Article is disappointing

Erwin Gane’s article “Within the Veil: Where Did Christ Go?” (December, 1983) has caused considerable discussion and disappointment among several pastors in this area. Our questions are not so much whether Dr. Gane is correct, but rather (1) What purpose does such an article serve at this time of controversy about this subject? and (2) Shouldn’t the author have been allowed to write more fully (a series, perhaps), using more quotations and Bible texts that would have lessened the chance of being misunderstood?—John Milton, Rainier, Washington.

I could never accept the speculative conclusions of men who assume knowledge received from the Holy Spirit that contradicts the inspired word of the Spirit of Prophecy. I thank God for the courteous and elucidating alternatives so revealingly outlined by Erwin Gane. It is clear to me that sinful priests had to be restricted by a visible veil, and even the high priest had to go through an elaborate cleansing ritual on the Day of Atonement before entering the Most Holy Place. Christ, the Sinless One, however, needed no such restrictions and could therefore move freely in any area of the heavenly sanctuary. No veil had to be torn apart in heaven for Him to approach His Father. Thus at the proper time the mediatorial work of the first apartment merged into the cleansing work of the Second.—Arthur A. Ward, Bowie, Maryland.

I believe Gane shows distorted thinking in his December article. He states that a single text may have two different meanings. I agree, but these must not be contradictory one to the other. I am concerned that you would publish such an article that is in conflict with the Bible and with what Ellen White has written.—Earl C. Mercill, Hayfork, California.

Leadership in crisis

“Leadership in Crisis” (December, 1983), by Gordon Bietz, had three pages of problems but no specific answers. That leadership has problems is clear. But is our crisis one of leadership or one of surrender? Continuous philosophizing and discussion of problems, analyzing and refining them, tends to stop when surrender to unchanging truth begins. Problems? Yes. But please, let’s have some specific answers from the Bible.—Pierre Moreaux, Cleveland, Tennessee.

Bietz’s “Viewpoint” article greatly appealed to me. It seems to me that our church often reacts too vigorously to attacks, thus betraying an uncomfortable insecurity. A secure person (or organization) can take a great deal of criticism with equanimity and continue his work without suddenly forsaking it to defend his attacked teachings. The person who continuously reacts does not control his own thoughts and actions; he is the victim of someone else’s thinking and doing. I like Nehemiah’s answer to those who tried to divert him: “I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down: why should the work cease, whilst I leave it, and come down to you?” (Neh. 6:3).—A. V. Wallenkampf, Adelphi, Maryland.

“Leadership in Crisis” was thought-provoking. We really do have a tendency to be overcritical of one another. I hope future articles of this sort will recognize that the “power of love” rather than the “love of power” will cause the inroads of doubt and lack of confidence in leadership to diminish.—C. M. Crawford, Ukiah, California.

Thank you for Gordon Bietz’s “Leadership in Crisis.” It was thoughtful, balanced, sensitive, and best of all, it offered a way out for those who, like the author, have a truly pastoral—as contrasted with a political—spirit. My only disappointment was to see this superb essay prefaced with the caveat “The ideas expressed in this feature . . . do not necessarily reflect the position of the Seventh-day Adventist Church or the opinions of the MINISTRY staff.” I hope the same caveat applied equally to several debatable theses propounded elsewhere in that same issue. In any case, I cast my vote in favor of Bietz’s vision of growth (and thus change) in unity.—Lawrence T. Geraty, Berrien Springs, Michigan.

The “caveat” referred to is a standing paragraph that accompanies each Viewpoint feature.—Editors.

I greatly appreciated Gordon Bietz’s thoughts on a vital area of our church life and organization. I am wondering, however, if it is ever wise, appropriate, or even necessary for us, as undershepherds of Christ, to “speak in public on controversial issues” or “to preach on sensitive subjects.” I believe we should enjoy academic freedom. But I’m personally persuaded that we should be so Spirit-led that our total ministry will be a “savour of life unto life” to those to whom we minister.—Carl R. Holden, Yellville, Arkansas.

Gordon Bietz’s points about reactions to modern church critics are well taken. He suggests that Satan’s purposes may be better served by those who try to identify the “good guys” and the “bad guys” more than by those who may have wrong theological conceptions. Administrators ought not to take professional critics too seriously. They pose as watchmen on the walls of Zion, crying aloud and showing God’s people their sins. But not everyone with a tape recorder and printing press is a true witness. The purpose of Christ is to unite and gather, not scatter and divide.—Ralph E. Neall, Lincoln, Nebraska.

I don’t believe that the general church membership is in the state of paranoia over theological discussions described by Gordon Bietz. He seems to imply that the average member is not capable of studying and making reasonable decisions regarding different theological positions. As I see it, paranoia is not our major problem, but rather a group of
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One Thousand Days of Reaping: the midpoint

During the first year of the One Thousand Days of Reaping, an average of 1,032 persons per day have united with the church! Now that the midpoint in time has been reached, the world director of this priority thrust for evangelism reviews what has happened since the program began and looks ahead to its conclusion and beyond. “Soul winning,” he says, “is dependent upon divine agencies and must ever remain in first place on the church’s agenda.”

By W. B. Quigley

On January 30, 1984, the One Thousand Days of Reaping program of the world church reached its midpoint and looked ahead to the final 500 days! Assuming that you are reading this April issue on April 15, 576 of the one thousand days will have passed, and 424 will remain. What has happened in the world field since the One Thousand Days of Reaping began September 18, 1982?

First, let’s review the decision to launch this program. At the 1981 Annual Council, Elder Neal C. Wilson presented to the delegates a document titled “Prioritizing Evangelism—One Thousand Days of Reaping.” It expressed a renewal of leadership’s earnest desire to see spiritual revival and a speedy finishing of God’s work on earth. It emphasized the church’s great need to give priority to evangelism in all that it does. The Council accepted the plan outlined in that document, and the delegates committed themselves anew to these priorities. As a result, the Council voted to do the following specific things:

1. To launch out in an unprecedented worldwide soul-winning thrust, placing unquestioned priority on evangelism in all forms and at all levels. The prophetic utterance that “more than one thousand will soon be converted in one day” (Review and Herald, Nov. 10, 1885) was accepted as a challenge, and the one thousand days preceding the June, 1985, General Conference session was dedicated to winning one million new members. The church was then realizing accessions at the rate of more than eight hundred per day, so a thousand per day seemed to be an acceptable goal.

2. To conduct an evangelism program on the first Sabbath of the 1985 General Conference session in New Orleans with reports of soul-winning victories from all divisions.

3. To call for intensified prayer, Bible study, and witness that would unite all workers and lay leaders in seeking and receiving the outpouring of the Spirit of God.

4. To emphasize the need for all soul winners to increase the thoroughness of their work in preparing people to be members of God’s remnant church. It is futile to win souls to the church in a shallow, superficial way, without deep conversion and commitment, only to have them go out the back door.

5. To encourage all ministers not only to be personally engaged in soul winning but to train lay persons and lead all employees of the church into such service. The departments should provide soul-winning materials and expertise in their various specialties.

6. To revitalize the Prayer Offensive voted at the 1980 Annual Council, and to give emphasis to entering all unentered territories.

7. To appoint a director in each...
We have every confidence that the goal of one million souls will be realized. Some are asking, "What then?" Will we rejoice that one million souls have been won, and then go back to business as usual?

Evangelism is the result of God's Spirit moving on concerned members and leaders; it is the very element of church life that will revitalize God's people and hasten the coming of Jesus.

As the church now moves through the final 424 days of the One Thousand Days of Reaping, we have every confidence that the goal of one million souls will be realized. Some are asking, "What then?" As we assemble at New Orleans in 1985 will we rejoice that one million souls have been won, and then go back to business as usual? A partial answer is provided by the action taken at the 1983 Annual Council. (See box, p. 6.) In this document, the General Conference officers have appointed a special study commission with the responsibility to formulate a plan for worldwide evangelism during the quinquennium 1985 to 1990. (See recommendation 6.)

We are experiencing but the very first droplets of an evangelistic surge that must occur for God's work to be finished.
The One Thousand Days of Reaping is to be but the initial training discipline for the church to march on to the finishing of the work of God on earth. . . . the coming of Jesus is long, long overdue.

finishing of the work and the coming of Jesus are long, long overdue! Now is the time to let the church fully gird on its armor and go forward to enlighten the ever-expanding population of this world! Perhaps the commission will envision an objective for God’s last-day church that will be possible only under the unction of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in latter-rain power!

The document emphasizes intercessory prayer as the key to success in both spiritual renewal and soul winning. There is no evangelistic method that can exceed the power of prayer. The reason is that the very thing we would pray for, the conversion of a soul to Christ, is a miracle! It is an event that only Heaven can arrange, a birth that only God can deliver. Evangelism, therefore, is wholly dependent upon divine agencies, and these cooperate with us when we pray. The evangelist, no matter how eloquent, skilled, or well-endowed with money and equipment, can only speak the words that make people think and reason. They can be words of truth, even words directly from Scripture and the sayings of Jesus, but for them to bring conviction and reach the conscience, the Holy Spirit must silently influence those to whom he speaks and for whom we pray. Jesus “saw the multitudes” (Matt. 9:36), and His heart of love was stirred because they had no spiritual leadership. In the midst of a bountiful harvest waiting to be reaped, laborers were scarce. His counsel was to pray that more harvesters might be sent. Today we must receive that spiritual renewal to sense our duty to the world, thatunction to lay aside the chains that bind us, and finally, that power of the Holy Spirit to bring men and women to the foot of the cross.

Another emphasis of the document is “example leadership.” This calls for every leader of the church—in spite of the fact that he or she may have been assigned an office job or an administrative post—to go forth and do the work of ministry. If leaders throughout the length and breadth of the church would give their highest talents to evangelism—the church’s first work and the only reason for which it exists—Heaven would hesitate no longer to empower these sincere workers with the outpouring of the Spirit in limitless measure! This is the basic mission of the church—evangelism “in all forms and at all levels.” It must be item number one on the church’s agenda.

The One Thousand Days of Reaping challenges the church to give “unquestioned priority to evangelism.” The church’s world president, Elder Neal C. Wilson, has said in his challenge to God’s leaders (MINISTRY, April, 1982): “We are often guilty of caring for the urgent, but we fail to give emphasis to the important! The winning of souls in these last days is a challenge that has both qualities. It is the most important function of the church, and the most urgent. . . .

“And so, fellow evangelist, pastor, administrator, the challenge is for us to put first things first. . . . Perhaps this will require much faith and even tortuous struggle in some cases. Let us emancipate ourselves, even if it means entrusting to God and others some of those things that formerly consumed so much of our time and effort! And let us go forth with sanctified resolve to give priority to the work of soul winning. As God’s workers ‘at all levels’ respond to and do this, God’s church will prosper, His unimpeachable purpose for us will be fulfilled, we will experience revival, God’s work will be finished, and we will know, as we have never known before, the fulness of His blessing!”

One Thousand Days of Reaping

As we have gathered for this 1983 Annual Council, 383 days of the 1000 Days of Reaping have passed; 617 remain. And, praise to God, He has not failed His people! As workers and members in many lands of earth have claimed Christ’s promise, “Ye shall receive power . . . and ye shall be witnesses” (Acts 1:8), they have felt His enabling power and have already experienced great success.

