

Volume 3

Number 3

SHEKINAH

July-September

1982



IN THE BEGINNING

✧ Rabbi Isador Zwern ✧

You are about to research the most simple, yet the most scientific explanation of how the universe got started. All to be told from the exact words of the Old Testament or Torah. If you are dead and unconscious of the age of reason and science, in your own eyes you will believe that you are wiser than your creator and the Book that has outlived all its enemies. If you will take the ROAD OF THE LIVING and have checked out THE ROCK OF FAITH OF ISRAEL that YEHOVAH ACHUD you will research these words very carefully. I was taught the Biblical story of creation over forty years ago by a great scholar of Spinoza and the Kabbalah by the name of Harry Waton. This year while visiting Israel, I ran into an artist whose father taught him the Kabbalah. A copy of the picture I purchased from him is featured on the cover of this issue of *Shekinah* to prove to the reader that this explanation of the creation story has been with the Jew for a very long time. In Zohar, the Kabbalah gives us the key to the profound mystery of creation. "ALL THAT EXISTS, CAN EXIST ONLY THROUGH THE MALE AND FEMALE PRINCIPLE." In this study we will be examining the metaphysical and female aspect of our cosmos – the mother of our universe – ELOHIM, in Torah.

Because very few people study the Kabbalah anymore (including myself) definitions are most important, for words found in the picture. *EIN SOIF*: means "THERE IS NO END" – to the wonders of the evolution of creation, who keeps lighting up the universe forever. Ein Soif is synonymous with Elohim, the soul and spirit of our creator. *METZILOT*: means 'deliverance,' or to be saved; or to escape—from death and darkness through the Light of EIN SOIF or ELOHIM.

There are THREE PRINCIPLES OR LAWS OF CREATION. (1) *BERIYAH*: in Hebrew means to give 'essence to,' or create, or give purpose to; (2) *YETZIRAH*: means 'to plan,' design, architect or create; and (3) *ASSIYAH*: means 'to make,' manufacture, or create a new creation.

Note that they all mean to create; yet with a different twist. Note that the artist depicts these three principles as satellites orbiting around the EIN SOIF or ELOHIM, since the beginning. Now let us start from line one of the Torah.

"In the beginning, Elohim BERIYAHED the heaven and the earth."

As already explained it means that Elohim gave purpose or essence to heaven and earth.

"And the earth was in chaos and disorder; and darkness was on the face of this mass. And the Spirit of Elohim fluttered over the face of the waters."

Because all the parts of the universe were "TOHOO VAVOHOO," or chaotic as could be, Elohim decides to bring order out of this mass, by giving each part a purpose, an essence or a role to play. The Mother of Creation is depicted as a bird fluttering over her own brood.

"And Elohim said, Let there be light, and there was light."

Elohim decides to enlighten the darkness. And she creates the Light.

"And when Elohim saw that the light was good, Elohim divided light from darkness. And Elohim called the light 'day,' and the darkness 'night.' And there shall be an evening and morning to every one day."

"VAYEHEE" can and is used in the future tense very often. We learn that although there is a big division between light and darkness, yet every day will begin with darkness then proceed to light. Yet evening and morning are but part of ONE or ACHUD day.

Line six continues with the second observation and period of time.

"And Elohim said, 'Let there be a RAWKIYAH or divider, which will divide the waters (below the divider) from the waters (above the divider). And Elohim called the divider 'heavens.' And there was or there will be – a morning and evening to the second day."

We are told that there exists a divider or sac

— Continued on page 22

Sexism in 'God talk' alarms United Church

Jesus may or may not have had a sense of humor — the point is still debated in some circles; but, His followers definitely need one, especially if they are women.

Consider a recent Sunday morning service at a well-known church. The congregation, about two-thirds female, fell silent as the 11 a.m. bell tolled and the robed clergy and choir took their places.

The minister-in-charge then turned and announced the opening hymn: Rise up, O men of God!

Having sung this perfectly straight-faced, the largely female grouping was then addressed in the following time-hallowed words:

"Dearly beloved brethren, the Scripture moveth us in sundry places ..."

The clergy at the front were all male; the hymns, lessons, and particularly the sermon, were all full of male references; the stained-glass windows celebrated male saints — clearly even the Unseen Deity being worshipped was maleness apotheosized, i.e. made god.

Small wonder that Christian feminists, who have seen beyond the funny side to the ultimate — one may even say, transcendent — put-down of women all of this implies, are up in arms.

They rightly point out that language is not just a matter of "mere words" but the conveyor of meanings, the shaper of our deepest instincts and understandings.

Just as racism cannot be eliminated or even fought against without careful examination of the words we use, so, too, with the oppression involved in sexism, they argue.

Once you accept their thesis and look at religious symbols, language, and customs from this point of view, you can't help but be forcibly struck by the enormity of what has happened.

Religious equality

You no longer just want to smile when you hear that the Women's



TOM HARPUR
Religion Editor

Auxiliary began their mid-week session with the old, Anglican hymn: "Lord send us men..." You want to be part of the revolution you know has got to come before women will attain full, religious equality to match their civil gains.

That is why Canadian churches — most notably Canada's largest Protestant denomination, the United Church — are in a ferment over this issue. A very basic prejudice against the female permeates most of our church life.

Ordaining women is not enough. Indeed, those major churches which ordain women, the Anglican, the United, and the Presbyterian, have real problems placing their female ministers anywhere but in remote areas or in very minor roles. In the Roman Catholic Church, women can not even serve at the altar, never mind preach a homily at mass, or become priests. Other religious groups are just as restrictive, or more so.

Significantly, the United Church is currently undertaking a grassroots study of a small 28-page booklet called, Guidelines for Inclusive Language.

It has been approved by the executive of the church's top legislative body, the General Council, and is likely to be the focus of hot debate when the 29th General Council sessions are held in Montreal in early August.

The guidelines, drawn up by an impressive-sounding committee, the Interdivisional Task Force on the Changing Roles of Women and Men in Church and Society, is not likely to result in changes to the basic Christian prayer.

Congregations will not find them-

selves being asked to pray: "Our Supreme Parent Who art in heaven, hallowed be..."

Jesus Himself will not be treated as though He were female, or male-female (androgynous).

But, noting correctly that theological language is nearly always that of analogy, symbol, and metaphor — since we are speaking about the unspeakable — the task force urges the use of language which includes both sexes wherever possible.

Thus, church people, especially educators and clergy, are urged to avoid terms such as man, men, or mankind when what is really meant is, people, persons, humanity, every-one; or simply, men and women.

The phrase "Sons of God" should be replaced by "People of God," "daughters and sons of God," "children of God," or "God's offspring," the booklet says.

Since the Bible was written in fairly primitive, patriarchal times, it naturally reflects this in its preference for male-dominated terminology with regard to God.

But, in many cases where the translators have used male pronouns, the original Hebrew or Greek words were not "gender-specific." What is more, as the ill-fated Pope John Paul I pointed out in October, 1978, "We can also speak of God as our mother."

Jesus' words

Many Bible passages which speak of God in feminine terms have been consciously played down by theologians over the years. The booklet recalls Isaiah 46:3-4 where God says:

"Harken to me...(you) who have been borne by me from your birth, carried from the womb, I have made and I will bear, I will carry and I will save." Deuteronomy 32:18 speaks of the "God who gave you birth."

Jesus Himself spoke of wanting to gather the people of Jerusalem to Himself protectively "as a hen gathers her chicks."

In passing, it is worth noting that

many contemporary theologians, when lecturing or writing, now refer to God as She or Her from time to time. Not that they feel God is female — the God concept includes and transcends sexuality — but as an attempt to redress the centuries of imbalanced thinking.

Some indeed go so far as to suggest that the Third Person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, now be regularly looked upon as the female aspect of the deity.

The guidelines point out that, traditionally, evil has often been associated with a woman in the Christian tradition. Many indeed still blame woman for the fall of man in the Garden and feel, in a twisted way, that the "original sin" was sexual, with woman as "the devil's gateway" to hell. The "devil" himself is always thought of as male.

The booklet therefore urges the avoidance of all personifying of evil or the demonic as either masculine or feminine.

If the guidelines become church law, there will be a thorough-going search to eliminate sexist stereotypes from all worship, educational, and theological materials in the United Church.

Preachers are warned: "In descriptions of women, a patronizing

or girl-watching tone should be avoided, as should sexual innuendoes, jokes and puns."

Women should not be treated as sex objects or portrayed as typically weak, helpless, hysterical, or housebound. Terms such as "the little woman" or "the ball and chain" are taboo.

Famous passage

At times, the authors get a little carried away, especially in their advice about preachers quoting from classical or modern literature. The pains they go to in trying to eliminate sexism from the famous passage in John Donne about no man being an island (given as an example) are little short of hilarious.

Here is their purified form of it: "John Donne commented on the reality that no one among us is an island entire of itself. Rather each of us is a piece of the continent." (p. 15)

On a more serious note, however, they put their finger on a vital matter when they urge Christians to examine closely their language and that of the church, not just regarding sexism, but the putting down of ethnic or religious minorities as well.

I have been long convinced that the worst possible theology, sexism,

and religious intolerance is to be found in Christian hymns, and careful revision is needed.

Now that we have all the great religions of the east thriving in our midst, it is surely time to give up singing lustily about the "heathen" overseas in language like that in "From Greenland's icy mountains" (Bishop Heber, 1819).

In the hymn, the people of India, Africa, and the Pacific allegedly:

Call us to deliver their land from error's chains.

Can we whose souls are lighted with wisdom from on high,

Can we to men benighted the lamp of life deny?

A famous children's hymn written in 1888 is still very much in use. It runs:

*Little lips that Thou hast made,
Neath the far-off temple's shade
Give to gods of wood and stone
Praise that should be all Thine own.*

*Little hands whose wondrous skill
Thou hast given to do Thy will,
Offerings bring, and serve with fear*

Gods that cannot see or hear.

