

Power Before The Throne, c. 1999, by Ruth Rieder
A Review By Roxanne Murphy

Introduction

Let me begin by stating that I have reviewed this book, and have committed my review to paper, because more than one person has asked me to show reasons why I disagree with the main premise of this work. I have no personal ill-will, or grudge, against the author. I believe that she is a sincere, praying person. However, sincerity does not excuse the misuse of scripture. I also have no intention of destroying the true teachings of the Word of God regarding ‘standards’, better known to be our separation from the world unto a holy God. I am persuaded that the Word of God contains all that we will ever need to help us live a holy, righteous, and godly life.

Book Introduction (pp. 13-14)

The author correctly admonishes the reader to seek the old paths, and to receive with meekness the engrafted word which is able to save our souls. This is great Biblical counsel, and as such, must be the final measure by which we judge all that is put forth as godly teaching in this book.

Chapter 1 “Revelation or Perish!” (pp. 15-20)

“In addition to love for God and the fear of the Lord, we need one more ingredient that will aid us in our obedience. **Revelation!**”¹ How can this statement stand when compared to this passage of scripture:

According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue:

*Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your **faith** virtue; and to your **virtue** knowledge; And to **knowledge** temperance; and to **temperance** patience; and to **patience** godliness; And to **godliness** brotherly kindness; and to **brotherly kindness** charity.*

For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.

*Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: **for if you do these things you shall never fall:***

For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. (II Peter 1:3-11)

¹ Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 18

I don't find 'revelation' in this list of those things we need to have as we grow in our spiritual walk. As for revelation, all that we need to know has been revealed to us in the Word of God. The Holy Ghost is not in the business of new 'revelation', rather, He is the One Who opens our understanding to the scripture (Luke 24:45, John 14:26, John 15:26). All that is called 'revelation' must be in agreement with the Bible, or it is not of God, and as such is subject to God's judgment. (See Deuteronomy 4:2, Proverbs 30:5-6, Galatians 1:8-9, Revelation 22:18-19)

In this chapter, the author mentions a "protective covering of holiness"². Where in scripture is such a concept or principle found? It isn't. Just because the scripture teaches that a woman's hair is given to her for a covering, this does not allow the leap to make this covering somehow a protection. There is no scripture to support this claim.

On page 19, the author gives this definition, from the Hebrew, of the word translated as 'perish' in Proverbs 29:18: "to loosen; dismiss; avoid; absolve, go back, make naked; to bare; uncover; to set at naught (cast off restraints)." Interestingly enough, that parenthetical phrase, 'cast off restraints', is NOT found in the Strong's definition. This is what we find as the definition of 'perish', from Strong's: "para, *paw rah*, a prim. Root; to *loosen*; by implication to *expose*, *dismiss*; figuratively, *absolve*, *begin*:- *avenge*, *avoid*, *bare*, *go back*, *let (make) naked*, *set at naught*, *perish*, *refuse*, *uncover*."³

It appears from a later quote that the author inserted the 'cast off restraints' definition after obtaining it from the NIV Bible.⁴ She then states, "Now, the second portion of this verse, which focuses on the blessedness of obedience, fits with the beginning."⁵ I respectfully submit that this verse always did fit together as God intended it to! It is only with the generous use of a newer and suspect translation of the scripture that this verse now fits the author's personal interpretation, to the benefit of the theme to be developed in this book.

Chapter Two: Role Reversal vs God's Order (pp. 24- 34)

The author begins this chapter well, stating the obvious truths that our current world culture is actively attempting to reverse the order God ordained when man fell into sin in the Garden of Eden (See Genesis 3:16-17). She makes one comment that I don't quite find scripture for: "A wife is to allow her husband to fulfill his role, submitting to his loving, sacrificial headship as the church submits to Christ."⁶ How is it that the man, being by God's design the head of the woman and the family, must be given permission or liberty by the wife to be what God has already

² Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 20

³ Strong's Comprehensive Concordance of the Bible

⁴ Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 20

⁵ Ibid

⁶ Ibid, p. 22

ordained him to be? The wife has not the authority to allow or disallow her husband to be the leader of the home.

