

Woman's Journal, vol. 3. No. 18, 5/4/72, seq. 145, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute. Harvard University.

NEW LIGHT

Professor Bartlett has been studying up his Greek testament, and has made some further discoveries calculated to throw light on "women's preaching," and several other topics. One thing he settles conclusively: that women must not become bishops. Reason, because a bishop must be "the husband of one wife" – and how can a woman be the husband of one wife?" This literal rendering of the apostolic injunction not only settles the woman question, but divers other little items.

For instance, it is equally clear that no bachelor should become a bishop, as he certainly is not "the husband of one wife," also that when a bishop becomes a widower he should immediately resign his charge, being no longer "the husband of one wife." It moreover raises the horrible suspicion that a man who isn't a bishop may have as many wives as he chooses! The learned expositor does not allude to these last visible deductions from his premises, however, but goes on to clinch his argument by observing that the "elders" alluded to in the epistles "are described in the masculine gender." From this, he concludes that women cannot be elders.

The major premise of the syllogism (not stated) is obvious this: -- "A class described only in the masculine gender must necessarily exclude the feminine."

This gives us an entirely new and original view of the question, in all its aspects and bearings. If the nouns and pronouns of "masculine gender," wherever used, refer to man alone to the exclusion of woman, we are exempt from all moral and legal obligations. "Judgment came upon all men to condemnation." It is certainly pleasant to reflect that we are not included in the category!

"Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."

"All men" are commanded to repent. How significant that no women are thus commanded! Of course they must not; it would be as great a sin for them to repent when the class called upon to do so are "described only in the masculine gender," as for them to become elders or bishops under similar circumstances! But what does this prove? Either that they are sinless, and have nothing to repent of, or that they are destitute of a moral nature, and so incapable of either sinning or repenting. In one case they are angels; in the other, animals. Which theory shall we adopt? Will not Professor Bartlett make another excursion into his Greek, and enlighten us?

Lavinia Goodell