The United Church is on the right track. This kind of material is overdue for extinction.

Waco Tribune-Herald

Saturday, August 14, 1982

Accepting differences key to world unity, Axtell woman says

By JEFF HAMPTON
Tribune-Herald Staff Writer

The key to world unity is people learning to accept each other's differences. And that must begin in the home, a Central Texas woman said upon her return recently from the Fourth Annual International Prayer Congress for Unity in Christ.

Bishop Lois I. Roden, founder of the Living Waters Foundation near Axtell, recently attended the congress in Manila where several hundred representatives of Christian denominations met to discuss world peace and Chris-

tian unity.

The congress was hosted by the Rev. Sonia Y. Lim, executive director and founder of The Dove Foundation and granddaughter of one of the first Chinese Christian ministers, and was attended by President Ferdinand E. Marcos of the Philippines.

Speakers included Ms. Roden; Cardinale Jaime Sin, head of the Roman Catholic Church in the Philippines; David Du Plessis, ecumenical author and lecturer; Eugene Rudolph Bertermann, executive director of the Far East Broadcasting Co. and associate

director of Lutheran Bible Translators in California; and Gerald Derstine, an internationally known evangelist, speaker and author.

Ms. Roden said the purpose of the annual congress is to "bring unity among God's people of all faiths."

"I approached the subject from what caused the disunity — Lucifer's coveting the earth and original sin," she said, while Du Plessis spoke on unity in the family, and Derstine spoke on the world's debt to Israel.

"The family unit is the origin of unity," Ms. Roden said. Family mem-

WORLD UNITY...

Continued from page 4

ers are individuals and should accept each other's right to be different, but at the same time "a person can be an individual and get along too," she said.

There is always some piece of "common ground" to be found, she said, and the same holds true for various Christian denominations and society.

She said delegates to the congress are not calling for a melting down of

all Christian denominations into one body. Denominations should protect their individual liturgies and traditions, but they should seek and promote areas of common belief. "Unity and diversity was really the idea," she said.

NEW WOMEN/NEW CHURCH JULY 1980

NEW WOMEN/NEW CHURCH JULY 1980

Preaching Traditions in the Middle Ages

By Joann Wolski Conn

During the eleventh century, in Europe and England, lay women and men, single and married, were preaching. Yet by the late thirteenth century, this practice was forbidden. How and why did this preaching tradition arise? Why did it not continue? If the medieval reasons for its elimination no longer hold today, could lay preaching again become widespread?

Late in the eleventh century, Pope Gregory VII tried to bring all church members' lives into closer conformity with gospel values. He especially wanted to free church policies and land holdings from the control of feudal lay lords. He insisted that priests live lives of chastity, honesty, and attention to their pastoral duties. He even asked the faithful in Milan to shun the ministry of priests who lacked basic gospel virtues.

This concern to live the gospel life generated many groups of men and women who wanted to imitate Jesus and the apostles by living voluntary poverty and by traveling through cities and small country towns preaching the message of repentance and reform.

Tensions and conflict arose between these wandering preachers and the local clergy and bishops. Even those whose preaching content was completely in agreement with traditional church doctrine experienced opposition. The story of two similar groups can be used as a typical example of the reasons for the conflict. What happened in the twelfth century to the Waldensens (followers of Peter Waldo) and the Humiliati (humble ones), and why it happened brings to our attention the central ideas and values which controlled official church decisions regarding preaching at that time. What is especially significant is that, except in rare cases, these same twelfth and thirteenth century views are those which continue to in-

fluence the official practice of preaching in Catholicism today.

What did happen to the Waldensens in France and Humiliati in Italy in the late twelfth century? These poor, traveling lay women and men explained the Scriptures, tried to serve the church in its struggle against false teaching (heresy), and encouraged all people to follow Jesus in repentance, honesty, prayer, non-violence. When one of the local bishops refused the Waldensens permission to explain Scripture (that is, to preach), Waldo turned to the pope, Alexander III. He was sympathetic, and in 1179 permitted these lay persons to preach, but only when they were asked by a parish priest. They observed this restriction for a time, but eventually felt too confined and instead began preaching anytime and place they saw a need. In the same year, the Humiliati requested a similar permission from the pope but were refused. Five years later, a new pope, Lucius III, because of both groups' disobedience excommunicated them (put them out of the church), naming them heretics.

What were the main reasons for this condemnation? Why is the central issue preaching and the authorization to preach? What was the church's estimation of laity at that time? How did the groups themselves understand what they were doing? Why were they disobedient?

Preaching was presumed to be an aspect of what was called "apostolic life," but there continued to be debate about the question of whose lifestyle was genuinely apostolic. Those in monasteries identified themselves as apostolic because of their humility and community life. However, their seclusion and lack of pastoral involvement with outsiders raised doubts about this identification. The general picture at the end of the eleventh century was that "apostolic life" meant that of a poor wandering preacher

patterned after Jesus' life, and this life-style was taken up by persons from all the established divisions of medieval society: clerics, monks, canons, lay women and men.



There was no consolidated thinking yet on the question of authorization to preach. In the early church lay persons preached (proclaimed the message of Scripture), even at the Eucharist, but during a time of hotly debated doctrinal issues, bishops fear of heresy made them forbid this practice to laypersons and reserve all preaching to themselves. Later the right to preach was given, in certain places, to priests (whose prior ministry did not necessarily include preaching) and to the superiors of monastic orders of men (abbots, who were not necessarily priests) and of women abbesses. (A detailed account of the conflict over lay preaching is Rolf Zeffass, *Der Streit um die Lainpredigt*, 1974.) The latter, women, preached in a formal fashion in their monastic churches prior to the fourteenth century. (Male reaction to this practice is explained in G.R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England*, 1926.) The most important legal text of the time (Gratian's

Decrees, 1140) does not even mention the question of whether or not a bishop's permission is needed in order to engage in the pastoral ministry. This implies that the ultimate source or call to preach was still in question. Some presumed this call came with ordination. But, clearly, for years the non-ordained had preached while ordained persons did not. (For details see K. Osborne, "A Re-thinking of the Special Ministry," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 1969.) Now laity were supporting their claim to preach from the New Testament command of Christ (Mk. 16:15-16) which they believed went beyond the distinction of clerical and lay. The Old Testament also, according to some medieval teachers, supported lay preaching. For example, they said: the men of the tribe of Levi, who were the clergy of that day, were not the only ones to teach the Law; men from other tribes, who were laity, did also. St. Francis of Assisi, who led a group of wandering preachers, maintained that anyone, lay or cleric, who had the Spirit of God, could preach. (Reasons for lay preaching are detailed in M.D. Chenu, *Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century*, 1968.)

How did the Waldensens see themselves at the time of their condemnation? They followed the Gospel as their rule of life. They criticized many aspects of the institutional church as abuses, especially practices which prevented ordinary people from participating in a prayerful gospel life, for example: demanding Latin prayers for people who could not understand Latin; exclusion of women from ministry; tolerating corrupt and ignorant priests and bishops. Jesus Christ was Lord over the church, they said, and they obeyed Him. Even at the point of condemnation, they were willing to discuss a solution with officials. Even their enemies saw the Waldensens as humble and holy. (For the full story of this movement see K.S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity*, 1953.)

What was the concept and estimation of "laity" at this time? "Laity" as a specific category was understood in terms of the person's function in feudal society. They were a division of society according to what was conceived of as a divine plan. Stability and a clear order of "who ruled whom" were primary values. Thus, in a world of fixed institutions (e.g. monasteries, feudal landholdings) both wandering preachers and merchants were suspect because their life-style was unstable and free from service to one noble or local bishop. Documents of the time

3

presume that the class of society called "laity" were: secular rather than sacred (as clergy were); subordinate to and forbidden to exercise any authority over clerics; illiterate (even though many country priests were illiterate). (See Zerfass, *Der Streit* . . .)

Thus, the Waldensens' spontaneous preaching and experiments in lifestyle broke deeper into the ground of the historical, social, and theological setting than they or their critics realized. The Waldensens' sense of being sent and their spontaneous preaching were viewed by officials as an attack upon the church's self-understanding, as usurping clerical functions, as disobedience and insubordination, as actions that undermine the stability of church and civil society. The Waldensens were actually not so much anti-clerical as desirous of sharing what was presumed by many officials to be the right of the clergy alone: pastoral ministry. The Waldensens represented a movement that was a turning point in history, a movement that called for new, creative re-thinking of many presumptions about the church. However, the response it met was reinforcement of institutions already in place. (See Zerfass, *Der Streit* . . .) To blame one side or the other is not helpful. To examine the ideas and values at work is educational for the church that thinks about these same issues today.

Evidence that the issue was not so clear cut as the 1184 papal condemnation made it seem is present in the effort at reconciliation by the next young pope, Innocent III, in his first year in office (1199). In an effort to win these groups back for church service, he formulated a policy which presumed the need to be more careful to prove and distinguish what is really heretical from what is not. For example, the Humillati were disobedient, but their preaching content was not necessarily heretical. Thus, their custom of preaching in their own assemblies was approved by the pope, and bishops were ordered not to refuse their permission on the local level. The only restriction placed on the preachers was that of not treating "articles of faith and sacraments"; they could, however, give "words of exhortation." Here the pope used an old theological distinction between "exhortation" and "preaching." In actual content and form, however, what was practiced as "exhortation" differed very little from traditional preaching. (See Zerfass, *Der Streit* . . .) For example, in 1210 a segment of the Italian branch

of Waldensens received permission to preach sound doctrine against all heretics, and this could be done without seeking the local bishop's permission. This same term, "exhortation", was obviously useful since it appeared again in the same year to name the type of permission given to the first Franciscans, who were wandering lay preachers. (Full details regarding the clericalization of lay preaching are found in L. Landini; *The Causes of the Clericalization of the Order of Friars Minor*, 1968.) By using this term the pope showed his willingness to build into the structures of that time some legal possibility of having apostolic initiative present outside of the sacramental and priestly apparatus. (Further support for this conclusion is in B. Bolton, "Innocent III's Treatment of Humillati," in G.J. Cuming and D. Baker, eds., *Studies in Church History*, 1972.)