The author then continues on through the next few pages, giving a basic and proper explanation of I Corinthians 11:5-6. It is true that a woman is to pray and prophesy with her head covered, and it is her hair that is given to her for a covering. It is a shame for the woman to cut her hair, and the scripture says she might as well be shaven. This is all true and right, and proper exegesis of this text.

On page 27, the author gives this definition of GLORY: “a highly praiseworthy or brilliant asset; something that secures praise or renown; resplendence, magnificence.”⁷ I believe this is a modern dictionary definition, because the Strong’s definition of the Greek word **doxa** *dox-ah*, is: *glory (as very apparent)*, in a wide application, (lit. or fig., obj. or subj.):— dignity, glory (-ious), honor, praise, worship.⁸

“Paul felt that the Corinthians were capable of judging whether or not it was appropriate for a woman to pray to God uncovered on the basis of nature. God has placed that sense of propriety in us from the beginning, but the rebellion in our society is drowning it out.”⁹ I agree with this statement as a true application of I Corinthians 11:14-15.

I do not agree with the statement, “When they stand before God and proclaim ignorance of His law, all He has to do is show them the dolls they created .”¹⁰ Nor do I agree with this one: “When it comes to the matter of dress and the distinction of the sexes, all He will have to do is show them their restroom signs or ask them to draw a stick man and woman.”¹¹ I appreciate the point that the author is trying to make, but, the truth is simply that we will be judged by the Word of God, according to our works.

And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. (Revelation 20:12-13)

No Barbie dolls, bathroom signs or stick people here!

⁷ Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 27

⁸ Strong’s Comprehensive Concordance of the Bible

⁹ Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 29

¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹ Ibid, p. 34

Chapter Three: The Million Dollar Question (pp. 35-40)

Again, the author begins this chapter by correctly defining ‘how long is long’. It is true that the scriptures definition of long is uncut, thus, it is a shame for a woman to cut her hair. The act of cutting the hair causes a woman to be uncovered in the presence of God, thus out of order.

It is in this chapter that I begin to see the beginnings of the doctrine that I believe is being added to the Word of God, that is, that a woman’s uncut hair provides some sort of supernatural protection for her and her family.

“... do not cut or trim the covering that was provided by God himself, for this will place you in disobedience to God’s command.”¹² Had the author ended here, she would have remained within the bounds of scripture. Yet, she continues: “As you read further in this book, you will see the dire consequences that this can bring upon you and your family.”¹³ Unfortunately for the author, this is where she steps outside of the bounds of scripture into personal opinion, and puts forth this opinion as doctrine.

Chapter Four: Who Really is in Bondage? (pp. 41-48)

At the beginning of this chapter, the author makes the point that the world is offering a substitute two women to take the place of their submission to God. This is true, and it is also true that a godly woman does not need the embellishments of this world’s fashions to make her beautiful. Her beauty is found in holiness. “True liberty and freedom are only found in the church of the living God.”¹⁴ To this I will say a hearty, “AMEN!”

Chapter Five: We Have no Such Custom! (pp. 49-54)

In this chapter, the author explains I Corinthians 11:16 by making use of the history of Corinth, it’s worship of the Greek goddess Diana, and the common assumption that there were questions in the Corinthian church about whether or not the women were to offer their hair as a sacrifice to Jesus as they were used to doing in the temple of Diana. She also equates this ancient Diana worship with the feminist and animal rights’ movements alive in our world today, and I can appreciate the similarities she points out.

Let me say here that, had the author made this the ending of her book, it would have been well and good. She covered what is available, Biblically, to explain I Corinthians 11:1-16. Unfortunately, she goes on into unscriptural supposition in the next chapter.

¹² Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 38

¹³ Ibid

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 48

Chapter Six: Guardians of the Glory (pp. 55-79)

Here is where I begin to have serious doctrinal issues with this book. I am persuaded that the author has gone beyond the bounds of scripture into fantasy and fiction, created a doctrine that cannot be supported by scripture, and passed it along as ‘revelation’. As far as the Bible is concerned, this adding to the Word of God is just as wrong as taking away from it.