As this Council convenes, four quarters, or one full year, of the 1000 Days of Reaping have been concluded. Tonight we can rejoice that as of September 30, an estimated 370,000 precious souls have joined God’s prophetic movement. This represents the largest number of souls ever gathered into the church in any four quarters. As our Intercessory Prayer Objective becomes a part of our lives, and as the Holy Spirit moves upon every entity in the church, it appears we will, by His grace, exceed the projected goal of one million new members!

As delegates to this Annual Council, we praise God for His blessings received, and we renew our commitment and determination to pursue the twofold objective of spiritual renewal and unprecedented priority for evangelism. We beseech our heavenly Father for the power and inspiration to lead our people and our workers into the achievement of these goals. We, therefore, hold before the world church the following recom-
We know our preaching should be Biblical—but how can we best use the Bible in our sermons? The author suggests ways in which the Bible can shape our sermons, nurturing our congregations with God’s thoughts and not merely our own. He calls for a balance in using both the Old and New Testaments, and indicates both the preparation and sermon types most fruitful with each.

Toward Better Preaching □ 4  William G. Johnsson

Those of us who have been preaching for years will realize the truth of this analysis. At the same time we can recall how we have sought to bring Scripture to bear on our presentations—whether we were sharing our experience or addressing a perceived need. We remember searching for the most appropriate passage, mentally turning the pages of the Bible as we reviewed its stories, cast of characters, and arguments in an endeavor to be true to our commission to preach the Word.

Such effort, at times to the point of wrestling with the text, is always well directed. For Biblical preaching—preaching that makes the Word itself the controlling center of the presentation—has built-in advantages.

Both preacher and hearers stand to benefit from Biblical preaching. He who preaches a Biblical sermon opens the door wider to the possibility that God’s thoughts, rather than his own, will be conveyed and that, through the miracle of the Spirit, the centuries will be bridged allowing the ancient Word to whisper in contemporary tones. The text itself also helps to organize and shape the content; the preacher’s role is that of one who carries and presents the sacred fire from afar, rather than one who strikes the flint to ignite it.

Biblical preaching also nurtures the congregation. The passage or passages under study focus the attention and aid in the understanding of the sermon and its development. These passages enhance recall of the sermon’s message as church members come around to them again in their own reading and study. That is, the Word provides a network of associations for Christians into which sermons may naturally be integrated.

How to bring the ancient Word to life—that is the task of Biblical preaching. How to make it live in the experience of preacher and congregation, addressing their problems and calling them heavenward, avoiding making the sermon merely a Bible study, a lecture on the Bible, or an exposition—this is the challenge of Biblical preaching.

Preaching is an art, and so every preacher will have his own approach to Biblical preaching. As I share with you my ideas, I will deal with the Old Testament separate from the New Testament. I will do so because, while many observations are true of Biblical preaching in general, the Old Testament usually is underutilized. For various reasons it intimidates preachers, with the result that rich veins of the Word remain unmined.

I have preached several times on “What God Requires,” Micah 6:8 forms the basis of the sermon: “He has showed you, O man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?” (R.S.V.).”

Notice how verses 6 and 7 provide the setting, however. The question posed is as old as human striving after the eternal: “With what shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before God on high?” (verse 6, R.S.V.). What, after all, does God expect of me? What can I do to please Him? Isn’t this question still a live one?

Think of the answers given in various times and places. Think of the outpour-
The preacher who draws only upon the New Testament will be weak in social ethics. The New Testament emphasizes individual life; the Old Testament tilts toward the concerns of the community.

But Micah is ablaze with indignation against rapacious landlords, venal priests, and corrupt prophets. He calls the nation back to moral living because Yahweh is moral Arbiter of the universe and will not permit oppression and greed to go unnoticed or unpunished.

The preacher who draws only upon the New Testament, important as it is, will be weak in social ethics. For various reasons the New Testament emphasizes individual rather than corporate life; the Old Testament, however, tilts toward the concerns of the community. Together, the two provide balance; isolated, they lean to one-sided treatment.

Because the Old Testament tends to be neglected, however, preaching from it calls for particular preparation:

1. The preacher cannot assume a general familiarity with the material on the part of the congregation. Take the book of Micah, for instance. In preaching on "What God Requires," he should not simply jump into chapter 6, verses 6 to 8. He needs to help listeners find the passage in their Bibles and to adjust mentally to swimming in strange waters. For many people the unfamiliar is uncomfortable, if not threatening.

2. Considerations of context are even more important. I have in mind not only the immediate setting of the passage (in the case of "What God Requires," Micah 6:6-8) but also the questions of the introduction of the book itself. When was it written? By whom? For what audience? With what purpose in mind? Against what historical and social background?

In preparing to preach, the minister must refresh his knowledge in these areas. But for him who makes the effort, taking seriously the commission to preach the Word—all of it—the rewards are great. The clarity of moral insight, the directness of appeal, the overpowering sense of Yahweh as Lord of history and Lord of His people—these are fire in the bones of the preacher.

The richness of the Old Testament literature lends itself to a variety of sermon types. I have shown already how particular passages lend themselves to exposition and application in a relatively straightforward manner. The Psalms, of course, are especially rich in material; they echo the words of Jesus regarding the greatest commandment in the law (Matt. 22:35-40). Elaborating each forms the major part of the sermon.

This passage and its development for preaching illustrate several features of preaching from the Old Testament.

We see first the wealth of the Old Testament as a sermon resource. The Old Testament is studded with such passages as Micah 6:8—passages that lend themselves to exposition and application in a relatively straightforward manner. Together these three characteristics of the life, pleasing to God, form a trilogy that echoes the words of Jesus regarding the greatest commandment in the law.
Because of the variety of Old Testament literature, topical sermons based on this material are awkward. With the New Testament the way is open for topical approaches as well as expository ones.

not. Among others, I have preached on Jeremiah, God’s revolutionary. This reluctant prophet, rejected and killed by his own people but later venerated and to whom Jesus was likened, is remarkably frank in sharing with us his flights of feeling. He was a revolutionary for God—a person socially, politically, spiritually far ahead of his times.

How about a narrative sermon? Again the Old Testament abounds in stories. We all know the tales of David, Saul, and Goliath; of Abraham and Isaac; of Daniel and his three friends. These stories sustained the people of God anciently, were grist for the spiritual mill of the New Testament, and still may speak to believers in these times.

But there are many others. He who takes time to read the Old Testament on a recurring basis will find treasures, new and old, to be brought out of the storehouse and polished for display. Recently I preached for the first time on “The Lord Our Banner,” based on the story of Exodus 17:8-16. I showed how the elements of desperate need, human weakness, and divine power, structure the passage. It’s not difficult to point to the contemporary nature of these elements! Read the passage and see what you might do with it.

Then, of course, the Old Testament provides splendid opportunity for sermon series, if you care for them. “Preaching From the Prophets” (see how knowledge of and enthusiasm for the minor prophets will be sparked), “Jesus in the Old Testament,” “God in History,” “The Paradox of Pain” (on the book of Job)—the possibilities are immense.

Although in this article I have given more attention to the Old Testament than the New, I by no means wish to downplay the latter. I have placed the emphasis on the Old because it is the neglected area, not because it is more important than the New.

The New Testament, however, is the source of most Biblical preaching and should continue to be so. Without the New Testament, the Old is moving without arriving, promising but never realizing, hoping but never achieving. One God and one faith run throughout the Scriptures, but they reach their denouement in Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh.

Obviously, the remarks above about preparing to preach from the Old Testament apply also to the New. Familiarizing the congregation with the material (increasingly necessary, with the diminution in Bible knowledge), considerations of immediate and larger context, use of homiletical and scholarly “tools”—all are necessary, if not quite to the same extent.

Likewise a variety of sermon types can be found: preaching from individual passages, preaching from chapters, preaching from books, biographies, narratives, series.

In three respects the New Testament offers possibilities of a distinct nature, however: in its portrayal of Jesus Christ, its greater accessibility for Biblical sermons of a topical nature, and its unique material.

Although Jesus is prefigured in the Old Testament, He is seen in His matchless charms only in the New. Because of this, sermons drawn from the New Testament find their center in His life and teachings with a clarity and directness that preaching from the Old Testament cannot provide. His person dominates the New Testament, so that all other biography is diminished and inevitably is developed in relation to Him, for example, a sermon based on the life of Peter does not deal with Peter per se, but rather with Peter in relation to Jesus.

The Carpenter-Teacher from Nazareth had a profound impact on the people of His day. Throughout the centuries this solitary figure whose brief career was cut short at high noon has disturbed the peace of men and women as they have pondered His claims, His life, and His death. And still today His question “But who do you say I am?” comes with surprising confrontational thrust. It is altogether fitting that Christian preaching continue to proclaim His person and work. Indeed, what is preaching if not this?

Because of the variety of Old Testament literature, written over a span of 1,000 years and requiring more attention to the background of each passage, topical sermons based on this material are awkward. Biblical preaching from the Old Testament best proceeds from the exposition of a particular passage, chapter, or book. With the New Testament the way is open for topical approaches as well as expository ones, however. The list of possible subjects is long: grace, faith, hope, the fruit of the Spirit, the gifts of the Spirit, Christian growth (2 Peter 1:5-7), and so on.

Finally, the New Testament contains unique material that may furnish splendid Biblical sermons. Take the parables of Jesus. These stories upset human logic and expectation, turning the tables on society and the ways of the world as they illustrate the nature of the kingdom of heaven with urgency and directness. Transposed to modern settings they still present Jesus’ teachings with incisiveness. They can be preached singly or in a series. Likewise such resources as the Beatitudes, or the “I am” sayings of the Gospel of John, or the seven “words” from the Cross should not be neglected.

Sometimes young ministers worry that they can’t find anything to preach about. The answer is: Preacher, open your eyes! Open your eyes and see the needs of your people. Get close to them and find where they are hurting. Open your eyes and read the newspaper. Find out what life is about in this late-twentieth-century world of ours. And especially open your eyes and read the Word. Read it daily, absorbing its information, letting its philosophy seep into your being.

He whose eyes are open will never lack subjects for sermons. He will not have to seek them, they will present themselves to him from a hundred sources. And he whose life is nurtured from the Bible, constantly imbibing its goodness, will qualify himself to be the man of Paul’s admonition, a preacher of the Word.

Typology and the Levitical system—2

The author concludes his two-part series with this article. In it he deals with the questions as to whether there is a basic continuity between sanctuary type and antitype, and what role Hebrews plays in interpreting the Old Testament sanctuary. Is Hebrews the only New Testament interpretation of the sanctuary and its services and must it be regarded as the only and ultimate norm in interpreting them?

The Called Church □ 8 Richard M. Davidson

What is the nature of Biblical typology in general and sanctuary typology in particular? Does the traditional view of typology adopted by Seventh-day Adventists in their interpretation of the Levitical institutions stand the test of sola Scriptura? These are the hermeneutical questions that occupied our attention in a preceding article.¹

Biblical typology has its roots in the Greek technical term typos, which etymologically means “form,” probably originally a “hollow form” or “mold.”² The characteristics of typos in its original (and continued) denotation of “hollow mold” are strikingly suited to illustrate the dynamics of Biblical typology. For example, our family has a soft plastic mold for producing penguin-shaped ice sculptures. When we wish to add a festive touch to our punch at social get-togethers, we fill the hollow, penguin-shaped mold with distilled water, suspend it overnight in the freezer, then peel back the plastic mold, and there is a gleaming white penguin ice sculpture for a centerpiece in the punch bowl. Now note how the five essential features of our hollow mold (a typos) illustrate the basic aspects of Biblical typology.