Because the complex theological issues regarding both the ultimate call or authorization for preaching and the roles of clergy and laity in pastoral care were not attended to, and because the reasons for continued opposition by local clergy (i.e. claims of authority) were not counteracted by the distinction between "exhortation" and "preaching", and because the type of preaching needed against heretics demanded an education that was then available only to clerics, the door that Innocent III opened to authorize lay preaching was soon closed. (Even the preaching of laymen in religious orders such as Franciscans was soon completely clericalized. See Landini, *The Causes of the Clericalization* . . .)

Decrees of the next pope, Gregory IX, and those of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) spoke of all preaching issues in the context of heresy and insisted that only the bishop and pope could authorize preaching. They forbade the founding of new Orders. (All groups seeking approval were wandering preachers, remember.) They defined lay preaching as usurping a clerical office and forbade all laypersons to expound or dispute truths of the Catholic faith either privately or publicly.

Sparks of these issues flared up again during the sixteenth century Reformation but were extinguished in official Catholic circles by reinforcing the assumptions of these thirteenth century decrees which excluded laypersons from what was commonly understood as preaching. Protestant traditions, however, took a different direction. (For details see B. Cooke, *Ministry to*

Word and Sacrament, 1976.)

Even Congar's 1957 landmark book on the positive role of laity, *Lay People in the Church*, presumes that theology, which is identified as the content of preaching, is exclusively a priestly possession. Congar maintains that laity can never have the same close contact with church tradition as priests.

Reflecting upon some lay person's desire today to engage in the ministry of the Word, we naturally ask whether the reasons given for excluding lay preaching in 1257 and even in 1957

are valid reasons in the 1980s? Do not some laypersons today have the same theological and pastoral training and experience as clerics? Does the call and competence to preach really come only with ordination?

JOANN WOLSKI CONN is an associate professor of Religious Studies at Our Lady of Angels College, Aston, Pa. She holds an M.A. in Theology from Marquette University and a Ph.D. in Religion from Columbia U. — Union Theological Seminary.

THE RECORDER AND TIMES (Brockville, Ontario), Tuesday, August 10, 1982

Scriptural evidence of God's femininity

In our society today we hear much of equal rights for women, women in the ministry, can there be female priests, and is God male or female?

In the scriptures we find the answers to these questions.

Romans 1:20 says: "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse."

Genesis 1:26, 27, "And God said. Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth."

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them.

The Hebrew word for God is Elohim, "Eloh" feminine singular and "im" masculine plural.

We know that the Trinity consists of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, but we have always been led to believe that the Godhead was all male.

Ephesians 3:15 says that we have a family in heaven, "of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named."

A family consists of father, mother and child, (children).

The word "Spirit" "Ruah" Hebrew feminine noun. In the Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts, John 15: 26, 27 and John 14: 15-18 are translated, "But when the Comforter is come, Whom I will send you from the Father, Even the Spirit of Truth, who proceedeth From the Father, She shall testify of me: And ye also shall bear witness."

"If ye love me keep my commandments And I will pray the Father And he shall give you another Comforter That She may abide with you forever: Even the Spirit of Truth: Whom the world cannot receive, Because it seeth Her not, neither knoweth Her." "But ye know Her; for She dwelleth with you, And shall be in you for I will not leave you Comfortless (orphans without parents) I will come to you."

The above texts are taken from the Dead Sea Scrolls, which date back to the third century.

Proverbs chapters 1:20-33; 2:4; 3:11-18; 4:5-13; 8:1-36; 9:1-11; tells us that Wisdom is She.

Mark 13:28 and Luke 8:35, tells us that "wisdom is justified of all her children."

Galatians: 4:26 "But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all."

Isaiah 66:13 "As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you; and ye shall be comforted in Jerusalem."

Jeremiah 33:16 "She shall be called the Lord our Righteousness."

In 1956 in Quamran Cave 11, a parchment about Melchizedek was discovered which revealed the "Melchizedek as Elohim (feminine-masculine) has a place in the Divine Assembly, and it also speaks of the feminine singular suffix...and the person addressed seems to be Melchizedek." The Melchizedek Tradition pg. 77 by Fred Horton.

The Apostolic Church of the East states that the Aramaic New Testament scriptures, Mark 1:10; John 1:32; 6:63; 7:39; Acts 8:29, 39; 16:7; Romans 8:9,10,11; 8:16,26; Cor. 3:16; Tim. 4:1; Peter 1:11; 4:14; and John 5:6; speaks as the Spirit as feminine.

Few western scholars believe that the New Testament was originally written in Aramaic, but the eastern scholars believe that it was and they have original manuscripts in Aramaic called Peshitta which means "original."

Aramaic was the language that Jesus and the apostles, and the Jews spoke in their day.

There are many many more references to show that the Godhead is both feminine and masculine.

Those who want to be led into all truth (John 16:13) will seek as for hidden treasures, (Proverbs 2:4).

Beverley Sabourin

Preaching in the New Testament

By Bernadette Brooten

When I was asked to write on this topic, the first two lay preachers who came to mind were Jesus and Paul. Some might be surprised by this statement, so let me explain. Both Jesus and Paul preached in the synagogue. They could do this because the ancient synagogue did not ordain certain individuals to preach, but rather asked a member of the congregation to give the sermon. There were synagogue functionaries, such as "elders" and "rulers of the synagogue," but they do not seem to have had any special duty or right to preach the sermon. There were also rabbis, but rabbis were not synagogue functionaries in the ancient world; today's rabbi, who often does function like a priest or minister, is the product of a modern development, and should not be confused with the rabbi of ancient times. Finally, there were priests, but priests were also not synagogue functionaries; their service was in the temple.

Against this background it is clear that Jesus and Paul preached in the synagogue as lay people. For example, when Jesus preached the sermon in his home synagogue in Nazareth (Matthew 13:53-58; Mark 6:1-6; Luke 4:16-30), it was not as an ordained preacher that he did this. Jesus was not a priest (One has to be born as a priest in Judaism; one cannot become one.), nor was he a ruler of the synagogue, an elder or any other synagogue functionary. Some did call him "Rabbi" (Mark 10:51; John 20:16), which may be translated "teacher," but in Jesus' case, this probably did not mean that he had specialized training. Even if he had been a priest, a synagogue functionary, or an "ordained rabbi" (The ordination of rabbies may not even have existed in Jesus' time.), none of these would have given him any greater right or duty to preach than he already had as a layperson.

What of preaching within the Christian community itself? In general one can say that there is no text which limits preaching to ordained persons. In fact, it seems that ordination itself is a later development, and that the earliest communities existed without it. A key text here is 1 Corinthians 12:28: "And God has appointed

BERNADETTE BROOTEN is a doctoral candidate in New Testament and Christian Origins at Harvard University. She is currently writing a dissertation on the roles of women in the synagogue and in the early church.

in the church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then workers of miracles, then healers, helpers, administrators, speakers in various kinds of tongues."

The first three — apostles, prophets and teachers — are probably the most important for preaching. Paul says that these are appointed by God; he does not mention any kind of ordination. We know that women were excluded from none of the three. In Romans 16:7 Paul greets a woman apostle, Junia (All of the Church Fathers took the name to be feminine, "Junia," rather than masculine, "Junias," as later authorities would claim. Further the name occurs in ancient literature and inscriptions only as a feminine name.); in 1 Corinthians 11:5 Paul assumes that women prophesy in the assembly (1 Corinthians 14:34, "the women should keep silent in the churches," is probably a later addition to the text.); in the Acts of the Apostles 18:26 we read that Priscilla, together with her husband Aquila, taught Apollos. In other words, of the titles mentioned by Paul which probably implied preaching, women were excluded from none of them.

A community which makes one think that the earliest Christians did not have an ordained preaching ministry is the Corinthian community. Nowhere in 1 or 2 Corinthians does Paul mention ordained preachers. On the contrary, quite a number of people seem to be speaking in the assembly: "When you come together, each one has a hymn, a lesson, a revelation, a tongue or an interpretation" (1 Corinthians 14:26).

In the "Pastoral Epistles" (1 and 2 Timothy, Titus), which virtually all critical biblical scholars believe are not by Paul himself but are considerably later than Paul, we do read of an ordained ministry. Timothy, the recipient of 1 and 2 Timothy, who is said to have been ordained by the elders (1 Timothy 5:14), is commanded to "attend to the public reading of scripture, to preaching, to teaching" (1 Timothy 5:13). While it is not said that others may not fulfill these tasks, we do see here the beginnings of institutionalization, and therefore of the limitation of certain tasks to ordained Christians.

In the course of time, the ministry of preaching became more and more institutionalized, and one came to forget that there had been a time in which the laity had had the word.

THE MAGNA CHARTA OF WOMAN

By Jessie Penn-Lewis

PART 2

1

"Ye All Can Prophecy. . . ."

Let us consider the three passages in the New Testament which contain the teaching of Paul concerning the ministry of Christian women in the Church of Christ. As our examination of them involves questioning the rendering of the original text by translators, it would be well first to emphasize the vast debt we owe to the labors of scholars in the translation of the Scriptures and to remind ourselves of the fact that, as Schofield has said, "the labours of competent scholars have brought our English Versions to a degree of perfection so remarkable, that we may confidently rest upon them as authoritative." That this is so we gratefully admit, but, we are bound to add, with the exception of passages relating to the status of women. These most sorely need revision as must surely be acknowledged by all who honestly weigh the facts set forth by Dr. Bushnell who says, "It is very serious to base principles

of action on translations of obscure passages—those upon which no translators can dogmatise."