“The cherubim, one of the angelic orders, seem to be particularly assigned the responsibility of guarding the glory of God.”¹⁵ There is absolutely not one shred of Bible to support this claim. The three verses of scripture the author does give to support this do not what she claims they do, and here they are:

Psalms 80:1 Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock; thou that dwellest between the cherubims, shine forth.

Psalms 99:1 The LORD reigneth; let the people tremble: he sitteth between the cherubims; let the earth be moved.

Isaiah 37:16 O LORD of hosts, God of Israel, that dwellest between the cherubims, thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth: thou hast made heaven and earth.

These verses simply tell us where the children of Israel believed that Jehovah dwelt: between the cherubims, and this fits with the ark of the covenant, which had the mercy seat that was covered by the two cherubim.

It is true that Lucifer was the anointed cherub that covereth, but nowhere does the Bible tell us what it was exactly that he covered. It is the author’s opinion, not the scripture, which supposes that he was “set forth as the chief guardian of the glory of God”.¹⁶ Here begins the whole problem of creating doctrines that cannot be supported by the Word of God.

Yes, the Bible tells us what caused Lucifer to rebel against the Almighty God (see Ezekiel 28:17), but again, it does NOT say that he turned “traitor to the very glory that he was created to protect”¹⁷, for the Bible does NOT say Lucifer was created to be ‘guardian of the glory of God’, not anywhere in scripture. “Even to this day he tempts mankind, especially women, to do the same thing.”¹⁸ Again, another statement with no scriptural support. In fact, the Bible tells us, “But **every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed**. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bring it forth death. Do not

¹⁵ Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 55

¹⁶Ibid

¹⁷Ibid, p. 56

¹⁸Ibid

err, my beloved brethren. (James 1:14-16)". There is no Bible to back up the claim that the devil somehow tempts women more than he does men. Again, this is purely opinion, being put forth as doctrine.

"If the Lucifer spirit has taken up residence in our hearts, it will cause us to rebel."¹⁹ Actually, the Bible tells us that rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft (I Samuel 15:23), and that witchcraft is a work of the flesh (Galatians 5:19-21). Nowhere does the Bible mention a 'Lucifer spirit'.

"When a woman desires the things of the world, she can manipulate her husband to accept her desires for worldliness....Using her power of persuasion over her own husband, she bends him to her wishes...Like Adam, the man is placed in a difficult position; he must now choose between the will of God and the will of his wife."²⁰ First of all, if a woman is able to usurp authority over her husband, it is because the husband has allowed that to happen. Second, where in the Bible does it tell us that Adam had to choose between the will of God and the will of his wife?

In telling the story of the family who inquired about the church she and her husband were pasturing, the author makes this comment regarding the wife: "She forfeited the opportunity for salvation for herself and for her family..."²¹ Since the woman is not the head of the family, the man is, there is no logic to this statement. It is the man of the family, by not maintaining his rightful place, who bears the responsibility for his family not being saved, not the woman. The author also states that women who are under the influence of the 'spirit of vanity' (better known as the flesh), "...will sacrifice their family's chance for salvation..."²² Scripturally, this is incorrect.

The author continues in this vein of thinking in telling stories of women who corrupted their church. The problem, biblically, with these situations is that the men did not fulfill their roles as leaders. Had they done so, these tragic stories would not exist to be told.

And now, back to the doctrine of "the significance of the covering in connection with the glory of God."²³ The author again makes the claim, not founded in scripture, that, "Lucifer's main responsibility was as the covering cherub that guarded the glory of God."²⁴ She goes on to

¹⁹ Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 57

²⁰Ibid, p. 58

²¹Ibid, p. 61

²²Ibid

²³Ibid, p. 65

²⁴Ibid

further develop this thought. “When he was cast out, he lost his covering”.²⁵ Yet again, there is no scripture to support the statement. And, I would like to ask, how is it that Lucifer has gone from being the anointed cherub that covereth, to somehow having a covering? This is changing what the scripture says.