First, a penguin typos, or hollow mold, is a concrete reality, not just an abstract idea. Likewise, a Biblical type is a concrete historical reality—a person, event, or institution.

Secondly, the hollow mold is not itself the original but has been shaped from a prototype which existed previously, either concretely or in the mind of the designer. So the Biblical type has been “shaped” according to a previous divine design—existing either concretely, as with the heavenly sanctuary original, or in the mind of the Designer, as with the Old Testament historical types.

Thirdly, my hollow plastic penguin functions as a mold to shape the end product, that is, the ice sculpture. So in Biblical typology the Old Testament type serves to “shape” the end or eschatological product (the New Testament antitype or “antitype”).

Fourthly, the end product (the ice sculpture) invariably conforms to the basic contours of the hollow penguin mold. Likewise in Biblical typology the eschatological fulfillment, the antitype, conforms to the basic contours of the Old Testament type.

Finally, the end product (the ice sculpture) transcends the mold and fulfills the purpose for which the mold was designed. In the same way the New Testament antitype transcends the Old Testament type as it fulfills the ultimate eschatological purpose for which the type was intended.

The historical Adventist understanding of the nature of sanctuary

Richard M. Davidson, Th.D., is assistant professor of Old Testament at the SDA Theological Seminary, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan.
The very fact of differences in the two Old Testament sanctuaries seems to provide an Old Testament indication of what constitutes the essential features—those contours that remain constant in both.

typology harmonizes fully with just such a Biblical view of typology. Building upon this basic Biblical perspective, let's now focus on the use of sanctuary typology in the book of Hebrews—perhaps the most crucial cluster of issues involved in the typological understanding of the Levitical system. Seventh-day Adventists have traditionally maintained that a basic continuity exists between Leviticus and Hebrews, between the essential contours of the Old Testament sanctuary type and New Testament antitype. If so, the earthly sanctuary, with its apartments and services, clarifies the essential features of the heavenly sanctuary. Recently, however, scholars both within and without Adventism have seriously challenged this position. They have argued that the author of Hebrews, because of his frequently "manipulating the type to fit the antitype," has virtually collapsed the continuity between the two and thus rendered illegitimate any argument from earthly sanctuary type to heavenly sanctuary antitype.

The issues are indeed complex and require more than cursory treatment. But I have become convinced that one is not forced to choose between the typology of Leviticus and that of Hebrews. A careful look at Hebrews reveals that its typology is consistent with the nature of typology elsewhere in Scripture and maintains a continuity between the basic contours of Old Testament type and New Testament antitype.

The author of Hebrews frequently argues from Old Testament type to New Testament antitype to prove doctrine, and this approach is what recent detractors from historical Adventist typological method consider to be illegitimate. For example, in Hebrews 9:23 the teaching regarding the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is based solely upon a typological argument. Because the earthly sanctuary was cleansed, so it was "necessary" (anagke) with the heavenly. Hebrews 8:1-5 uses the same approach, arguing from the sacrifices by the Old Testament Levitical priests to the necessity (anagkaios, chap. 8:3) of a sacrifice by the New Testament heavenly High Priest.

The use of the terms types and antitypes in Hebrews 8:5 and 9:24 respectively makes it clear that the author of Hebrews conceives of a continuity between the basic contours of the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries. The word antitypes means "that which corresponds to the types." As with the penguin types and the ice sculpture antitypes, so with the terminology used in a technical sense in Biblical typology: there is a continuity of basic contours between type and antitype.

In Hebrews this continuity is further underscored by reversing the ordinary typological terminology used elsewhere in Scripture. We have earlier used the phrase "argues from Old Testament type to New Testament antitype," and it probably is best to maintain this common use of terms in Biblical typology. But to be more precise, in Hebrews the Old Testament earthly sanctuary is labeled the "antitype" (antitypos, chap. 9:24) and the heavenly reality is referred to as the "type" (typos, chap. 8:5). This is because the Old Testament earthly sanctuary not only points forward to a future heavenly reality but also points upward to the already existing heavenly reality. The earthly is therefore the antitypes, "that which corresponds to the [previously existing] type." So, to those who would insist that one must not argue from type to antitype, but only from antitype to type, it should be pointed out that such is precisely what the author of Hebrews is doing when he argues from the earthly (antitype) to the heavenly (type).

In Hebrews the earthly sanctuary is also called a "copy" (hypodeigma) and "shadow" (skia) of the heavenly sanctuary (verse 5). Obviously this involves an intensification between earthly copy/shadow and heavenly original/true. But just as clearly these word pairs at the same time indicate a continuity of basic contours. A "copy" corresponds to its "original," and a "shadow" reveals the basic contours of its "substance."

Recent detractors from the historical Adventist sanctuary interpretation argue against such a basic continuity by pointing out the differences between the Mosaic tabernacle and the Solomonic Temple, which were both built according to divinely provided patterns. But such argument can be turned on its head, because the very fact of differences in the two Old Testament sanctuaries seems to provide an Old Testament indication of what in fact constitutes the essential features—those contours that remain constant in both. Although there might have been differences in size, types of material used, and numbers of articles of furniture, the basic design of the two sanctuaries (Mosaic and Solomonic) remained the same—the two apartments, the same dimensional proportions, and the same kinds of articles of furniture. It is precisely this basic design that is described in Hebrews 9:1-5.

But the next crucial question is this: Are there not clear deviations from the Old Testament type in Hebrews? Several passages are frequently cited: Hebrews 7:11-28; 8:1-13; 10:1-14. In these passages we do, indeed, find points of stark contrast between type and antitype. The Old Testament priest was (a) mortal, (b) sinful, and (c) from the tribe of Levi; the heavenly High Priest is (a) eternal, (b) sinless, and (c) after the order of Melchizedek. The Levitical sacrifices (a) were ineffective, (b) were offered repeatedly, and (c) involved the blood of animals. The antitypical Sacrifice (a) was efficacious, (b) was offered once for all, and (c) involved the High Priest offering His own blood. The first covenant is contrasted to the new covenant, which was based upon better promises. And finally, the earthly sanctuary is a copy/shadow and the heavenly is the original/true.

How can the author of Hebrews posit such deviations between Old Testament "type" and New Testament "antitype" and still maintain a fundamental continuity between the two? The answer is at once simple and striking: in each of the passages cited above the author of Hebrews introduces a departure from the Levitical type, but he substantiates such a
In these changes from Leviticus to Hebrews the author of Hebrews provides a "sound piece of exegesis" of Old Testament control passages to demonstrate the "self-confessed inadequacy of the old order."

change from the Old Testament itself! Thus Christ's priesthood does, indeed, differ in essential features from the Aaronic priesthood, but the author of Hebrews shows how these differences are already indicated in Psalm 110. To be sure, Christ's sacrifice differs from the animal sacrifices of the Old Testament ritual service, but this alteration of the type is already set forth in Psalm 40. Again the new covenant does contain better promises than the old, but these are already pointed out in Jeremiah 31. And finally, the heavenly sanctuary is indeed the "greater and more perfect tabernacle," but this is already indicated in Exodus 25:40. In each of these changes from Leviticus to Hebrews, the author of Hebrews does not engage in an arbitrary "manipulation of the Old Testament type," but provides a "sound piece of exegesis" of Old Testament control passages in order to demonstrate the "self-confessed inadequacy of the old order."

Thus the author of Hebrews does not collapse the continuity between type and antitype. To the contrary, he so highly regards this continuity that wherever the New Testament antitype moves beyond intensification to an actual modification of the Old Testament type, he feels constrained to demonstrate that such an alteration is already indicated in the Old Testament.

Do we find this same high regard for the continuity between type and antitype when we move from Hebrews 7, 8, and 10 to the much debated passage of Hebrews 9:1-9? Some recent commentaries insist that in Hebrews 9 the author of Hebrews deliberately deviates from the earthly type (the bipartite sanctuary) in his description of the heavenly sanctuary. This interpretation focuses in particular upon verse 8 and concludes that here the earthly holy place stands for the entire Old Testament order, and the earthly Most Holy Place corresponds to the New Testament heavenly sanctuary.

While it is not possible to provide here a detailed analysis of Hebrews 9, I am convinced that significant contextual and exegetical considerations make such an interpretation untenable. First of all, we should note that Hebrews 9, unlike Hebrews 7, 8, and 10, gives no Old Testament citation to substantiate a deviation from type to antitype. We should not press the argument of consistency unduly, but certainly it should caution us against too easily positing radical deviations between the earthly sanctuary and the heavenly when the passage sets forth no Old Testament evidence to indicate such changes.

A number of recent studies, persuasively arguing that the larger context of this passage reveals a comparison between old and new covenants, make the point that each of these covenants has a sanctuary. Thus Hebrews 9 compares the whole bipartite earthly sanctuary of the first covenant—which is a parabolē standing for the Mosaic system—and the whole heavenly sanctuary of the new covenant, "the greater and more perfect tabernacle" than the earthly copy. Verses 1-7 constitute a description of the former, or earthly, sanctuary (prōtē skēnē), and then verse 8 moves away from the earthly sanctuary to introduce the heavenly sanctuary (tōn hagion).

The words prōtē skēnē in verse 8 should be understood, then, in the temporal sense of "former [earthly] sanctuary" (as prōtē ["former"] is used in verse 1), and not as continuing the spatial meaning of "first sanctuary" or apartment (i.e., the holy place), as in verses 2 and 6. Thus the author employs a chiasitic literary pattern of A:B:B:A to bring the reader back to the main point introduced in verse 1.

Perhaps the most weighty consideration in support of the contextual, structural, and linguistic points just mentioned is the nature of Biblical typology. Those who argue for a disparity between type and antitype in this passage generally consider the word parabolē in Hebrews 9:9 as a synonym for typos, referring to typology. They see a typological relationship between the earthly holy place and the whole Old Testament Mosaic order on one hand, and between the earthly Most Holy Place and the ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary on the other. But in the light of the typological structures that have emerged from our study of representative typological passages in Scripture (as summarized in the previous article), we must conclude that parabolē in Hebrews 9:9 does not refer to a typological relationship. The author of Hebrews has carefully chosen the word parabolē in contrast to typos or antitypos. According to Hebrews 9:9, the prōtē skēnē (whether denoting the first sanctuary or the first apartment of the earthly sanctuary) only symbolizes or stands for, but does not point forward to or prefigure, the "present age" of which it is a part. Thus there is no prophetic structure operating in this verse. Likewise the eschatological element is missing; the "present age" is not the eschatological fulfillment foreshadowed by the earthly sanctuary.

Because these crucial typological characteristics are lacking, one cannot speak of a typological correspondence between the earthly sanctuary (either in whole or in part) and the old order for which it stands. If this first correspondence is not typological but symbolic, it is not sound exegesis to place this symbolic correspondence in direct parallel with the clear typological correspondence between earthly and heavenly sanctuary that functions in the wider context of this passage. This is mixing apples and oranges. One cannot say, therefore, that the holy place of the earthly sanctuary is a symbol standing for the present age and the Most Holy Place of the same sanctuary is a type pointing forward to the New Testament heavenly sanctuary.