But "it is not worth our while," writes Dr. Bushnell, "to complain that men have not always seen truths that had no special application to their needs, either in interpreting or in translating the Bible; we merely wish to point out wherein there is need of changes. . . . Supposing women only had translated the Bible from age to age, is there a likelihood that men would have rested content with the outcome? Therefore our brothers have no good reason to complain if, while conceding that men have done the best they could, alone, we assert that they did not do the best that could have been done. The work would have been of a much higher order had they first helped women to learn the sacred languages . . . and then have given them a place on the translation committees. . . ."

For "there are truths," Dr. Bushnell rightly says, "that give light upon problems that women alone are called upon to solve," and "such truths

Reprinted by permission from THE MAGNA CHARTA OF WOMAN by Jesse Penn-Lewis, published and copyright 1975, Bethany House Publishers, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55438.

man is not equipped to understand, much less to set forth to the understanding of women."

Canon Payne Smith says of the Bible, "A bad translation of this Book exercises a depressing influence upon a nation's civilisation; a good translation is one of the great levers in a nation's rise." This is especially so in the effect of a "bad translation" connected with the status of women in general. For, as Dr. Bushnell observes, the reason why "so large a proportion of the women of Christendom are given over to fashion and folly" is that they have never been "given a proper and dignified work in the advancement of God's kingdom. . . ." And this because three passages in the epistles of Paul have been rendered into English in such a way that they have entirely misinterpreted the teaching of the Apostle, and by so doing have shut out women from "proper and dignified work" in the church of God.

Now let us turn to 1 Cor. 14:34, 35 and see what fresh light Dr. Bushnell brings to bear upon it. It reads in the R.V. thus:

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.

By minute examination of the original Greek text, references to authoritative scholars and the historical setting of the occasion calling forth the epistle, Dr. Bushnell shows clearly that Paul never wrote these words as a "commandment of the Lord," but was *quoting what the Judaizers in the Corinthian church were saying*. Their mischief making at Corinth was in connection with the work of Christian women as in other ways. This simplifies the entire subject, if the statement proves to be in harmony with the context and other parts of scripture.

Referring to the various attempts which have been made to reconcile Paul's words about women praying and prophesying (1 Cor. 11:5: "But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoureth her head. . .") with his seeming command, "Let the women keep silence," in 1 Cor. 14:34, Dr. Bushnell points out some weak points in the explanations and expresses what many Christian women have felt, that most of these attempts have not solved the difficulty satisfactorily. "The Holy Spirit does not descend to sophistry to induce women to do the will of God," says Dr. Bushnell. Nor does Paul, as Prof. Ramsay suggests, use "tortuous special pleading," or resort to "Jewish fables" to "find a pretext for silencing women." For Paul spoke as "the mouthpiece of God," and his writings were prompted by the Holy Spirit. Therefore a "consistent worthy sense can be found" in his words, if his arguments are not twisted out of conformity with Scriptures. For it is a safe rule that scripture must interpret scripture under the illumination of the Spirit of God, and when it does so, it will be found to have no contradictions. The true interpretation carries with it, to a spiritual mind, a reasonableness and simplicity which is worthy of God.

So it appears in this instance. That Paul is but quoting the language of the Judaizers in 1 Cor. 14:34, 35 is in harmony with previous parts of the epistle. Again and again from chapter 5 on to end of chapter 14, it can be seen that he is replying to a letter of questions sent to him by the Corinthian Church. In instance after instance it can be detected that "the reference to the questions is repeated whenever a new point is taken up."¹

We need to remember that in the Greek manuscripts there were no capital letters to words, no quotation marks, and no punctuation such as

1. Conybeare and Howson's translation of the epistle brings out clearly many of these "quotations."

we have in our English versions of the Bible. So those who use a translation (e.g., English) are dependent upon the translators for the addition of these valuable and necessary aids in obtaining the sense of the original. From the Greek text itself there is no means of knowing when a sentence is a quotation or when it expresses the mind of the writer except by internal and contextual evidences and careful examination of the historical setting of the words. Even then "few are the translators, fewer the exegetes . . . to abstain from finding in the Bible thoughts which it does not contain, and rejecting, or unjustly modifying, the thoughts which are indeed there," says Archdeacon Farrar.

How solemn, then, the fact that for centuries Christian women have been robbed of their true status in the Church of Christ because translators, and many expositors, have failed to perceive the true setting of the Apostle's words. But God is giving the true light on this subject at the time when it is most needed for women's service in the world. Scholars are now in possession of greatly increased knowledge of facts connected with early church history and other subjects which enables them to understand better the writings of the New Testament. Some appear to be beginning to see that the key of "quotations" from the letter of the Corinthian Church to Paul unlocks some problems as to the meaning of some statements in his epistles, statements which have hitherto been beyond solution. For example, Professor Sir William Ramsay, the most widely accepted authority on St. Paul in the present day and known for his researches in the history of the early church in Asia Minor, "an extensive writer about St. Paul, his epistles, and journeys," says: "We should be ready to suspect Paul is making a quotation from the letter addressed to

him by the Corinthians, whenever he alludes to their knowledge, or when any statement *stands in marked contrast* either with the immediate context, or with Paul's known views."

Dr. Bushnell observes that this "marked contrast" is obvious when 1 Cor. 14:34, 35 is placed alongside of 1 Cor. 11:5, for Paul must have written the words in chapter 14 not more than half an hour after the previous ones, which show clearly that women were accustomed both to pray and to preach in public. Moreover, that 1 Cor. 14:34, 35 contained a "quotation" of the Judaizers' words is confirmed when it is considered in detail. "It is not permitted," says someone, for women "to speak . . . as also saith the law . . ." (v. 34). But this cannot refer to the Old Testament Scriptures, for there is not one trace, from Genesis to Malachi, of any such prohibition, nor is there a single word in the whole "law of Moses" dealing with the subject.²

Therefore the words "it is not permitted" and "as also saith the law" must refer to some "rule" outside of Scripture. There was no other but the Oral Law of the Jews, appealed to by the Judaizers in the church in their efforts at that time to bring Christianity back within the confines of Judaism. That the words "as saith the law" referred to the Oral Law of the Jews is recognized by some scholars, for a well-known lexicographer, in his Greek-Latin Lexicon, says that "as saith the law" refers to the Jewish Oral Law, which did teach the silencing of women. The Talmud also taught that it was "a shame for a woman to let her voice be heard among men"—almost the very words used in the language quoted by the Apostle.

Again, the reference to the "law" is, of itself, sufficient to show that the Apostle, who labored so earnestly to free the Christian Church from

2. That it did not refer to "Gen. 3:16" as "the law" will be seen on reading chapter 6, p. 85.

the very shadow of Judaism, as his epistles show, was not expressing his own conviction in the language attributed to him. Paul never appealed to the "law" for the guidance of the Church of Christ, but, on the contrary, declared that believers were "*dead to the law* by the body of Christ" (Rom. 7:4), that they might serve in newness of spirit and not the oldness of the letter (v. 6). Then how could he say consistently, "Let the women keep silence . . . *as also saith the law*," even were such a prohibition to be found in the law of Moses?

It is therefore clear that the Apostle was quoting what the Judaizers in the Corinthian Church were saying. For, as Dr. Bushnell writes, "many were in it as 'false brethren' to destroy it (2 Cor. 10:12; Gal. 2:4) . . . and others were honestly, but mistakenly, working to the same end, but with better motives. . . . None of them could hope to influence the Christians to return to . . . the traditions of the Jews by attacking things that were regular. . . . The only opportunity lay in something irregular, and this they found in the public prophesying of women. The Oral Law had said 'It is a shame,' and the Judaizers took up the cry that 'the women must keep silence' . . . 'they must ask their husbands at home.' . . . 'It is a shame for a woman to speak in the assembly, the Oral Law of the Jews says so,' etc. All this was written to Paul from Corinth. He copies it out for his text. He shows up its sophistries, [and] exhorts his converts to be jealous of their gift of prophecy in the church. . . ."

As to the women "asking questions of their husbands at home," Dr. Bushnell points out that it is not known that even men asked questions in church as the Jews did in the synagogue. If Paul said these words as a command, in the condition of the Corinthian and other churches of

that time, he would be sending some women back to heathenism or Judaism for spiritual help or, in some cases, to no "help" at all, since many might be without husbands.

Let us look now at the context of 1 Cor. 14: 34, 35, and see how the "quotation" fits into its place as a quotation. To grasp the subject clearly it would be well to read chapters 12, 13, and 14 in the R.V., remembering that in the original Greek manuscript there were no chapter divisions or texts to split up the matter into verses. The theme from the beginning of chapter 12 is one coherent whole, and verses 4-11 of that chapter form the basis and key to all that is afterward written.

Paul is dealing with the subject of the mystical Body of Christ and the operations of God the Holy Spirit in and through the *living members of the Body*. In verses 12-30 he describes the Body itself, the mystical church, and the way in which each member is joined up and set in his place by God the Spirit (vv. 18-28). Then comes the picture of the love life of God to be shown forth in each member (ch. 13), followed by a very full opening up of the subject of "preaching," or as it was termed by Paul, "prophesying," in chapter 15. The believers were to "follow after love" as the first essential, and desire all spiritual "gifts." But the primary gift was prophecy—power to declare God's message either by the prophetic gift or speaking to edification, and "exhortation and comfort." This was a necessity for the growth of God's children (vv. 3, 12, 19), as well as for the conviction of those "without" the church (vv. 24, 25). Then in verse 26 the Apostle pictures a gathering of the members of the local church—the assembly which in Corinth was probably held in the house of Gaius (1 Cor. 1:14; Rom. 16:23). He pictures one and another

present. "What is it then, brethren?" he writes. Here we must remember, as Dr. Bushnell points out, "that the word 'brethren' was more like 'sisters' in Greek than in English." The difference is only between "*adelphos* (brother) and *adelphē* (sister)." Moreover, "masculine and feminine nouns and adjectives very generally had the same form in New Testament Greek." In English "it is only by an effort of thought that women take the word 'brethren' to themselves, but not so the Greek *adelphoi* . . ."