“God in his amazing and poetic nature delegated Lucifer’s lost estate to the woman.”²⁶ I am amazed at how far a person can go once they begin to make the Bible say things it doesn’t say. There is not one single speck of Bible to support such a preposterous, vain claim! The author of the book attempts to take I Corinthians 11:10 and 15 to make it all fit together, but in reality, she does damage to the Scripture.

Let us look at I Corinthians 11:10, in context:

*For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man. **For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels.** Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God. (I Corinthians 11:8-12)*

For what reason ought the woman to have power [translated from the Greek **exousia**, this word simply means *privilege*, i.e. (subj.) *Force, capacity, competency, freedom*, or (obj) *mastery*, (concrete *magistrate, superhuman, potentate, token of control*), delegated *influence*:- authority, jurisdiction, liberty, power, right, strength.]²⁷ on her head? In proper context, this verse is not saying women have some kind of special power on their heads, it shows that, by being in submission to the head that is over them - their husbands - this shows that they recognize the authority that is placed over them. The word for because, as in the phrase, “because of the angels”, comes from the Greek word **dia**, “a primary preposition denoting the *channel* of an act; *through* (in very wide applications, local, causal, or occasional):- after, always, among, act, to avoid, because of (that), briefly, by, for (cause) ...fore, from, in, by occasion of, of, by reason of, for sake, that, thereby, therefore, X though, through (-out), to, wherefore, with (-in). In composition it retains the same general import.”²⁸

And, let us do the same with I Corinthians 11:15.

Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered? Does not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering. (I Corinthians 11:13-15)

²⁵ Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 65

²⁶ Ibid

²⁷ Strong’s Comprehensive Concordance of the Bible

²⁸ Ibid

Again, context matters. A woman's hair is given to her for a covering that she might be in a proper relationship with her head, her husband, and thereby be able to pray and prophesy properly. There is no special angelic power given to women who do not cut their hair. To attempt to make the scripture say such is to put one's self in danger of wresting the scriptures to one's own destruction, as Peter warned us in II Peter 3:16.

"The enemy tempts women over and over to tamper with the covering because it symbolizes to him everything he has lost. When he sees as saint of God who is a guardian of the glory, he gnashes his teeth in frustration and anger".²⁹ Once more, a big statement with no scripture to support it.

"This is one of the sources of enmity that God declared would be between the woman and the serpent in Genesis 3:15."³⁰ Really? Let's see what Genesis 3:15 truly says, again, in context.

And the LORD God said unto the woman, what is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, the serpent beguiled me and I did eat.

And the LORD God said unto the serpent, because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life:

And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and now shalt thou bruise his heel. (Genesis 3:13-15)

Not one tiny little mention of Lucifer's 'lost glory', or 'the woman being given Lucifer's place', to be found in this passage of scripture.

"Women are now the 'Guardians of the Glory'."³¹ No scripture for this.

"The glory is not hers but is the glory of God residing upon her and in her life."³² Again, this is not what I Corinthians 11:15 teaches us; it simply tells us that if a woman has long hair, it is a glory **to her**, not the glory of God resting on her life. If this were true, then there are practicing witches who must have the glory of God resting in their lives, for they, too, have uncut hair. We understand that this is not true.

When discussing what a woman often does when she backslides, the author rightfully states that the hair is often the first to go, to be cut. "She removes the glory. She loses her covering like Lucifer lost his when he was cast out. No longer is she a guardian of the glory, for she has

²⁹ Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 65-66

³⁰Ibid, p. 66

³¹Ibid

³²Ibid

rebelled just like he did.”³³ Again, a repetition of the false doctrine of ‘guardians of the glory’.

“The only other place where you see these three components mentioned together - the covering, the angels, and the glory - is in the Ark of the Covenant.”³⁴ I would submit a simple revision to this statement, to say that the only place where you can see these three components mentioned together **in proper context** is in reference to the Ark of the Covenant.

“If ever the mercy seat, was removed from the Ark, the angels were removed with it. They were attached to the covering. The glory, mercy, and presence of God were removed as well, leaving only naked law, no mercy. To forfeit the covering was to forfeit divine protection!”³⁵ There is no Bible to support this theory, either.