Our discussion thus far has not concluded that the author of Hebrews is trying to prove the existence of a bipartite heavenly sanctuary that corresponds to the earthly counterpart. It has been said that in his argument the author remains faithful to the idea of continuity between type and antitype. Apparently he assumes such a bipartite sanctuary in the original as well as in the copy because he uses the terms typos and antitypos, but this is not explicitly stated and is not the point at issue in his argument.
Thus in the allusions to the Day of Atonement in Hebrews 9, the point at issue is the efficacy of sacrifice, not the issue of time as it relates to the whole Day of Atonement service.

We may expect the author to indicate in this context, as he compares the sanctuaries of the old and new covenant, some reference to the point of transition between the old and new covenant, to the commencement of the new covenant ministry and the inauguration of the new covenant sanctuary. Such is precisely what we find in Hebrews 10:19, 20, where the verb ἐνεργαίζον ("inaugurates") is employed to describe Christ's entrance into the heavenly sanctuary. Just as the Old Testament sanctuary was inaugurated or consecrated before its services officially began, so the heavenly sanctuary was inaugurated when Jesus began His priestly ministry in its precincts.

George Rice has recently shown that Hebrews 10:19, 20 is part of a chiastic structure encompassing chap. 6:19-10:39 and that Hebrews 10:19ff. is the explanatory development of the parallel member of the chiasm, Hebrews 6:19. Therefore, in the light of the clear reference to the inauguration of the heavenly sanctuary in chap. 10:19, 20, it appears likely that the same inauguration event is viewed in the description of Jesus' entering of the heavenly sanctuary in chap. 6:19ff.

This, however, is not the primary concern of the epistle and the cultic argument of the central section. William Johnson has persuasively shown that the major concern in this central portion of the epistle has to do with "the relative value of sacrifice." To those Hebrew Christians who are tempted to turn away from Jesus and return to Judaism, the author of Hebrews argues that only in Jesus does one find the "better blood," the one all-sufficient and efficacious sacrifice that can purify the conscience of the believer. If they turn from Him, where will they go? The author indicates from Psalm 40 that all the sacrifices of the Old Testament coalesce into the one great Sacrifice in the person of Jesus. Still the depths have not been plumbed. The apostle pronounces the only interpretation of the Levitical services. The interpretation of the Levitical system given in Hebrews is only part of the rich typological mosaic which includes the total witness of Scripture. In particular, the apocalyptic visions of Daniel and Revelation present profound insights into the timing and nature of the eschatological fulfillment of sanctuary typology. In recent years Seventh-day Adventists have enjoyed a deepened understanding and appreciation of the Biblical mosaic of sanctuary typology, building upon the pillars of the foundation that God has provided in our past history. Still the depths have not been plumbed. The significance of the Jewish economy is not yet fully comprehended. Truths vast and profound are shadowed forth in its rites and symbols. The doctrine of the sanctuary has lost none of its brilliance and beauty. The closest investigation of sanctuary typology will continue to make it radiate with greater relevance, force, and glory.

1 See Ministry, February, 1984, pp. 16ff.
2 For a full discussion of the etymology and semantic development of types both within and outside of Scripture up to and including New Testament times, see Richard M. Davidson, Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Types (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1976), pp. 115-190.
3 The leading proponents of this view are identified and their arguments more fully articulated and critiqued in a paper by the present writer, "Principles of Hermeneutics: The Nature of Typology in Hebrews," to be published as part of a book prepared by the Hebrews Subcommittee of the Daniel and Revelation Committee of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. The discussion of typology in Hebrews in the present article is adapted in part from this paper.
6 See, e.g., Bruce, op. cit., pp. 194, 195: "It is further to be noted that whereas hitherto our author has used 'the first tabernacle' of the outer compartment of the sanctuary, here [in Hebrews 9:8] he uses it to mean the sanctuary of the 'first covenant' [chap. 9:1], comprising holy place and holy of holies together. Hence Josephus (Contra Apionem II. 12) used ἱερός σκήνη in this same temporal sense of 'first tabernacle' (i.e., the earthly sanctuary preceding the Solomonic Temple).
8 See, e.g., Bruce, op. cit., pp. 194, 195: "It is further to be noted that whereas hitherto our author has used 'the first tabernacle' of the outer compartment of the sanctuary, here [in Hebrews 9:8] he uses it to mean the sanctuary of the 'first covenant' [chap. 9:1], comprising holy place and holy of holies together. Hence Josephus (Contra Apionem II. 12) used ἱερός σκήνη in this same temporal sense of 'first tabernacle' (i.e., the earthly sanctuary preceding the Solomonic Temple).
9 See Ministry, February, 1984, pp. 16ff.
10 The hermeneutical issues involved in the interpretation of apocalyptic prophecy have been the subject of previous articles in this series on the "Called Church." See Kenneth A. Strand, "Apocalyptic Prophecy and the Church," Ministry, April, 1983, pp. 20-23; December, 1983, pp. 14-18.
11 Ellen White, Christ's Object Lessons, p. 133.
historically, there has been a unique relationship between the General Conference and North America that has resulted in a different organization and operation for the North American Division as compared to other divisions. Since the 1980 General Conference session, certain restructuring of the North American Division has been taking place, making it, in some respects, more like its counterparts in the rest of the world. Recently MINISTRY editor J. R. Spangler interviewed Charles Bradford, General Conference vice-president for North America, and Robert Dale, administrative assistant to the vice-president for North America, about the new situation and probed their aspirations and outlook for the division.

Q. What exactly happened at the 1980 General Conference session in Dallas to alter the structure of the North American Division or the way it had been operating prior to 1980?

A. That session voted to add a section to the bylaws allowing the North American representatives on a GC nominating committee to recommend those officers and departmental directors who will be assigned to North America. This was the first time such an action had been formally taken.

You see, the North American Division, unlike other divisions, has almost always been administered directly by the General Conference. In fact, for many years the two have been virtually indistinguishable. This has been true because the General Conference offices have been located in North America and because for most of our church’s history the greater part of the membership has been resident in North America. Now the situation has changed; church demographics are almost reversed, and the majority of church members now live outside North America. Nearly a decade ago serious discussions began on how we would relate to the new situation. A Commission on Church Unity, established in 1976, resulted in resolutions and recommendations presented at the 1978 and 1979 Annual Councils. These all led to the action taken at Dallas in 1980.

Q. Maybe we should clarify just what a division is and how it differs from, say, a union or local conference.

A. There is a great difference. A division is the General Conference acting in a certain part of the world field, a “branch office” if you please. Thus its constituency, like that of the General Conference itself, is the entire world field. A division has no localized constituency as does a union or a local conference. The North American Division is the General Conference in North America.

Q. Have we ever had the North American Division separate from the General Conference?

A. Yes, but it didn’t last very long. In response to a request from the North American union presidents, the 1913 General Conference Session organized a fully autonomous, constituency-based division. Other such divisions were
organized in other parts of the world. The General Conference Bulletin for May 27, 1913, gives some of the speeches made during the discussion. The delegates passed the action, but the experiment lasted only two or three years because of certain inherent problems in the organizations they set up.

Q. What problems specifically?

A. Mainly that the divisions were new bodies based on constituencies. They had separate constitutions and bylaws from the General Conference. They were no longer a part—an extension of the General Conference—but independent bodies. Also they had their own elections. This was vastly different from the system returned to a few years later in which the General Conference embraces the world field and works through its divisions. The present system brings a real strength and unity. Among church groups, the Seventh-day Adventist Church has an unusual degree of unity, not only doctrinally but organizationally.

Q. How has the action taken in 1980 changed the way the North American Division operates?

A. Well, certain individuals in each department and area have been assigned specifically to North America. This has enabled us to focus more directly on the needs and opportunities of this field and to bring about a more cohesive attitude throughout the division.

Q. In your thinking, do you envision North America becoming similar in organization and operation to the other divisions, as the recent changes seem to be tending, or will the special relationship with the General Conference continue?

A. It seems there will always be a unique relationship of some type between the General Conference and the North American Division. The very fact that the General Conference resides here in North America makes for such an arrangement. The North American group feels that it is under assignment. The General Conference describes our parameters and gives us our job description. As the parent group, it gives us direction in how we ought to go.

Q. I take it, then, that you don't feel that in its proposed relocation the General Conference should consider a site outside North America to give the church more of an international flavor. Some have suggested Switzerland.

A. No. It's our opinion that the Lord planted the headquarters of the church here in North America, and this is where it ought to be. Few other places in the world could provide the access to world transportation, the ready exchange of funds, and the religious freedom available here. There was a divine direction and purpose in all this.

Q. What about the physical proximity of the North American Division to the General Conference offices? When the General Conference plans the new offices, should it plan a wing for North America? Or would it be better if North America established offices in some more central location within the division?

A. We'll leave that up to the brethren, although both of us have lived in the Midwest! We know that when people are together, physically, in a group, there is a chemistry that takes place. We notice that even when our staff meets together. But at present we don't even have a room to call ours. We're like the couple that is still living in a parent's house. We have to share the kitchen and all the rest.

But division status is not physical separation necessarily. It is not even organizational restructuring per se. Constitutional changes would be minimal. There doesn't need to be a great reordering of priorities. What is important are operational concerns. The North American Division should be given its terms of reference and then be given the latitude to focus on the problems, the challenges, and the felt needs of North America.

Q. How do you see that latitude taking place for North America? What are some concrete examples?

A. The work in North America, in our judgment, needs a system of organization and terms of reference from the General Conference that will give it greater accountability for its own actions. More responsibility. Division leadership would be able to have and expect this accountability throughout the field if it had a more distinct role from that of the General Conference.

Some of this is already taking place. The officers of North America do meet on a regular basis and bring about strategies developed specifically for the division. The Caring Church strategy is an example. This strategy has been developed uniquely for North America with accountability built in. So we feel the General Conference has already given us many areas of latitude and function that we are to carry out in North America.

Q. One of the big fears in many minds is that if North America becomes too independent, there will be a serious impact on the financial base of the world field. How do you respond to this concern?

A. It's true that the North American Division is still the financial base for the church. We need to face that. But the superstructure is outgrowing the base! Wouldn't it be wise to strengthen the base in order to strengthen the entire organization? If the church has a strong base, it will be more able to reach out to other lands to support the work that is going forward in new areas. If the financial base is weakened, or if it...
North America doesn't want to renege in any way on its responsibilities. It is an integral part of the world church. But we also need to reach the specific culture of our own assigned territory.

remains static, the programs of the world are going to be hindered.

Those who may be concerned that North America is wanting to turn inward to the detriment of the rest of the church will be interested in our thinking as expressed in our Statement of Mission. It says in part, "Recognizing that the work of the church will not be finished until all peoples everywhere have been confronted with the claims of the gospel, the division is committed to maintaining its historical status as the backbone of support for the world mission program of the church." North America doesn't want to renege in any way on its responsibilities to the rest of the church. It is an integral part of the world church. But we also need to reach the specific culture of our own assigned territory.

Q. Let me probe this a little more. You have just put yourselves on record as being very firmly in support of the entire world field. But what happens if someone comes to North American leadership in the future who is committed to keeping more and more funds in that division and reducing the flow of support to other areas? What safeguards protect us against such a possibility?