"What is it then, brethren? When ye come together, each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation." This would easily produce confusion, and so the Apostle directs that each one may speak "by course" but all "unto edifying." "For," he writes, "ye all can prophesy one by one, that *all* may learn, and *all* may be exhorted" (v. 31, R.V.m.). "God is not a God of confusion, but of peace; as in all the churches³ of the saints" (v. 33).

"All" might prophesy, said the Apostle, that "all may learn," as God gave the word of wisdom or word of knowledge to one and the other—surely women as well as men—both "alls" obviously including *all* who might be in the assembly. This was Paul's light from God for the church at Corinth, in answer to the objections of the Judaizers, which he now proceeds to quote. The very writing of the words seems to stir his indignation, for he follows them with the abrupt exclamation or question "What? was it from *you* [Judaizers, or criticizers, at Corinth] that the word of God went forth? or came it unto you alone? . . . If any man thinketh himself to be spiritual [see ch. 12:1—*knowing the Spirit, and what comes from Him*], let him take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are the *commandment of the Lord*" (vv. 36, 37).

In reference to the expression "the word of God," Dr. Bushnell points out that it has a definite and specific sense in the New Testament, "as referring either to the Gospel or prophetic utterance given from above."⁴ In this again scripture interprets scripture. Paul is referring to the word of God in its *coming forth from God* and its *going forth through His messengers*. He has been explaining how the Spirit of God gave to one and the other in the Body of Christ "the Word" and the gift of prophecy. Could the Judaizers claim that it had come to them alone and gone forth out of them and no others? Were they the final authority as to who should speak when God gave the message? If any man among the objectors was "spiritual," it would be evidenced by his recognizing that *all* the things that Paul had written were "*the commandment of the Lord*," notwithstanding the "precepts of men" in the Oral Law of the Jews.

"Paul's contention is," writes Dr. Bushnell, that "since the Spirit of prophecy . . . did not . . . come forth from anyone but God, to attempt to control 'prophecy' by restrictions as to who may utter it means a dictating to God as to what instruments He may employ."

That Paul was quoting the Judaizers in the language he used in these verses again is made still more evident when we consider the historical setting, which may be briefly summarized as follows.

The Corinthian Church had written Paul a letter and he is answering it. There were divisions among them. He had enemies at Corinth who disputed his right to be called an apostle and criticized him and his companions for having a woman traveling with them. The fact stated in Acts 18:18 that Priscilla with Aquila her husband had left Corinth in company with Paul short-

3. "Ecclesia," assembly or congregation, meaning simply the local gatherings of believers, established in the first centuries of Christianity.

4. See Luke 3:1, 2, 5; Rom. 9:6; 1 Thess. 1:8, 2:13; 2 Cor. 2:17, 4:2.

ly before seems to make clear that the woman referred to was Priscilla.⁵ She was well known to all the churches of the Gentiles (Rom. 16:3, 4), and it is probable that Paul was writing his reply to the letter in her home at Ephesus (1 Cor. 16:19).

Now why should there be any trouble over Priscilla? It seems that Aquila was a Jew from Asia Minor and his wife was probably also a native. Here women were held in great honor. "The honours and influence which belonged to women in the cities of Asia Minor," writes Prof. Ramsay, "form one of the most remarkable features in the history of the country. . . . Under the Roman Empire we find women who are magistrates and presidents of games, who are loaded with honours. The custom of the country influenced even the Jews, who . . . in one case, appointed a woman at Smyrna to the position of ruler of the Synagogue." Out of this atmosphere of dignity and honor, Priscilla goes to Corinth expecting to take her usual position of equality with her husband! So we have the occasion for the criticism of the Judaizers and the questions of the church at Corinth!

How the early believers understood Paul's reply to their questions on the subject is also seen in Acts 21:9, referring to Philip's "four daughters . . . which did prophesy." Dr. Bushnell observes that "not even a year after [the] Corinthian epistle was written were women yet silenced."

It all is so clear now that we know! And we cannot but marvel why this simple and obvious explanation of the words of Paul did not occur to the translators of our English versions. But we shall see the reason for their eyes being holden

and their minds being closed as we turn to the other passages bearing upon this subject.

Before doing so, let us note that not *all* expositors have been blinded. Dr. Adam Clarke writes concerning 1 Cor. 14:34, 35 that it is "the *only one* in the whole Book of God which even by a false translation can be made prohibitory of female speaking in the Church. How comes it then, that by this one isolated passage, which according to our best Greek authorities, is *wrongly rendered and wrongly applied*, woman's lips have been sealed for centuries, and the 'testimony of Jesus, which is the spirit of prophecy' silenced, when bestowed on her? How is it, that this solitary text has been allowed to stand unexamined and unexplained, nay, that learned commentators who have *known* its true meaning, as perfectly as either Robinson, Bloomfield, Greenfield, Scott, Parkhurst, or Locke, *have upheld the delusion*, and enforced it as a Divine precept binding on all female disciples through all time? Surely there must have been some unfaithfulness, 'craftiness,' and 'handling the word of life deceitfully' somewhere. Surely the love of caste and unscriptural jealousy for a separated priesthood has had something to do with this anomaly. By this course, divines and commentators have involved themselves in all sorts of inconsistencies and contradictions; and worse, they have nullified some of the most precious promises of God's Word. They have set the most explicit predictions of prophecy at variance with apostolic injunctions, and the most immediate and wonderful operations of the Holy Ghost, in direct opposition 'to [supposed] positive, explicit, and universal rules.'"

5. The R.V. margin reads "a wife that is a sister." This could mean Paul's own wife or Priscilla, who was Aquila's wife, or the Apostle was speaking in the abstract of the principle of liberty of action.

To be continued in the next issue of SHEKINAH.



what the people are saying



I am very glad to receive your parcel of books on the previous day. I got the books which interested me very much. I was surprised that the Holy Spirit was the Female. I told about the Female Holy Spirit to my Christian friends and they also were interested in that news. Please continue to send booklets and pictures.

**Khai Cin Thang
Burma**

We praise the Heavenly Family for leading out in this great finishing work! For providing outside evidence to support your teachings. I am particularly impressed by the concrete facts you published in the June edition of the Shekinah entitled "An Introduction to Ancient Manuscripts." I am astonished that this valuable information has been withheld from the majority for centuries. The time is now well overdue for us to demand to know the whole truth of God so we will be without excuse in the fullest sense.

**Vivienne O'Harris
Toronto, Canada**

Approximately 6 months ago, there was to be an ordination of a female elder in the S.D.A. church here in Stirling, however, on the Sabbath of the appointment, the South Australian Conference President, C. Christian, threatened the Pastor to "defrock" him, if he proceeded. The local congregation was not against it however.

**Jan van Schuilenburg
Stirling, Australia**

I read about your newsletter, "Shekinah" in "Daughters of Sarah." As a Christian feminist, I am interested in learning more about this subject of the feminine attributes of God. I know, of course that God is neither male nor female. I am speaking only of the symbolism used in the Bible.

**Ruth Blacksher
Carmichael, California**

Special greetings come to you all the workers of the Shekinah in the true name of our dear Mother who art in Heaven (Holy Spirit) one of the Trinity. I am highly impressed with the discovery of the Holy Spirit which is

being our Heavenly Mother. The Bible clearly says, "In time to come, God will surely reveal all secret things unto His faithful servants." And to this He has done by that mysterious vision which you saw during your Bible teaching period. And I must agree with you that the Holy Spirit is a FEMALE because if we sincerely study the prayer of Jesus in the book of Matthew, the 6th Chapter which says, "Thy will be done as it is in Heaven." To my personal knowledge if there has been no Female in the Trinity of Godhead, then, this shouldn't be on earth. Mrs. Roden, I am 100% in agreement with all my Christian friends throughout the whole world. Being a minister of the Gospel, I will fight in my spiritual way to interpret these tidings to all of my members that they too may know this long hidden secret.

**Albert G. W. Samuel, Jr.
Liberia, West Africa**

Thank you also for the Jan-Mar 1982 Shekinah. I was especially interested in the article, "Women's Wilderness Wanderings — Plight of Flight or Fight in the 80's." These women that are unhappy with their restricted religious experience in the churches, are bewildered and frightened, for they do not understand that this urge to flight or fight is deliberately brought on to them by the Divine wisdom of our Mother the Holy Spirit. Take a mother bird for an example. When her young ones are old enough to leave the nest, she pushes them out. They are bewildered and frightened at her seeming cruelty. They seemingly must fly or die. Their mother seems to have forsaken them, but she would not let them fall. So it is with these bewildered women in the churches. I know, for I have been down that road! Our Heavenly Mother is pushing us out of our nest, the church, where we have been fed a restricted diet of spiritual food, brought to us by our church pastors. Mother Bird, the Holy Spirit, is saying, by her actions, that it is time for us to forage for our own spiritual food; to seek, hunt and find new foods. So let us spread our mental wings and

FLY to a higher mountain of understanding. We would never learn to think for ourselves, if we had not been pushed out of our comfortable nests. After we are ousted from the nest, we are prepared to receive truth on a

Women as Ministers: Breaking the Sex Barrier

What happens when women want to do more than worship—when they want to become ministers themselves? Often, they run into traditional, church-sanctioned chauvinism, and some of them, not surprisingly, have reacted with resentment. "It's not that men's ministries have no meaning for women," says Joy Howard, the woman who gets "a feeling of family" from her faith. "But it means so much more to be able to participate. Sometimes I wonder if there is any point in remaining in a church where I don't have the same clout as a man."