“The woman’s hair is a type and shadow of the covering that Jesus provided for his church.” No Bible for this.

And now, for the numerous references to special, divine protection because of uncut hair.

“Herein lies a fantastic promise of protection not only for the woman but also for her family.”³⁶ The ‘fantastic promise of protection’ is thus far founded only on a very serious misuse and misapplication of Scripture. Thus, the promise is as valid as the foundation it is resting upon.

“When a woman cuts her hair, she actually severs the glory of God from her life. The angels will lift and depart, for they are committed to the glory. Where there is no glory, the angels are absent except for judgment.”³⁷ Again, a woman’s uncut hair is a glory to her, not the glory of God upon her life.

The author claims that, since our hair is ‘the glory of God’, rather than a glory to the woman as the Scripture teaches, that ‘glory’ is a protection for our backs, since God did not provide armor for our back in the list found in Ephesians 6.³⁸ This makes me wonder about the poor men who are commanded to cut their hair, does this leave them without a piece of armor that the women have ?

³³ Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 66

³⁴ Ibid

³⁵ Ibid, p. 67

³⁶ Ibid, p. 68

³⁷ Ibid

³⁸ Ibid

The author also incorrectly translates the phrase ‘keepers at home’ as “a guard, to beware.”³⁹ This comes from taking the definition of the second part of a compound word, and disregarding the first part of that compound word. The definition, from the Greek, is from a compounding of the Greek words for ‘home’, and ‘a guard’, meaning a *stayer at home*, i.e. *domestically inclined* (a good housekeeper):- keeper at home.⁴⁰ The author, from this improper base, then makes the following assertion: “Ladies, your job description involves more than housekeeping. You are to be a guard that will beware of any evil that would tried to come into your homes.”⁴¹ This is in opposition to the illustration used by Jesus in Matthew 24:43, “But know this, that if the goodman of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up.” Jesus said the man of the house, not the lady of the house, should have been watching to make sure the thief didn’t get in. I believe that the author of this book is wrongly teaching women that they have power and authority and responsibility that they in truth do NOT have, and, should they attempt to exercise this authority, they will be out of order so far as the Word of God is concerned.

Again, this phrase appears: “Your uncut hair brings protection to the entire family.”⁴² And again, there is not one tiny piece of scripture to support this fairy tale! This time this claim is followed by story of a preacher’s wife who cut her hair, and then her husband fell into adultery. “She opened her home for an invasion of the enemy because she lifted the covering through her disobedience. Before long her husband fell into adultery...”⁴³ Whether it was intended or not, the author gives the reader the direct impression that, had the woman not cut her hair, her husband would not have fallen into sin. This is unbiblical.

“Can our husbands’ hearts safely trust in us to guard the glory and to insure divine protection for our family...? What an awesome responsibility, yet what a tremendous privilege that God has entrusted to the woman...Do you dare forfeit divine protection...Can the Lord depend on you to guard the glory faithfully and diligently?”⁴⁴

This is an emotional appeal (from a woman)to emotional readers (women), founded completely on a misinterpretation of scripture. Believe it or not, such writings as these cause women to have a false sense of responsibility and pride, and to pass this along to other women as doctrine. This is a dangerous and wrong teaching that has done, and will continue to do, much damage to those who are deceived thereby.

³⁹ Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 69

⁴⁰ Strong’s Comprehensive Concordance of the Bible

⁴¹ Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 69

⁴² Ibid

⁴³ Ibid

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 70

“We have been afforded the privilege of angelic protection and also a special place of ministry in God’s kingdom.”⁴⁵ This idea of ‘a special place of ministry in God’s kingdom’ is nothing more than pride. Jesus said, “*And whomsoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many. (Matthew 20:27-28)*”

“What a comfort it is to know that the angels of the Lord are encamping around about our families, diligently on guard against any intrusion of the enemy forces.”⁴⁶ This, just as it is stated, is true and can be supported scripturally. Why? Because the Bible DOES say, “*The angel of the LORD encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them. (Psalms 34:7)*” We ought not to attempt to make the Bible say more than it does say. “*Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar. (Proverbs 30:5-6)*”

The author mentions ‘praying the armor of God’ on her children. However, I cannot find Bible to support this, either. In speaking of the armor of God, the Bible gives us this instruction: “*Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand (Ephesians 6:13)* .” I don’t find in this text anywhere that we can ‘pray the armor of God’ on somebody else.

