any reasonable interpretation attained from context; the masculine pronouns are in keeping with a precise translation from the original languages. However, radical feminists holding places of prominence in liberal churches strongly objected to being referred to with masculine pronouns. In some newer Bible translations, every effort has been made to use neutral-gender words to replace clearly masculine words found in the Hebrew and Greek texts thus abandoning sound translation methods in doing so. This soon led to a further campaign by feminists to remove the exclusive male-gender references to God in Holy Scripture as well, and various publishers have readily complied in order to sell more Bibles. By accommodating special secular interest in interpretation, the entire bible text is at risk of corruption. (cf. *CRC Book III*, page 446-449).

Recently, some major church denominations, pushed by vocal feminists in their ranks, went so far as to hold national conferences wherein they were called upon to determine if God should only be referred to in the neutral-gender. In Scripture, God is consistently referred to in the male gender as our Father, and Jesus Christ was unquestionably born male by frequent references to Him in his humanity and in his deity as the Son of God. Some feminists militantly choose to regularly refer to God in the female gender as their "mother." Even the male gender of Jesus is questioned at every opportunity in accordance with their radical agenda – often without any serious censorship by the leaders of today's worldly temporal churches. As women increasingly occupy church pulpits, this radical feminist agenda will further displace sound doctrine abetting in the drive toward eventual total apostasy of the true faith (cf. Lu.18:8b). Although many evil men in the temporal church have bought forth many grievous errors in the past – and continue to do so – the feminist movement within the church has the potential for blasphemous doctrinal errors and practices of a still greater magnitude as we approach the final days leading up to the return of Christ. © *Arthur J. Smith March 2015*