A. The financial plans for the support of the world work are developed at the Annual Council, made up of delegates from the entire world field. All the divisions are represented. Power in the church is rather evenly distributed. In an Annual Council, with North America and the other divisions sitting together in decision making and looking over the needs of the entire world, it seems unjustified to fear that the support from North America as a part of the church family will be diminished. Church policies and recommendations are not really what force any of us to support work outside our own area of responsibility. We all do so because God's people want to see His work finished. Not a dune we give belongs to any particular conference or union, really. It belongs to the world church. As long as we have a strong General Conference guiding and directing all of us, the necessary support will be forthcoming.

There's another thing, too. Matthew 24:14 is valid in North America just as it is everywhere else. "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." The gospel can't center internally on one little segment. We don't like the expressions, "separate division" or "independent division," or anything that would give the idea of a spirit of pulling away. North America has a mission as does every division, and it is concerned to strengthen that mission. But not at the expense of any other part of the church.

Q. Since this division contains probably the most complex and sophisticated society of any division, what needs do you see in terms of staff?

A. None of us connected with North America is interested in building up a large, superstaff. The General Conference is still responsible for what business calls R&D, research and development. As a division of the General Conference, we should be operationally oriented. We don't need a large staff for research and development, for producing materials. We intend to depend largely on the General Conference for resource materials. But we would ask that the materials relate to the felt needs of North America. For example, we have asked the Sabbath School Department to prepare some program helps for us, using the concepts of the Caring Church strategy.

Q. Would these materials be usable only by North America, or could they be adapted by other divisions?

A. In some cases we might need materials that would be geared specifically for North America, its culture and needs. In other instances the materials might be usable on a much wider basis. As an example, the General Conference Youth Department has prepared a baptismal manual. It will be provided camera-ready for all divisions including North America. Our group is also preparing a baptismal manual that will be designed for a special use in our division. But we will be able to use both of these; they are not mutually exclusive. They both fill a particular need.

Q. What effect will the new situation with the North American Division have on the financial overhead of the church? With the present division staff being made up of individuals assigned from the General Conference departments, is the net effect simply a transfer of workers to different responsibilities, or will more workers actually be required?

A. Our plans for North America shouldn't require additional workers at the division level. For one thing, we are drawing on the abilities and skills of persons at the conference and union levels. You said a moment ago that North America was more sophisticated and complex than other parts of the world. I'm not sure that is necessarily true, but to the extent that North America has reached a maturity that some other areas have not yet reached, then North America needs less direct help, not more. That is why we are reaching out to the total resources of the church wherever they may be. We don't believe that all knowledge is resident at 6840 Eastern Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. The Holy Spirit is free and open, and He is in the total church. One of our tasks here is to be talent scouts for the church. We should be observers of what is going on. We should encourage the field and serve as a clearing house for concepts. We are a service team to those in the field who are doing most of the actual work.

In keeping with this idea, we have already developed several specialty committees made up of people from the division, the conferences, and unions. These groups are actively carrying forward certain areas assigned to them.
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Four of these are currently handling much of the work in North America. This way we don't have to add to staff here. Our staff may serve as chairman of one of these committees, or as secretary, and that ties the group to us. An example is our Faith Action Advance Ministries Coordinating Committee. This group cares for the total Caring Church strategy. A local president, Malcolm Gordon, chairs that committee. The secretary is our North American ministerial director, W. C. Scales. Several conference presidents sit on this committee along with people from our staff. We think it's important for the field to have a significant role. The three other committees are the FAA Services Committee, which deals with the 800 telephone number at Andrews University and our efforts to streamline resources and outreach through computerization; the Ministerial Training Advisory Committee, which handles the equipping of the pastor in his work of ministry; and the FAA Curriculum Committee, which cares for developing materials and tying it all together.

Q. Do you envision a separate annual council for North America, perhaps following the world Annual Council or combined with it?

A. The time has come, we believe, when we need to give a higher profile to North American items at a time when the North American people can focus on them and translate what the General Conference has done into North American terms. The time has come for the brethren to say to North America, "This is what the General Conference wants done in the field. You go and implement it."

All the top companies in North America have this philosophy of management. The central office doesn't become involved in operational matters. But it holds tenaciously to the main objectives and purposes of the company. It keeps before the entire organization the centralities that make it what it is.

"The people in the field know more about running the field than we do," they say. "So let the people in the factories run the factory. We'll encourage them. But we'll hold them to the aims and objectives of the company." That is what FAA is all about. FAA says, "We have a mission. We must perform it." And our first priority is that we must strengthen each other. We must make every person in the organization the very best servant he or she can be.

1000 Days of Reaping

From page 6

Recommendations to assist in the remaining 617 of the 1000 days:

1. Prayer. Intercessory prayer is the key to success in both spiritual renewal and soul winning. We recommend that in all our homes, churches, institutions, and headquarters offices there be daily intercessory prayer by our believers and leaders on behalf of the salvation of people in the cities and villages of every country. As this program takes effect, it is our hope that the whole church will be led to join in this great surge of earnest prayer. First among prayer concerns should be to claim the infilling of the Holy Spirit and His gifts for the finishing of the gospel commission.

2. Two days of fasting and prayer. (a) That every division establish a special day of thanksgiving, fasting, and prayer during 1984, emphasizing the 1000 Days of Reaping goals. (b) That we here proclaim Sabbath, January 5, 1985, a united worldwide day of thanksgiving, fasting, and prayer for the remaining six months of reaping in preparation for the fifty-fourth session of the General Conference to be held June 27 to July 6, 1985.

3. Example leadership. That "example leadership" be more fully implemented by the administrative teams in each division. This can be realized only as leadership at all levels sets forth the urgency and priority of both intercessory prayer and soul-winning programs. Every member of the team should engage in some avenue of evangelism according to his or her talents, uniting with pastors and laymen in soul winning, and continue this exemplary leadership throughout the remainder of the 1000 Days.

4. Departmental activities. That in each division, administration and departmental leaders give renewed study to the redemptive outreach of each department, emphasizing the unique ability of each department to contribute to the 1000 Days of Reaping objectives.

5. Funding. That we affirm the "funding for evangelism" recommendation which was voted at the 1976 Annual Council calling for a definite percentage of retained tithe to be set aside for evangelism.

6. Evaluation and planning for next quinquennium. That we request the General Conference officers to immediately appoint a commission, responsible to the president, to evaluate and assess the effect of the 1000 Days of Reaping program upon the world church in the present quinquennium. This commission shall make recommendations for a worldwide evangelism program that will lead "the Caring Church" to ever greater heights of success during the quinquennium 1985-1990, in the hope that God's plan for His remnant people may be so fully realized that His work of preparing the world for the long-awaited coming of Jesus will be completed.
What I expect of a pastor

In February we published Lawrence Downing's article as to what he, as a pastor, expects of a conference administrator. In this article Philip Follett gives the complementary view—what he, as an administrator, expects of a pastor. He discusses what he expects a pastor to be, what he expects him to do, and he indicates some of the means by which he measures the pastor's performance. □ by Philip Follett

A young man just returned from the Seminary asked for an appointment. "What do you expect of me?" he inquired. "I've been watching some of the other pastors, and I wonder if I can match their performance. I believe God called me to the ministry, and I'm convinced that I can be an effective pastor. But I want to know if I can meet the expectations you have of me in this conference."

That was a wise young man. His very asking of that question impressed me positively. Many of us are not brave enough, or secure enough, to voice such a question openly.

Of one thing we can be certain: Everyone has expectations of us. And everyone discusses them—with other people. After a Sabbath morning sermon, church members talk about how well we met their expectations. Fellow pastors discuss what they expect from their peers. Conference office personnel talk about what they want to see from pastors, just as pastors share with each other what they need and expect from conference office staff.

MINISTRY has asked me to share what I expect of a pastor. That question is difficult to answer because it is so broad. I have different expectations of a pastor of a large institutional church than I have of a pastor of a district of two small churches. Because every church differs, as does every pastor, I must adapt my expectations of each.

Generally, I expect a pastor to be (and I believe he also wants to be) faithful, competent, well-rounded, and growing. A faithful minister has a consistent dedication to God, His church, and the ministry. Church boards frequently ask about a prospective pastor, "Is he spiritual?" My answer is, "What do you mean?" To some people the word spiritual seems to refer to a mystical aura that is hard to define. I believe that the spiritual person is thoroughly dedicated to God and His service, that he places God's will above personal advantage, and that he loves God's Word and seeks to live by its principles.

A faithful pastor loves God's church and seeks its good always. "Christ . . . loved the church, and gave himself for it" (Eph. 5:25). Husbands are admonished to relate to their wives as Christ does to His church. That requires an attitude of respect, protective nurture, and care. While it is our responsibility to protect the church from being wronged or mistreated, we must be cautious lest our zeal to correct mistakes results in harm rather than healing. I expect a pastor to build up the church of God.

I expect pastors to function as members of a team, not as loners. Pastors need to develop a spirit of collegiality, a willingness to build each other, and they need to have enough security in their own work so that they can learn and benefit from one another's strengths. A strong pastor refuses to join in criticism that undermines his fellow pastors or other church leaders. I see his participation in, and attitude toward, workers' meetings as one index of his relationship with his fellow pastors.

I expect pastors to be competent in their practice of ministry. Our church members sometimes have the impression that those who have been employed as ministers feel that the church owes them a job until retirement regardless of their competence (or lack thereof). Laypersons who serve on committees of the church voice concern about our protecting incompetence in both office personnel and pastors. We must perform our work effectively if we want continued support by our members.
Pastors should be competent in preaching, soul winning, teaching, leading in worship, counseling, relating to people, planning, organizing, and leading a congregation—the list goes on and on. Which of these skills is most important? Different assignments require a different mix of skills. The pastor must be sensitive to his members and his own abilities in order to have the proper emphasis in his current assignment.

No pastor can function well for long unless he develops personal study skills and time-management ability. One of the most frustrating decisions for beginning pastors to make is how they will utilize their time, particularly how they will protect time for personal study. In school, bells and class schedules ruled their lives. In their first district they quickly learn that they have no one to tell them when to study, when to visit, when to plan, and when to give Bible studies. They must plan their own program, follow that plan, and maintain proper priorities. Some degree of frustration over that responsibility will probably continue throughout their lives!

A pastor does not become effective just by accumulating a series of skills. How he exercises these skills for the upbuilding of the church is the real measure of his ministry. This requires sanctified, sound judgment. That quality of judgment leads the pastor to exercise flexibility without compromising principle. A pastor who is too idealistic becomes unyielding and loses his ability to lead his congregation. On the other hand, one who reflects only the opinions and convictions of influential members loses the respect of spiritual leaders.

I want a pastor to be well rounded in his life. A pastor should give proper attention to his family, his personal needs, and all of life around him. His companion and children should know him as one who is interested in them and who meets their needs. A wholesome sense of humor is an asset. While he should be serious, a pastor should be fun to live with.

A pastor should not be closed off from his community and its concerns. He can contribute more if he has some interests apart from the books in his study. Jesus immersed Himself in all of life. His teaching reflected His acquaintance with farming, fishing, marketing, and finances. A pastor who is willing to share in the life of the people he serves will be better able to lead those people to Jesus.