Again, the author references “this wondrously important duty that God has entrusted in her hands”, and warns women not to “make the same mistake Eve did and to allow the enemy to make inroads into their families.”⁴⁷ This is contrary to the teaching of the scripture which places the responsibility for the spiritual welfare of the family upon the man, not the woman.

“Only eternity will reveal how many times your family was protected because of this promise of power on your head .”⁴⁸ What promise?

“She reminded God of how a scissors had never touched her hair. She prayed the promise of I Corinthians 11:10 and claimed the power that was available to her because of the angels.”⁴⁹ I Corinthians 11:10 merely says, “For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels.” There is no promise of divine protection in this verse. It is in the statement of a woman being under the authority of her head, her husband, when it is properly read in context.

⁴⁵ Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 71

⁴⁶Ibid, p. 72

⁴⁷Ibid

⁴⁸Ibid, p. 73

⁴⁹Ibid

In response to the stories used as examples of the author of miraculous power through uncut hair, I ask, what of all those women who have never cut their hair, yet bad things do happen to them and/or their families? Where did the promise that is declared to be in I Corinthians 11:10 go?

As to the cherubims, yes, they are as described in Ezekiel 10:12. However, they are not called ‘special guardian angels’⁵⁰ anywhere in the Bible. In fact, the word for ‘cherubim’ in this verse and the word for ‘angel’ in Psalm 34:7 are two different Hebrew words. The Hebrew word for ‘cherubim’ is **keruwab**, while the Hebrew word for ‘angel’ is **mal’ak**.

“God is coming back for a glorious church which has not severed the glory from her head but has maintained diligent protection of it.”⁵¹ Really? That doesn’t match what the apostle Paul told the Ephesian church: *“That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish . (Ephesians 5:27)”*

“If we stay on the pathway of righteousness and allow the Word of God to continue to shine the spotlight of truth upon our motives, we will be kept from the spirit of vanity and strong delusion.”⁵² I humbly submit to the author that she can follow her own counsel and allow the spotlight of truth of the Word of God to shine on her teachings, so that she will not become a tool in the hands of the enemy, causing herself and her followers to become as described in this scripture:

Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen ,vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, And not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. (Colossians 2:18-19)

The Head that we should be focused on is not ours, not our hair, but Jesus! It is from HIM, not us, that nourishment is ministered to the body whereby it increases with the increase of God.

On page 78, the author equates uncut hair with our spiritual inheritance. This is false teaching. The Bible tells us that our inheritance is “incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you (I Peter 1:4).” I don’t know about anybody else, but my hair is currently on my head (my husband’s hair is currently in transit), not reserved in heaven for me, and it gets dirty and tangled, and even fades if I am out in the sun too long without a hat.

This whole created doctrine of ‘guardians of the glory’ is, in my opinion, nigh to idolatry. It wrongly tells women that they have special power if they don’t cut their hair, that their uncut hair brings special protection to them and their family, that it gives them a special place in ministry, and that it gives them the position before God’s throne that Lucifer once held. It creates a sense

⁵⁰ Rieder, Ruth. Power Before the Throne, c. 1999. Morris Publishing, Kearney, NE. p. 75

⁵¹Ibid, p. 77

⁵²Ibid

of spiritual pride and superiority, and does damage to the true teaching of the Bible regarding authority, headship, the leadership of the home and family. Plainly put, to believe this doctrine is to do damage to other parts of scripture.

I believe the words of the apostle Peter sum it up well:

Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. (2 Peter 1:20)

As for ‘power before the throne’, there is no such phrase to be found in scripture. Rather, I find this:

Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities ; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need. (Hebrews 4:14-16)

May our focus be on Jesus, our Righteousness, and not on ourselves!