Others have chosen to fight, and despite the difficulties, the number of women entering the ministry is on the rise. In 1972, 3,358 women were enrolled in theological seminaries in the United States and Canada, representing slightly more than 10 percent of the total enrollment. Last year, the figure for women had shot up to 10,208—21.1 percent of the total enrollment. And among the ordained clergy, the number of female ministers has increased from 10,470 in 1977 to an estimated 15,000 today.

One woman who has broken the sex barrier is the Reverend Bonnie Jones-Goldstein, pastor of the United Methodist Church of Springdale, Connecticut. She is encouraged by the rising number of women entering the ministry; as their ranks increase, she believes, the church itself will change.

"These women who are entering the church are very creative in a number of ways," she explains. "Their perspectives and attitudes and goals for the faith are different. They're more open-minded, less full of rules, free of the old legalisms and established patterns." She knows of one young woman, for example, who spent the summer counseling in a prison ministry: "Her bottom line is that faith makes a difference whatever you are.

"It's still very much a tentative time," Reverend Jones-Goldstein concludes. "But we're getting there. We have our foot in the door."
—R.S.A.

Letters

HIGHER ARC than we have ever been qualified to receive before. Generalities that suffice in early cycles of development are quite inadequate for those who aspire to more advanced work. The more knowledge we gain, as we strive to understand the universe we live in, the more aware we become of the vast areas about which we still know nothing at all. The vastness of what exists beyond the outer forms of things staggers the consciousness when it begins to make itself known.

Ruby Thomas
Fairview, Missouri

When we met in Jerusalem during the "Feast of Tabernacles" celebration in October, you asked me to read the booklets you published and comment on them. I refer to "In Her Image" and "In Their Image." I've looked through the two booklets and found some interesting material in it. Basically I agree with the opinion that there is a need for a more balanced approach to the male-female relationship in the Body of Christ. I'm not convinced, however, that a revised view of the Godhead is the most balanced approach to this mystery, nor that it is in harmony with the total teaching of Scripture. I believe that Scripture teaches that the distinctions between male and female must be clear and expressive, but without the kind of prejudice and unfairness to either party of the unity that human wickedness has introduced into this framework of male-female relationship. I find a parallel to this situation in the relationship between Jew and Gentile in the Body of Christ in which neither one or the other party is treated as inferior or superior; or on the other extreme, the distinctions between them are abolished so that they lose all significance. A unity in order to exist, whether of male or female or Jew and Gentile, must have recognizable components. In a marriage, if the man or woman lose his/her maleness-femaleness, then the marriage is as effectively dissolved as by divorce or death. Therefore, a renewed assertion of the importance of femaleness in the Body of Christ, unprejudiced and wholeness, is a good thing, but care should be taken not to exploit the in-

justices and distortions of the male element to such an extent that we have a female counterpart of these injustices and distortions. It seems to me that this is what has taken place in some of the feminist movements in the world.

Manahem Benhayim
Jerusalem, Israel

I came across a newspaper reprint with the headline "Sect's Trinity: Father, Son and Mother" from Dallas Times Herald. I read the article and was very pleased to find fellow Christians that believe the same way as I do. I am a missionary in Thailand. I am not in any demonination, but (with the Lord) on my own together with a few other Christians. I have been in Thailand for 5 months and I find people here much more receptive than in the West. As a Danish national I have been travelling around Scandinavia for the last 6 years preaching the Gospel, before I took the step of faith, and went to the missionfield. When in the West I was also distributing pamphlets about the Holy Ghost being the Mother of the Trinity. I realised this back in '78 through a revelation, and when praying for verses to confirm it, got the following: Prov. 3:13-18; 4:5-9; 7:4; all of Chap. 8; 9:1-12. Hallelujah! I would like to see the literature you are distributing.

Filip Bauer Spang
Thailand

I received a copy of your wonderful publication when I went to see the Dinner Party at the Art Gallery here. Would you please add me to your subscription list and accept the enclosed donation. By the way, have you room for the odd poem? I have written a few along your way of thinking. Let me know. The world today needs this message badly.

Mary F. Bullis
Toronto, Canada

I am writing this letter to fulfill a promise to send you an article in which I point out that the Holy Spirit is female and in reality THE MOTHER IMAGE AND CREATOR OF THE UNIVERSE. The Father image and Creator of course is Yehovah or Our Father. Torah calls them Yehovah-Elohim. Before I go further into this theory, let me congratulate you as of "The blessed, who are peacemakers -

therefore to be called Sons of God." You and anyone who break's down male chauvenism is helping break down the major cause of the ill-feeling between males and females. Of course these walls of hatred are based upon a BIG LIE that Our Father intended that either men or women should be superior or inferior to each other. Torah commands them to be ONE, because mankind would soon disappear if they would not need each other. Why I believe the Holy Spirit to be FEMALE! Because the original text was over 50 pages, the person who edited it for me knocked it down to 22 pages. Much of my original Biblical story of creation (Chapter 5) was omitted. Therefore I am enclosing the entire Chapter in the original (see Cover article); plus the picture of creation as seen by a Kabbahlistic artist, in Israel. Please underline the most essential proof that the Holy Spirit is female - which the Kabbahlist taught mankind - "ALL THAT EXISTS, CAN EXIST ONLY THROUGH THE MALE AND FEMALE PRINCIPLE." That principle or law is contained within the smallest unit of the one living God's perfect unity. I hope I have been helpful to you and to all those who have not had Hebrew school training given in Yeshivah. In return, could you give me some help in my efforts to break down the walls of hate that exists between Jews and Christians. This hatred is also due to BIG LIES of all hate propaganda. Because you visit Israel quite often, I am asking your help to spread this light where it is needed most - for the survival of both Jews and Christians and the Old and New Testaments; in their struggle with the Moscow-Muslim jihads and big lies against Zionism. You and your group know that you are New Israelites and of the seed of Abraham. Please publish the quotes of Torah proving same, which will be forthcoming in the second edition, or perhaps in your own words, or any part of this paper.

Rabbi Isidor Zwirn
Burbank, California

A thought for the day: British novelist William Thackeray said, "Mother is the name of God in the lips and hearts of little children."

Part 5

Melchisedec Manuscripts

by Norene Nicholls

Outside of the Psalms, which we have heretofore considered, only one other book mentions the MOST HIGH on several occasions, and that book is Daniel. The ELYON is mentioned 13 times therein, and that number is interesting in that, when you reduce it to a single digit by adding 1 and 3, it comes out to 4. This is the number of world wide coverage, and the Book of Daniel is concerned with the kingdoms of men but mostly with the Kingdom of Yah which shall be established in the earth. And, this Kingdom shall be worldwide, for "His Kingdom ruleth over all." Therefore, in view of the fact we are laying a foundation for the Melchisedec Order it should be noted that this glorious Priesthood/Kingship is definitely allied with the promised Kingdom. Thus at this juncture of world history when the saints of the Most High shall take the Kingdom, it is no wonder that the truth of the Order of Melchisedec is coming to the fore so strongly.

Let us therefore consider some of what Daniel has to say about the EL-ELYON. You will recall in the third chapter that Nebuchadnezzar had commanded that everyone fall down and worship the image of gold that he had made, but the three Hebrew children refused to do it. This infuriated the king who then commanded that they be thrown in a furnace of fire heated seven times hotter than normal. All of this story is related to Babylonian worship or the Babylonian religious system. The true followers of Israel's Elohim cannot abide such worship and thus will not fall down at the sound of Babylon's religious music and worship in their fashion.

After the three Hebrews were thrown in the furnace, the king was astonished to see them loose, after having been bound, and with them was the form of the fourth who was like the Son of God. This speaks to me that His appearing to us will be right here in the midst of the troubles on the earth, not off in the atmosphere somewhere. Listen to the king's words as he stood near the mouth of the furnace, "Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, ye servants of the MOST HIGH GOD (EL-ELYON), come forth, and come hither." Nebuchadnezzar called HIM by His right title, and he recognized Him as the

Most High with none higher than He. And, the name was thus used at the miraculous deliverance of the Hebrew children. Now we stand at the time when the Order of Melchisedec will be brought forth in fullness, and they are the priests of the MOST HIGH, and mighty deliverances will be wrought by them, for the MOST HIGH is that miracle working One.

To more fully understand what the deliverances wrought through the Melchisedec Order will be like, let us look into the details of this portion we are considering from Daniel 3. "And the princes, governors, and captains, and the king's counsellors, being gathered together, saw these MEN (gebar — strong, valiant person) upon whose BODIES the fire had no power, nor was an HAIR of their HEAD SINGED, neither were their COATS CHANGED, nor the SMELL of fire had PASSED on them." vs. 27. Those words we have capitalized need a bit of attention to see what kind of a deliverance was wrought, so let us take them one by one.

(1) MEN — This word is from the Hebrew GEBAR coming from GABAR which means strong, valiant, warrior. These Hebrew children were spiritual warriors, strong in Him, valiant by the Spirit of Yahweh. And in like manner, it is not the weaklings who shall conquer but those who are strong in Him. They may be weak naturally, but they have learned to rely solely upon His strength in the trying times until, when the crisis of all testings comes, they prove themselves strong and valiant, even warriors girded about with the armor of the Lord (Yahweh).