As long as he lives, I expect a pastor to keep growing. I admire a pastor who is never satisfied with his present effectiveness, who is constantly taking steps to improve his skills and relationships. He sets goals for himself and works to achieve them.

Thus far I have dealt with what I expect a pastor to be. What do I expect in terms of his performance? God desires the church “to make ready a people prepared for the Lord” (Luke 1:17). Accomplishing this goal requires the church to serve its community, to lead people to commit their lives to Christ and His church, and to nurture and train believers in witnessing and service. The pastor should evaluate all of his activities and functions—preaching, teaching, counseling, and leading—in terms of their effectiveness in accomplishing this purpose. His primary task is to develop the congregation into a redemptive community in which Christ’s life will be known and practiced and from which people reach out to others with the message of His salvation. In accomplishing this task, he himself ministers, and he facilitates the ministries of his fellow believers.

In view of this, I expect a pastor to nurture the unity and brotherhood of the members of his congregation. I expect him by his own activity and through the ministries of his church to teach God’s Word and lead people to make decisions for baptism. I expect him to nurture the personal lives and community spirit of the believers so that they will grow in Christ and become active in service for Him.

How do I measure the performance of a pastor? Not by any single criterion. One cannot easily measure the spiritual strength of a congregation. A healthy church has a good feeling of joy, optimism, togetherness, and commitment. And loyalty to Christ and His message should be evident. Statistics help reveal a church’s health because they frequently reflect the spirit and involvement of a congregation. Worship service attendance, baptisms, financial giving, the reclaiming of inactive members, and total membership may all be indicators of the spiritual well-being of the church. For that reason the good pastor-shepherd counts the sheep and searches carefully after any that is missing.

Every year in our conference we ask pastors and lay leaders to establish objectives toward which their congregations work during the coming twelve months, and to develop plans for reaching these objectives. Something of a pastor’s effectiveness is revealed as we review these targets with him and measure the church’s work for that year against the objectives.

When I talk with pastors returning from the Seminary, I express one more expectation—I expect every pastor to make some mistakes. No one person can be and accomplish all that a pastor wants to. Because I know that I have limitations, I cannot expect any pastor to be without them. I am more concerned with how he handles his limitations and mistakes and how he learns from them than I am with whether he makes them. I want him always to feel secure in sharing with me the mistakes he has made, and I want to deserve his trust by helping him to grow as a result of that experience.

Pastoring is one of the most demanding, sometimes frustrating, yet deeply rewarding, experiences God has entrusted to humanity. My task is to be an enabler of pastors so that they can be more effective in their service and experience more satisfaction and joy in their lives. To that end I have expectations of pastors, but I also want deeply to meet their expectations of me. For as servants of Christ, we are all called to work together for the building up of the body of Christ.
Ellen G. White and Biblical chronology

In her writings, Ellen G. White frequently made references to Biblical chronology—and a number of these references relate to Creation and the age of the earth. Many chronologies were available to her. Which one did she use? And how did she use it? The author considers these and other questions important for our understanding of her statements on chronology. by Warren H. Johns

Scholars have offered a greater variety of opinion upon the date for Creation than for any other single event in sacred history. Robert Young in his Analytical Concordance (p. 210) lists thirty-seven suggested dates for Creation, but he states that a nineteenth-century work, Hales’s A New Analysis of Chronology and Geography, History and Prophecy, lists some 120 possible dates and admits that the list might be swelled to three hundred. Of the 120 different chronologies, did Ellen White choose any particular one? Or did she establish an independent chronology that followed no humanly devised scheme? Are her statements authoritative yet today?

We are now in a position to provide a definitive answer to such questions. Owing to the recent development and marketing of the laser-disc Ellen G. White concordance by a group of SDA laymen in Sacramento, California, we can compile for the first time a complete set of all Ellen G. White statements relative to Biblical chronology. (The laser-disc concordance lists the occurrence of virtually every one of the 35,000 key words used by Ellen White—some 9 million references in all!) It may come as a surprise to some, but Ellen White makes more than 2,500 references to Biblical chronology. The current three-volume Comprehensive Index to the Writings of Ellen G. White lists only one fifth that number. (Perhaps we should put the word “comprehensive” in quotes!)

Of particular interest are the Ellen G. White statements that have a bearing on the age of the earth. Thanks to the assistance of the laser-disc concordance, we now have located a total of forty-two 6,000-year statements published by her in primary sources before her death in 1915. Of course, these do not include any compilations or reprints of her works made after 1915. In addition, we have forty-one 4,000-year statements and four 2,500-year statements—all of which are pertinent to the question of determining what was Ellen White’s view on the age of the earth.

Having recently completed an examination of all 2,500 references to Biblical chronology made by Ellen White, I can state unequivocally that her chronology matches that of Archbishop Ussher more closely than perhaps any other of the dozens of chronologies in use in the nineteenth century. Ussher’s chronology so dominated that era that his dates were printed in the margins of most Bibles. Ellen White must have been aware of at least a few chronologies other than Ussher’s. Of the 1,200 books by non-SDA authors in her library as of 1915, several were devoted entirely to chronology, and others contained dis-
The most crucial aspect of Ellen White’s chronological statements is the question of the age of the earth—crucial because it affects our understanding of a host of other issues.

Cussions of chronology. For example, she was familiar with the Scottish preacher John Cumming, whose works she read and borrowed material therefrom on occasion, but she did not adopt his chronology. The 6,000 years for Cumming ended in 1864. She had in her office library R. C. Shimeall’s Age of the World, but Shimeall in Millerite fashion placed the end of the world at the close of the 6,000 years, which he calculated to be the year 1868. Ellen White also seemed to have parted company with William Miller, who placed the end of the 6,000 years in 1843. For her as for Ussher there were exactly 4,000 years between the creation of man and the birth of Christ, thus making the earth 5,900 years old at the close of the nineteenth century. Cumming, Shimeall, and Miller differed with Ussher by more than one hundred years on their dates for Creation.

A careful analysis of all 2,500 chronological references made by Ellen White leads one to conclude that she sided with Ussher not only upon the issue of the 6,000 years but also upon the dating of numerous Biblical events. Some SDAs have suggested that Ellen White utilized her chronological expressions very loosely, speaking in generalities rather than specifics. But that is not entirely true. Generally she used chronology with exactness and skill. Except for a few rare cases, she would round off larger numbers to the nearest century and smaller figures to the nearest decade. Even in the use of terms like “nearly a thousand years,” “more than a thousand years,” “nearly two thousand years,” “three thousand years,” or “more than four thousand years,” her figures are not much more than a hundred years from those in Ussher and quite often less than twenty-five years removed. Her dates for the building of the Temple, the writing of Deuteronomy, the Exodus from Egypt, the time of Jacob, the Abrahamic covenant, and the Noachian flood are all in accord with Ussher’s dates. In only 1 or 2 percent of all her chronological statements did she deviate significantly from Ussher’s chronology. Ellen White had other options; she did not have to follow Ussher. One authoritative chronological study was William Hales’s A New Analysis of Chronology, which was in her library. However, she definitely did not follow Hales’s schema.

Because Ellen White followed Ussher’s chronology more closely than perhaps any other of the 120 chronologies in existence, does this mean that she endorsed the work of Ussher? Has Ussher become the standard for Seventh-day Adventists to follow in constructing a Biblically based chronology? Unfortunately, the work of Ussher has in all but a few cases been discredited by modern advances in understanding the unique chronological devices used by the ancients. For example, in regard to the period of the Hebrew kings, Ussher did not take into account the differences between accession-year and nonaccession-year types of reckoning, nor the existence of co-regencies. Consequently, Ussher’s dates for the beginning of the monarchy are nearly fifty years too early with respect to today’s established dates. A Seventh-day Adventist scholar, Edwin R. Thiele, has done a monumental work in correcting the dozens of inaccuracies found in Ussher’s calculations of the reigns of the Israelite kings. For Seventh-day Adventists to revert back to using Ussher’s chronology on the basis that Ellen White used it almost exclusively would be for us to take a giant step backward into the “Dark Ages” as far as chronology is concerned.

Of deeper concern here is the issue of inspiration. Are Ellen White’s statements on chronology inspired? Or are they uninspired insertions added by her editorial assistants in much the same way that citational references were added to the 1911 edition of The Great Controversy for quoted material? Today two views prevail in regard to the inspiration of Ellen White’s statements on chronology. The first one is what I have called the inspiration/full authority view. It stresses that inspiration acts upon the person, not upon the pen. The whole body of Ellen White’s works is inspired because they are the production of an inspired person. But not all of her chronological statements have equal authority in today’s world of advanced knowledge in archeology, ancient history, and Biblical exegesis. It advocates the hermeneutic principle that “time and place must be considered” in regard to the E. G. White writings. It recognizes that her statements on the use of milk or on race relations are tempered by the conditions existing at the time those statements were recorded. To advocate that these should be binding for all time in all parts of the world would be a misuse of inspired writings. So with her statements on chronology. A third view, which I have labeled the no inspiration/no authority view, will not be considered because it is not representative of Adventism.

The most crucial aspect of Ellen White’s chronological statements is the question of the age of the earth—crucial because it interacts with and affects our understanding of a host of other issues, such as Creation versus evolution, the Sabbath, and the historicity of Genesis. Some feel very strongly (and with good reason) that if we abandon the 6,000 years, then we become vulnerable to the theory of organic evolution, and once evolution is adopted, the Sabbath will be abandoned and the Seventh-day Adventist Church will cease to be. The 6,000 years is viewed as the first in a series of dams extending from the headwaters of a river to its mouth. If the dam farthest upstream breaks, then the cascading torrent will burst all the other dams along the course of the river.

The imagery of dams along a surging river brings up the question of function. What is the function of, or purpose for, the 6,000-year statements? Is it to provide a bulwark against a flood of false teachings and ideas? We have already seen that there are a total of eighty-seven E. G. White statements in primary sources (not including reprints) that
Whether one adopts the full authority view or the limited authority view, one is faced with the fact that not all Ellen White statements are of equal validity in settling chronological concerns.

have a bearing on the age of the earth question, forty-two of them having the figure of 6,000 years. Those who hold to the full authority view are convinced that the repetition of this matter by an inspired writer some eighty-seven times during her lifetime indicates she is validating a Creation date of about 6,000 years ago. Thus the statements’ primary function is chronological. The very first statement Ellen G. White made on the subject, which was in 1864, indicates that she is dealing very specifically with the uncertainty brought about by geology in regard to the subject of the authenticity of the Genesis record.11

On the other hand, those who hold to the limited authority view would suggest that Ellen White’s primary purpose in making the 6,000- and 4,000-year statements was not to provide a dam or bulwark in defense against the flood of evolutionary thought. According to the laser-disc concordance, the words “evolution” and “evolved” never appear within the context of any of the 6,000- or 4,000-year statements. For Ellen White the primary defense against the theory of evolution was not 6,000 years, but a belief in the literal six-day Creation week. This is borne out in a careful examination of her two major discussions of the subject, first in “The Literal Week,” Patriarchs and Prophets, pages 111-116, and then in “Science and the Bible,” Education, pages 128-134.