(2) BODIES — Strangely enough the Hebrew word used here is GESHEM which is not ordinarily used to describe the body. It is a word which means HEAVY RAIN, and another form of it means RAINED UPON. Therefore the meaning is that the temple or body in which they lived had been rained upon of the Father, and due to this, the fire had no power upon them. Wherever this word GESHEM is used it denotes a heavy rain, such as, in the flood, the great rain in the day of Elijah when he ran before a chariot holding the king, in fact, outran him to Jezreel, the great rain in the days of Ezra when he

gathered the people and read the law and commanded them to separate themselves from their strange wives, and the great rain promised in Hosea in connection with the former and latter rain. What is it therefore that will cause the body to be impervious to Babylon's awful fire? The physical being prior to the fire will have been rained upon by judgment depicted in the rain of Noah's day. "If we judge ourselves, we shall not be judged," well defines the kind of judgment rain of which I speak. What is accomplished in the mind and spirit affects the body tremendously and prepares it for great deliverance in the crisis day. Then, the rain of Elijah's day was a miracle rain impregnating him with power to outrun a chariot. I am not talking about miracles such as you see in a healing meeting, O no, but the miracle of trusting Yah for superhuman strength to do whatsoever has to be done. We are in that time of great endurance when we are only living by His power, His miracle power, and without this none of us could even survive. This miracle power to outdo even human machinery is readying us for an even greater deliverance than we can imagine. Also, there is the great rain that accompanied the reading of the law and the great separation of the people in Ezra's day of restoration. Unless this kind of rain brings about a separation of His people from the strange mixtures and an adherence to His law, there will be no greater deliverance ahead. Are we not in that time when He is making us to know who we are as Israel and therefore to live separated unto Him? Israel cannot live as the other nations, cannot unite with every other race, cannot be longer ignorant of His perfect way. If we are willing to be rained upon with such rain, then even greater deliverance is just ahead. And, lastly, Hosea tells us about Yahweh coming to us as the rain, as the former and latter rain upon the earth. He Himself is coming to us without the aid of men, and in His coming to us He is setting us aright, and this kind of rain will again prepare us for that time when we shall find out that the fire cannot harm us. All these dealings are as rain whereby our body is rained upon, and it will preserve us against the fire ahead of us. No word is misused or misplaced in the scriptures, and thus for the body to be called GESHEM would mean it has been rained upon with these dealings and thus fully prepared for the days immediately before us.

(3) HAIR of their HEAD SINGED — HAIR speaks of three things in the scriptures; POWER as in the case of Samson, BEAUTY as of the bride in The Song of Solomon, and SEPARATION as regarding the Nazarites. The HEAD speaks of the mind. So putting these thoughts altogether it refers to the power, beauty and separation of the mind that is renewed. Is it not written that we are TRANSFORMED (transfigured) by the RENEWING OF THE MIND? There can be no bodily change without a changed mind, but contrariwise, the body is changed in the same manner in which the mind is changed. Thus in the time of deliverance what has been outworked in the mind will not be SINGED. The word SINGED means MELT, BURN, EXCITE PASSION OR ANGER. In the final testing the mind cannot be excited to anger or passion or break down in that hour. Its power, beauty and separation with remain.

(4) NEITHER WERE THEIR COATS CHANGED — When we speak of the outer garment, we are referring to the body, the outer being, the physical nature. Because of changes before hand, the body will be preserved. "I pray that your whole spirit, soul and BODY be PRESERVED blameless unto the coming of the Lord." The word CHANGED speaks volumes, for it means in the Hebrew it is NOT REMOVED TO ANOTHER PLACE. This surely explodes the theory that we are going to be taken out of here and moved off into the heavens somewhere. NO! A thousand times NO! We are going to be right here to be a magnificent witness to the great in-workings and outworkings of Elohim. Their bodies were not removed to another place. It also means NOT DISGUISED AND UNKNOWN. The great deliverance means we will no longer be disguised, but the bodies themselves will witness to the great inner work manifest in the physical being. Furthermore, it means not in a second or inferior place. Of course not! For the great ELYON and the priests of EL-ELYON will be in the place He has ordained of ruling with HIM. These bodies will be conveyers of the magnitude of His deliverance.

(5) THE SMELL OF FIRE PASSED NOT ON THEM — The word SMELL means the TROUBLE, ANGER, FURY of the fire PASSED NOT on them, or did not ornament or bedeck
(Continued on page 24)

(Continued from our last issue of Shekinah)



The Discovery of Genesis



**How the Truths of Genesis
Were Found Hidden
In the Chinese Language**

C.H. Kang and Ethel R. Nelson

Chapter 5: They Shall Be One Flesh

In the word *all, the whole*, 全,⁷ it is documented that the whole of mankind consisted of just *two people* 人人 with *two mouths* 口口, surmounted by 人, indicating *together*.

As described in the previous chapter, Adam had the appearance of being robed in a glorious light, being made in the image and perfect character of God. Genesis notes, "And the man and his wife were both naked, and were not ashamed" (Genesis 2:25). These robes of light explain why, though naked, Adam and Eve were "not ashamed" to appear in the presence of God! A most interesting primitive radical meaning *naked, bare, or red (the color of fire)* 赤, completely confirms our supposition. This reveals a *dust* 土, *man* 人; however, there are "flames" jutting out from him. Research into the ancient forms clarifies the radical, for we find a *fire* 火 contained in it 炎. Several other stylized pictographs actually show two fires, portraying both Adam and Eve clothed with fire, covering their "earthiness" 土, as 堃.

Eve as well as Adam must have been clothed in light at this time, as the symbol for *glory* 榮 portrays this first sinless pair. The top radical *fire* 火 (see page 42) appears this time in duplicate and pictures *two persons* 人人 who look like fires with a bright and shining appearance. The light from them covered → a tree

木. This tree very likely represented the tree of life to which Adam and Eve in their sinless and glorified state had access. As long as they ate of it, they would remain immortal, and not be subject to death. When they sinned, they became "naked" and also lost access to the tree of life. Consequently the tree in this character is very significant.

Conversation originated with Adam and Eve, the first two glorified humans in their perfect state of innocence. *To converse or chat* 談 shows them as fiery beings 火火 exchanging words 言.

The character *ancestor* 祖, previously introduced, would appear to refer not only to Adam whom "God created in His own image," and was therefore as *God* 祢 also 且, but also to Eve. "In the image of God created He him; male and female created He them" (Genesis 1:27). The radical 且 takes many shapes in the ancient script, such as 𠂇 or 𠂈, and could even be used independently to mean *ancestor*. The horizontal lines are best explained in 𠂉, which can be interpreted as *two persons* 人.

In the first chapter it was emphasized that our planet earth has seen two very different worlds. The first, of which we have no personal acquaintance, was exquisite

and perfect in its newly created state. The first man and woman were given dominion or lordship over the entire creation. It was not only from them that the earth was to be populated but also because of them that sin was introduced to our world. Therefore the original people inhabiting our globe recognized the peculiar status of this first couple, Adam and Eve.

A unique finding in the Chinese characters appears to recognize the position of our first parents and identifies the primeval world and events of that era with them. There are a number of radicals, mostly used in duplicate, which designate or have reference to *two people*. Already these have been encountered:

1. 二, used in 元 or 且.
2. 人人, with modifications of 大大 and 才.
3. 口口, also written as 呂.

At this point, take a moment to review the words studied in this chapter, and you will be amazed at the number of these characters containing *two people*: *beginning* 元; *ancestor* 祖; *to go* 往; *to come* 來; *to sit* 坐; *to follow* 從; *all* 食; *glory* 榮; *palace* 宮; *to converse* 談.

It is notable that *to go* 往, *to come* 來, and *to sit* 坐 could all be accomplished just as easily with a single person. There is no logical reason for these words to specify *two persons* 才, 人人, unless they have reference to the first human couple as the subject of these verbs.

In a summarization of the creation story, observe the evolution of the following two words and how they are built upon the radicals *dust* 土 and *breath* 口, which show God's activity in speaking things into existence, "And God said, 'Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kinds'" (Genesis 1:24). Hence, 告 could be an abbreviated form to represent the "product of creation," and used thus in other figures. For God had commanded, by a word from His *mouth* 口, the *earth* 土 to bring forth plants and animals. When everything was in readiness for man, He *created* 造 Adam also from the dust. (See page 41)

Adam and Eve rejoiced in their togetherness with God in their beautiful *garden* 園. Here is the climax of the total God-energy expended, a glorious creation 告 with a handsome couple 人. Observe *two persons*, 人 and 人, the second issuing from the side of the first, neatly depicting the creation of Eve from Adam's rib. This event had taken place in the Garden of Eden. The

figure 人 is reminiscent of another similar word, 仁, meaning *perfect, in loving harmony*. This also depicts two people with the numeral *two* 二, also attached to the side of the first *man* 人. The only two *perfect* (sinless) human beings ever to exist were Adam and Eve, having the Garden as their home. An *enclosure* 口 defines the boundaries of the Garden of Eden.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} \text{土} & + & \text{口} & + & \text{人} & + & \text{口} & = & \text{園} \\ \text{dust} & & \text{breath} & & \text{two} & & \text{enclosure} & & \text{garden} \\ & & & & \text{persons} & & & & \end{array}$$

Thus ended the sixth day of earth's history. "And on the seventh day God finished His work which He had done, and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had done. So God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it, because on it God rested from all His work which He had done in creation" (Genesis 2:2, 3). As a memorial of God's handiwork, the weekly cycle of seven days was instituted.

The week is not an institution based on natural phenomena, such as the day when the earth turns on its axis, the month with its lunar relationship, nor the year marking the earth's excursion about the sun. The week dates exclusively to the great original days of creation, a period of time that is observed by the Chinese in spite of their thousands of years of isolation from the rest of the world and its customs.

An old Chinese saying, *the returning seventh day*, 七日來復 points up the fact that from very early times the Chinese have recognized the recurring seven day cycle which marks the week.

Even today, the seventh day of the first lunar month of the Chinese year is known as the "birthday of mankind" 人日, and literally means *man's* 人 *day* 日. Just as it was not the day of man's creation which was to be celebrated, but rather the following day of rest, so the Chinese also celebrate the seventh day as a lingering memorial of God's creative work and the creation of mankind.

One cannot help but be impressed with the composition of these ideograms which demonstrate so vividly the ancient history of earth's beginnings, heretofore documented only by the Hebrew writings. But this identical story has also been locked into the written Chinese language and preserved for more than 4,000 years for our investigation and study.