If the 6,000-year statements, which we believe are inspired, were not primarily given as a bulwark against evolution, what then is their main function? I wish to suggest that their main function is literary, not chronological. First, they serve as a means of literary linkage; that is, they link together two Biblical personages or events that have something in common. The following is an example of how she compares the first Adam with the second Adam, using the 4,000 years as a literary thread to bind the two together: “What a contrast to this perfect being [the first Adam] did the second Adam present... For four thousand years the race had been decreasing in size and physical strength.”12 The second function is that of literary emphasis. She uses chronological statements to reinforce what she wishes to convey by emphasizing temporal duration and extent just as one would use superlatives for emphasis. It’s a literary device. A typical example is this: “Six thousand years has this archenemy been warring against the government of God.”13 If one thousand years is impressive, then three thousand years is more impressive, and six thousand years even more impressive. The function is not to establish a date for Creation, but to show the extent and intensity of the great controversy between good and evil, between the government of God and the rebel government of Satan. Most of the 4,000-year statements fall under the category of literary linkage, and most of the 6,000-year statements are examples of literary emphasis. Additional evidence that their function is not primarily chronological is that one could insert the words “for thousands of years” in place of the 6,000- and 4,000-year figures without changing the overall intent or thrust of the statements in the least.

Whether one adopts the full authority view or the limited authority view, one is faced with the fact that not all Ellen White’s chronological statements are of equal validity, or authority, in settling chronological concerns. For example, she has two differing sets of statements on the length of the Egyptian sojourn and bondage prior to the Exodus. According to Ussher and most nineteenth-century chronologists, the Israelites were in Egypt exactly 215 years from the time that Jacob brought his family into Goshen to the time Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt. The SDA Bible Commentary has adopted this majority position, which advocates a “short sojourn.” A minority of scholars in taking such texts as Genesis 15:13, Exodus 12:40, and Acts 7:6 at face value have supported a “long sojourn” of 430 years for the same period, of which about four hundred years were spent in actual bondage. Interestingly, Ellen White, writing between 1864 and 1891, recorded a number of statements advocating the short sojourn; and between 1894 and 1905, she wrote statements advocating the long sojourn.14 Obviously both sets of statements cannot be correct. What, then, was Ellen White’s final position on the length of the sojourn? Because she followed Ussher so consistently, we would suggest that she sided with him on the short sojourn view. If the long sojourn view had been her true position, then it would have added 215 extra years to the age of the earth, thus pushing back the Creation date far enough so that the earth would have been more than 6,000 years old in her day—in fact, about 6,100 years. Her consistent position was that the earth was less than 6,000 years old.

Actually, even with her 6,000-year statements we find two sets of mutually exclusive statements. Between the years 1868 and 1913 she published ten statements advocating less than 6,000 years for human history, but between 1886 and 1890 she published three statements advocating a period of more than 6,000 years.15 What then was her final position? Again we would have to suggest that she sided with Ussher, based on the fact that she consistently followed him in other areas. One very good evidence of her final position is the way in which she revised one 6,000-year statement. In 1890 she wrote: “The continual transgression of man for over six thousand years has brought sickness, pain, and death as its fruit.”16 Then in 1913 she wrote: “The continual transgression of man for nearly six thousand years has brought sickness, pain, and death as its fruit.”17 These statements are identical except for the substitution of the word “nearly” in place of the word “over.” Some SDAs in attempting to solve this discrepancy have suggested that in the nineteenth century the word nearly meant “near to,” thus it could be interpreted as meaning “slightly beyond.” But Ellen White did not use it in this way. The laser-disc concordance lists 1,400 occurrences of the word nearly in her writings, and not once did she use it in the sense of “more than.”

Because Ellen White’s final position
Evident that their function is not primarily chronological is that one could insert the words “thousands of years” in place of the 6,000-year figures without changing the thrust of the statements.

was that 6,000 years of human history had not elapsed as of 1913, then her position on the length of the sojourn must have been that it occupied 215 years. There would not have been enough time for a 430-year sojourn. That would exclude the five statements advocating a long sojourn as having chronological authority. On rare occasions she made other statements that should not be viewed as holding authority today. It could be inferred that once she allotted a “thousand years” between Jacob and Christ, thus in effect making Jacob a contemporary with David. On another occasion she stated that it was “a thousand years” between the writing of Genesis and the writing of the Hebrews. Both of these statements underwent revision. One that was not revised was a Review and Herald statement where she ascribed a period of “more than a thousand years” from the writing of the book of Isaiah to the time when Christ quoted from its pages. The actual figure should have been seven hundred years. Thus the full authority view must make allowance for at least a few chronologically typed statements having no chronological authority.

Whether one supports a full authority or a limited authority position, it is crucial to realize what the basic principle is that is at work here in inspired writings—a principle that is true of Scripture as well as of the Spirit of Prophecy. The point is that in matters not essential to salvation the prophet sometimes had to choose the best of what was available, even though the best may have contained inaccuracies. Many New Testament writers quoted from Greek translations of the Old Testament that are definitely inferior to the original Hebrew. God did not give them a vision telling what the correct translation ought to be. So with Ellen White it was not necessary for her to have a vision every time she wanted to find a particular Scripture text, because a Bible concordance was available to her. She did not have a vision when she wanted to discover how far Hebron was from Jerusalem, or the Appii Forum was from Rome, because a Bible dictionary or atlas was at her disposal. In matters of chronology she need not have a vision whenever she needed to ascertain a particular time relationship, because the margins of most nineteenth-century Bibles provided dates for all Biblical events. We can give a clear-cut example of this. Once she wrote, “Solomon, at the age of eighteen years, commenced his reign upon the throne of his father, David.” 14 Nowhere does Scripture itself record information that would provide the exact age of Solomon then. Ellen White could have conveniently obtained such information by looking at the marginal dates for Solomon’s birth (1033 B.C.) and his coronation (1015 B.C.) as provided by Ussher’s chronology. The difference between the two is exactly eighteen years!

Notwithstanding all the criticisms that have been leveled at the work of Archbishop Ussher, his chronology has suffered less from the impact of modern archeological discoveries than most other chronologies in use in the nineteenth century. In other words, Ellen White, I believe, was divinely guided to choose the best available to her. Ussher’s chronology needed less revision because of his meticulous fidelity to the scriptural data and his refusal to interject conjectures and suppositions. If Ellen White were alive today, she would no doubt advocate that chronology that holds the closest fidelity to the scriptural record.
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Parson to Parson, a monthly feature in *MINISTRY*, consists of a question relating to the practice of ministry and responses as to how others have met or would meet such a situation. Both questions and responses are submitted by our readers.

We need your response to the following question, which we will feature in the July issue of *MINISTRY*:

Our church wants to make it possible for those of our members with young children to participate meaningfully in our worship services. We tried running a nursery staffed by volunteers from our church during the worship hour, but that didn't work out at all. Recently, on an experimental basis, we hired a nursery worker to attend the children aged from birth through 5 years. We handle her salary like our other bills, paying her through the mail at the end of the month.

This new program is working well. But some of our members are troubled because it seems to endorse "business dealings" on the Sabbath. Help! Have any of you out there encountered such a dilemma? How did you deal with it?

Have you faced this situation successfully? Or have you some ideas as to how you would? Then please sit right down, put your suggestions on paper, and send them to us. The lead time required for the publication of *MINISTRY* means that we need your response right away.

We need questions as well. We will pay $15 for any question you submit on the practice of ministry that we use in Parson to Parson. Specific and detailed questions meet our needs best. We publish the questions anonymously as a protection for those who submit them.


Parson to Parson: What would you do?

Censuring a repentant member

The SDA Church Manual states relatively clearly the circumstances under which we should disfellowship members. But the criteria for censuring them are not so clear. One of my members had a baby out of wedlock. She admits what she has done is wrong and plans on rebaptism. Because her attitude is good, I do not want to have her censured, but some members of my church insist that according to the Manual she must be. What should I do?

Censure fits this case

Your reason for not wanting to censure this person (the repentant attitude she exhibits) seems less than valid to me. According to the *Church Manual*, the specific nature of the offense does not determine whether censure rather than disfellowshiping is required in cases of open sin; it is the attitude of the person toward his sin that determines the level of discipline necessary. Actually, the *Church Manual* (p. 248) seems to indicate censure as the appropriate response for one with the very attitude you describe.

In a very similar case, I talked with the guilty individual, read to her the relevant portions of the *Church Manual*, and assured her of the church's continued love, support, and forgiveness. But I pointed out the church's responsibility to go on record with its disapproval of obvious sin. To overlook what she had done, even though she was sorry and had confessed her sin, would condone sin in some degree in the minds of many church members, as well as in the thinking of the community. I stressed that by recommending censure, I was not turning my back on her, nor was the church withdrawing its love and concern and support. In this case, the church followed through on the recommendation and voted censure for three months. The young lady accepted this action with grace and understanding and has continued to be an active and faithful member.

It seems to me that if a person is truly repentant, he will understand that restitution means the necessity for the church to disassociate itself from his sin; he will accept, graciously if not joyfully, this action.

Of course, it is the local congregation, not the pastor or the board, that votes discipline. If you feel strongly that censure is not appropriate in this case, your duty is to state your views plainly and attempt to persuade the congregation to see as you do. If you suspect that those members who are insisting on censure are doing so from motives of vindictiveness or legalistic harshness, you should try to counteract that attitude and show them their sin as well. —Name withheld.
She is censuring herself

To many people the term censure bears connotations of punishment or vindictiveness. In reality, censure should have two main concerns: the offender’s redemption and rehabilitation, and the church’s credibility. In this particular case, the offender essentially is censuring herself—by admitting that her sin is so grievous she can expect church fellowship only after rebaptism. The church’s disapproval of her behavior is made apparent by her own course of action. Thus anything that could be accomplished by a vote of censure already has been accomplished. To take further action would appear as nothing less than kicking a downed person who is trying to rise to her feet.

Votes of censure usually are taken in cases in which people refuse to admit or are indifferent to the gravity of their moral lapse. Censure is a dramatic measure to help them more fully appreciate their need to change. Furthermore, the church needs to go on record as to where it stands concerning certain types of behavior.

Unfortunately, in today’s permissive environment most pastors and church boards prefer to turn a blind eye rather than confront that which is unacceptable. By so doing, they not only show indifference toward God’s expectations for the Christian, but in effect declare the offender a nonentity—by implying that the person’s behavior is really of no consequence. A loving, gentle, but firm reaction actually is an affirmation of the offender’s significance. What he or she does counts; it is taken seriously.

Any approaches to the erring must be in love and with a deep sense of God’s love for that specific sinner as well as for sinners in general. It is better to go overboard with gentleness than with harshness—not a gentleness of indifference, but a gentleness of Christian concern.—James Coffin, Burtonsville, Maryland.

However, there are circumstances that the wise minister must take into account in dealing with the individuals under his pastoral care. Knowing the attitude of those involved—the sincerity of their repentance and of their desire to reestablish their walk with Christ—and the effect censure or lack of it would have on their relationship with the church and the Lord, the pastor must at times follow the spirit rather than the letter of the Manual. Sometimes public exposure of wrongdoing does more harm than good both to the individual and to the public—though obviously in this case public knowledge is unavoidable.

If the pastor and the church move in the direction of censure, the pastor should do his best to communicate to the individual concerned that the church is censuring the individual’s action and not rejecting the individual herself. (The church needs to understand this too.) And the pastor ought to lead his people into both the loving, accepting attitude Jesus showed toward repentant sinners and the support this person will need as she seeks to deal with her child properly.—Name withheld.