— IN THE BEGINNING

Continued from page 2

around our cosmos. We can call it a Rawkiyah or the heavens, which divides all within our universe from that which exists outside of our cosmos "and so it was." Continuing with line 9:

"And Elohim said, Let the waters that are below the heavens be gathered together into one place, so that dry land can be seen; so shall it be done. And Elohim called the dry land — earth. And the gathering of the waters was called seas. And Elohim saw it was good." This is too simple to need comment. Now line 11 continues:

"And Elohim said, Let the earth sprout forth grass, vegetables having their own seed. The fruit of the trees also able to make fruit of its own kind; in which its seed is within it, after its own kind. And Elohim saw it was good; and it was evening and morning of the third day."

We continue to see the rationality of Elohim in preparing the world for its final making or how it would be manufactured. Line 14:

"And Elohim said, Let there be lights in the Rawkiyah of the heavens, to divide the day from the night. And let them become for signs and seasons and days and years. And they will be for lights in the divider of the heavens to light up the earth; and it will be so. And Elohim made the two great lights; the greater light to rule by day; and the lesser light to rule by night and over the stars. And Elohim placed them in the heaven's divider to light up the earth. And to rule over the day and the night and divide between the light and darkness, and Elohim saw that it was good. And it was morning and evening of the fourth day."

We continue to see how Elohim continues the division by placing a ruler over darkness and evening. And a ruler over light and morning.

(Line 20) "Out of the waters below the Rawkiyah would swarm forth living things and birds. They too would contain seed after their own kind."

(Line 24) "And the earth too would bring forth living creatures which contained seed after its own kind, and Elohim saw that it was good."

(Line 26) "And Elohim said, Let us (obviously talking to Yehovah) make man in our image, of our likeness. And let them have dominion over the fish of the sea; and the fowl of the air, and the cattle, and over the earth, and every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth."

Mankind is to be made similar to their crea-

tor. And like the ONE LIVING GOD, is to have dominion over the fish, birds and the rest of the animal kingdom. Then on to lines 27 and 28:

"And Elohim essenced man in their likeness, in the likeness of Elohim was man created; male and female were they created. And Elohim blessed them and said to them 'be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion over the (continues the same concepts already stated to end the sixth day)..."

From line 27 on we see the same story continued. Note that man appears as the last experiment of nature; yet first in Godlike appearance. As for Elohim's days, we are told in the beginning of chapter 2 that they represent generations or periods of time.

Chapter 2:4,5 clearly tells the reader that before the heavens and earth were actually made by Yehovah-Elohim, there was not a blade of grass, or one vegetable or one person therein. All had to be beriyahed or essenced first.

From the above Biblical story of creation four more truths emerge:

(1) The three stages of the production process.

(2) The stages of progress from chaos and darkness to order and light.

(3) Everything created has its environment or containment to protect it.

(4) The law of opposites as a compound one or achud (in Hebrew).

Just as our Creator began creation with an essence; then designed the universe and finally made the world in the shape it is today; so must mankind follow the same process or laws of creation. No supernatural man will ever change natural or nature's LAWS. No one finds a new invention, then figures out how to put its parts together and then finds a use for the new creation. The process of creation was and will always be from BERIYAH to YETZIRAH to ASSIYAH. Thus everything made by man starts with a need or purpose. It is then designed and all the parts are planned to be put in an exact place. Finally it is made or extended from its essence and its design.

Just as our Creator started out with one big mass of disorder and darkness, so must each one of us start out life in darkness, totally disorganized to meet our problems facing us. And

— Continued on page 24

SPECIAL REPORT ON

4th Annual International Prayer Congress For Unity In Christ in Manila, Philippines, July 16-17, 1982

The Fourth International Prayer Congress for Unity in Christ was held July 23-24, 1982, in Manila, Philippines, the gateway to the Orient—the only Christian nation in the eastern world.



The Manila Hotel in Metro Manila site of the 4th Annual International Prayer Congress For Unity in Christ.

Sponsored by the Dove Foundation and hosted by Rev. Sonia Y. Lim, founder and executive director, the Congress' purpose was to pray and work for unity in the body of Christ—so divided into many denominations—that it may reach out in unity with the gospel to China.

Speakers, representing a spectrum of denominations, Baptist, Presbyterian, Catholic, Methodist, Mennonite and Charismatic, stressed unity in the family, the community, the church, the nation, and in missions' outreach.



Some of the delegates outside Methodist Church in Manila. Left to Right—Kay Matteson, Rev. Eddie Cajigas, David Kho, Rev. Sonia Lim, William Kho, Bishop Lois Roden, Perry Jones and Astor Santalices.

The leading Catholic prelate of the Philippine nation, Jaime Cardinal Sin, opened the Congress with his keynote address, "Unity Through Prayer," followed by the world famous "Mr. Pentecost," Dr. Rev. David DuPlessis, who



Bishop Lois Roden and Perry Jones in front of bus taking delegates to tour U.S. Naval Base at Subic Bay.

spoke on "Unity in the Body of Christ;" Rev. Juanita Smith, of Los Angeles, who spoke on "Unity of Body and Soul;" James Rosenthal, Minister and Counselor of the U.S. Embassy, who spoke on "Friendship Through Spirit of Unity;" Dr. Alex Aronis, Pastor of International Community Church, Manila, spoke on "Unity in the Spirit for Mission Outreach;" Dr. Cirilo Rigos, Pastor, Ellenwood Church, Manila, who spoke on "Unity of the Church;" Rev. Gerald Derstine, American television evangelist, who



Reception committee and delegates at Malacanang Palace. Left to Right—Virginia Kho, Sally Jane Lim, Nita Conde, Bishop Lois Roden, Bonnie Teotico, Evelyn Villar, Lilia Olzon, Rev. Sonia Lim, Charito Christian, Mary Dorr, Kay Matteson, Portia Sipin, Shirley Eisenhart and Nellie Ann Lim.

spoke on "Unity of the Community."

Bishop Lois I. Roden, one of the yet few women bishops, founder-publisher of SHEKINAH magazine, spoke on the Mother identity of the Holy Spirit in her "World Peace Through Unity;" and Mary Dorr, Executive Director of Religion in the Media, and the annual Angel Awards, spoke on "Unity of the Family."

The Tajanlangit Family of four boys and four girls charmed the Congress with their vocal and instrumental music and the world's most famous Christian clown, Jay Burrett, inspired the Congress with his clown version of his conversion to Christ. The Chancel Choir, directed by Dr. Adelaida Guzman, presented some very moving vocal offerings of praise to God.



Bishop Lois Roden meeting President Ferdinand Marcos at Malacanang Palace in Manila.

Rev. Lim arranged for the Congress speakers from America — Mary Dorr, Bishop Lois Roden, and Rev. David DuPlessis — to have an audience with the Philippine President, Ferdinand Marcos, at the Malacanang Palace. President Marcos received them very graciously in his private study, and spoke with each member of the party. Perry Jones, public relations for SHEKINAH magazine, presented President Marcos with a packet of SHEKINAH publications and a complimentary subscription to the magazine. Mr. William Kho, a member of the welcoming committee for the Congress, presented the President with bound copies of his son's health magazine.

The visiting party to the palace enjoyed a beautiful and delicious luncheon in the palace after their visit with President Marcos.

Rev. David DuPlessis and Bishop Lois I. Roden were presented with the Keys to the City of Manila by Mayor Bagatsing, who was introduced to them by Rev. Lim in the beautiful reception room at Manila City Hall.

At the close of the Congress, Rev. Lim invited all to attend the Fifth International Prayer Congress, which is to be held in Makati, Metro Manila, Philippines, July 16, 17, 1983. An invitation was also given to send in nominees for the seven International Dove Awards.

Closing exercises for the Fourth International Prayer Congress included the presentation of the Dove Unity Award to Rev. David DuPlessis, Rev. Gerald Derstine, Bishop Lois I. Roden, and Sidestreets Magazine. Plaques of Appreciation were presented to Mary Dorr, Rev. Rey



Recipients of Dove Awards from Left to Right—Gerald Derstine, David Du Plessis and Bishop Lois I. Roden

Halili, Rev. Gerald Derstine, Rev. David DuPlessis, and Bishop Lois I. Roden.

Those attending the Congress were presented with complimentary copies of SHEKINAH magazine. Many positive comments were made during the Congress regarding the articles in SHEKINAH which deal with women in the ministry and the Holy Spirit as Mother.

For complete details of the 5th International Prayer Congress in Manila, July 16, 17, 1983, with extended trips to Hong Kong, China and Korea, also information regarding the cost of a special tour already arranged for groups, group leaders, or individuals, please contact Perry Jones, Route 7, Box 471-B, Waco, Texas 76705 (817-863-5663).

THE MELCHISEDEC MANUSCRIPTS—from page 19 them. No matter how great the fire Babylon can stir up, not a tinge of her trouble, fury or anger will invade His elect. And, that will be because at this present moment they are not allowing the anger and fury of Babylon's fire to affect them.

The above feebly describes the great deliverance of EL-ELYON for and in the servants of EL-ELYON, the MOST HIGH. And this is the kind of deliverance that will be manifest in and through the Melchisedec Order of Priests. This kind of deliverance supercedes anything ever preached or witnessed in deliverance meetings, for this is the deliverance of bodies, not from illness, but from death and destruction and into His great IMMORTALITY! Such is the ministry of the Order of Melchisedec!

IN THE BEGINNING—from page 22 as our Creator brings order out of chaos, and light out of darkness, so could we. Just as Elohim made every morning to have a morning and they became one day, YOM ACHUD, so must everything in life have its counterpart. There is a negative and a corresponding positive for everything. We know that opposites coexist, such as good and bad, high and low, black and white, pain and pleasure, etc. We all start out with that Adamic nature in us and God the Father seeks for us to grow out of it.