Rebaptism—beginning again

Repentance does not obviate discipline. Wise parents continue to hold their children responsible for their actions while at the same time freely forgiving them. Discipline not only functions to bring about repentance on the part of the individual who has committed the wrong but also makes an important statement to the church and to the larger community as to the church’s understanding of the seriousness of violating God’s expressed will and of disregarding one’s membership commitments.

But this discipline must not be applied in a spirit of revenge. It must be done in love, as a means of restoring both the person and the community that has been hurt by this individual’s wrongdoing.

A genuinely repentant person will not be bothered by discipline applied in a loving, restorative way. Repentance includes acknowledgment of wrongdoing, recognition of the justice of appropriate discipline that may result, and a desire to do whatever is possible to compensate for the wrongdoing.

In your case I see no problem. Since the individual involved has already agreed upon being rebaptized, she apparently recognizes the seriousness of her offense. Rebaptism implies that her relationship with Christ and His church has been broken and is now to be restored. I think you should be able to explain to her that the church’s action in dropping her membership and renewing it through rebaptism symbolizes this. It offers a chance to begin anew, with a clean slate.—Name withheld.

Objectives of censure?

The underlying question, it seems to me, is whether your member “qualifies” for censure. The essential objective of censure is to bring a change of course in the member’s life. Regarding censure the Manual explicitly states, “If a member falls into sin, sincere efforts must be made to reclaim him.” Other objectives are to “cleanse the camp of Achans,” to ease any “disgrace upon the cause of God.”

I would try to lead the church membership into doing three things: (1) to ask what Biblical issues are involved, (2) to expose the actual intention of the Manual in such situations, and (3) to see how this woman’s case relates to Scripture and the Manual. The congregation should be guided into limiting their discussion to these three issues.

In the meantime, I would visit further with the woman, encouraging her and assuring her of God’s acceptance of her and her repentance. I would tactfully suggest that she voluntarily remove herself from any church office she might be holding (or find some way of convincing those who question her remorse). I would inform her of the positive attitudes of any in the church who felt as I did about her.

When actually dealing with the question in church business session, I would emphasize essential Biblical themes applicable in the situation, and what I understand to be the explicit intention of the Manual regarding censure. I would also emphasize that to censure the woman when she has openly admitted her wrongdoing, has requested rebaptism, and shows a generally good attitude would contradict the intent of Scripture and make redundant the objectives of the Manual.—Will Eva, Takoma Park, Maryland.
**From the Editor**

**Growing members that read**

The Christian who doesn’t read is likely to be experiencing a very average relationship with his Lord and with the church. One of the best services you can provide your people is to encourage them to read.

As a pastor, one of the things I looked for in visiting the homes of my members was the presence of books. Now, I know I have an innate bias toward books. I can’t remember not being able to read and not reading! I read books by the armful from the school library, the public library, and any other place I could find them. I read books by flashlight under the covers after my parents turned out the lights and told me to go to sleep. At any one time I’m usually reading five or six books, so I confess to being somewhat addicted to the printed page. But I looked for good Christian books in the homes of my church members for another reason: the reading Christian is generally a strong Christian.

Is the average Adventist member in North America regularly reading good Christian literature? If so, he isn’t reading the books coming from the denominational presses! Richard Coffen, book editor at the Review and Herald Publishing Association, tells me that the usual press run for a paper-cover book at that house is approximately 7,500 copies. Church membership in the North American Division currently stands at about 650,000. This means that the publishers expect only slightly more than one percent of church members to buy any given title.

One of the most beneficial services you can perform for your people and for your church is to encourage your members to read good literature that will build their Christian experience and grow strong characters. Of course, to do so you need to be reading yourself. Books are to the minister what wrenches are to the mechanic or scalpels to the physician. Someone said, “The average pastor around here doesn’t read two books a year.” And the answer came back, “That’s probably why he is still average!” That’s true of your members, too. The Christian who doesn’t read is likely to be experiencing a very average relationship with his Lord and with the church.

The religious press continues to pour out titles (some good, some mediocre, some poor). Our own presses provide a variety of materials for all ages and interests. Have you been inside an Adventist Book Center lately and seen the selection? Sometimes we hear the criticism that our presses seem to produce more children’s storybooks than anything else. No doubt you can find a lot of storybooks at an Adventist Book Center. That’s not bad, of course. Children need good books too, during the times the TV is being repaired. But I’ll wager (preachers shouldn’t bet) that you can find more variety and more solid spiritual food in an Adventist Book Center than you may have thought possible if you haven’t been in one lately. And if the ABC doesn’t provide enough selection, there’s always the local Christian bookstore.

Never has a Christian had a greater choice in good reading. Why, then, does reading sometimes appear to be becoming a lost art? It’s easy to blame television and the video revolution. It’s easy to blame the school systems for turning out graduates who simply can’t read anything more difficult than the help-wanted ads. But the facts are that electronic technology hasn’t yet replaced the written word and doesn’t seem likely to do so any time soon. Professor Daniel Tanner, of Rutgers University, says: “The demise of the stenographer was predicted with the invention of the Dictaphone; the demise of the theater with the invention of the Dictaphone; the demise of the concert hall with the invention of the phonograph; the demise of the concert hall with the invention of the phonograph; the demise of the motion picture with the invention of television; and the demise of handwriting with the invention of the typewriter.” Like Mark Twain’s death, reports that the printed page has expired are greatly exaggerated. Many people can read well, and will if they are encouraged to do so. That’s where you come in.

Christian bookstore managers testify that success or failure in their business often hinges on the pastors who occupy the pulpits of their community. When a pastor mentions a book he has read and recommends that his people buy it for their home libraries, the bell over the bookstore door starts making the sound that managers like to hear. Not many people open a Christian bookstore hoping to get rich. Even with the best of encouragement and promotion, the margin between success and failure is often thin. The get-rich-quick schemes in the classified section of the National Enquirer encourage you to address envelopes, raise chinchillas (or worms), sell synthetic motor oil, or let someone find you a job in Saudi Arabia. But I’ve never seen one extolling the profits in a Christian bookstore. Even National Enquirer readers wouldn’t be taken in by that! Most Christian bookstores are operated by individuals who are more interested in building up the body of Christ than in building up the gross national product. Certainly this is true of those operating Adventist Book Centers. Of course, they are businessmen, too, and it would be nice to be able to pay the bills and have a little left over.

So if you’ve come across a book that has expanded your spiritual horizons, why not tell your members about it? (It doesn’t even have to be from our denominational presses!) If you weave into your sermon some concepts or quotes from a book you’ve been reading, why not mention that fact and encourage your people to read the book for themselves? Why not have a place in your newsletter for books you recommend? In most cases, your encouragement and advice will largely determine what your people read—or in some cases whether they read at all.

Wouldn’t you really like to have a church of members who are growing spiritually through the things they are reading?—B.R.H.
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Most people find their lives divided into stages—and wives of pastors are no exception. While the times of transition between stages often bring extra stress, you can meet them successfully.

Shepherdess □ Karen Nuessle

Five faces of the minister’s wife

Our author, Karen Nuessle, has written a most perceptive article. As I read it I felt in some respects as if my own life was transpiring before me. Tracing the stages of experience of a minister’s wife, Karen says it is possible she will wear five “faces” during her lifetime. While there will be times of boundless joy, she will also encounter times of difficulty and decision-making. As you read her article I am sure you too will be able to identify with most of these faces. It is comforting to know, as you meet new challenges, that God has a plan for your life and that there are other ministers’ wives experiencing similar circumstances. Karen says that a prior awareness of difficult times, prayer, and love will see you through. Her conclusion is one you will agree with. God loves you.—Marie Spangler.

“Oh, I know you. You’re the pastor’s wife.”

No matter what her talents or her personal or career achievements, when Mrs. Pastor is introduced to the congregation she will always be the pastor’s wife. In no other profession in the world is a woman as closely bracketed to her husband and his work. (It may be a calling or it may be a profession, but it is always work.)

This constant alliance has advantages and disadvantages. Because she moves so frequently, the pastor’s wife may find it reassuring to know that she has a ready-made niche just waiting for her to fill. Most people will be friendly to her just because she is the pastor’s wife, and she will develop deeper friendships with some of these church members as time passes.

But what of the disadvantages, the special stresses and strains that uniquely affect the woman who also happens to be a pastor’s wife? I sometimes think we need a ministerial Erma Bombeck to point out to us that though our problems are uniquely ours, almost all ministerial wives face them at some time or other.

I believe there are five distinct “faces” we as ministers’ wives assume because of the impact of our husband’s work on our lives.

The new bride who happened to fall in love with a minister is catapulted into the role of minister’s wife. Idealistic and eager, she plans to turn the world around for Christ, to drive away apathy and try out all sorts of rosy dreams and plans.

Whether working outside the home or in it, she willingly shoulders preparation of the bulletin, visitation, Bible studies, food baskets, Dorcas, and Sabbath school responsibilities in order to do “her” share to finish “the work.” Excited and enthusiastic, she finds fulfillment in spending her time on her husband’s goals, the church’s aims, and her relationship with Christ.

At times she may wonder about her motivation. Is she doing all these things for love of God or love of her man? But all in all, in the first flush of ministerial initiation, the wife’s total involvement is taken for granted. She is part of the team. They work together.

Then the first baby arrives, generally followed by at least one more child. The bride, though still a minister’s wife, has now added a new “face” to her life—mother.

The new arrival causes her to take one step away from her role as the totally involved minister’s wife. Her withdrawal adds to the strain on the husband-wife relationship already precipitated by the baby’s arrival. It is as though the ministerial wife has made a career change.

The role change becomes more involved if the wife works outside the home and continues to do so after the baby’s birth, or if she has worked outside the home until this time and decides to stay home. Both scenarios generate tension and require adjustment. If the ministerial couple realizes this tension is a natural outcome of their “blessed event” and that every couple needs time to adjust, they can reduce the stress and adapt more easily.

However, in some ways a baby’s arrival affects the ministerial family more than other families. Parishioners are often delighted with the new baby but fail to understand that the pastor’s wife consequently must curtail some of her obligations. And often the new mother faces pressure to be an exemplary parent raising a “perfect” baby.

Nothing harasses a ministerial mother more than wrestling alone with two small children in the back pew while being chastised by looks if not by words from the couples sitting around her, handling one child between them. If nothing else, this exercise in humility teaches her how to empathize with young mothers—especially the many single-parent families that need her understanding and support. She knows a little bit about single parenting—she’s been doing it for years!

When Junior and Junior Miss have started school, Mom faces another career change. In many cases Mrs. Minister would love to shift gears down and move back into the tight intimacy of that first stage in her life—she and her husband, a team for Christ. In most cases, however, the “demon” of school tuition rears its head. Necessity rules choice, and Mom steps back into her original career or has to train for one. Either way, in stepping back into the job market, she takes yet another step away from her original involvement in her husband’s work.

Now, even the few duties she retained during young motherhood must fall by the wayside. Further divorced from the work both of them love, she does not feel like a ministerial wife on any day but the Sabbath. In this role she can identify with many “seventh-day Adventists”—
she is involved with the church only on the seventh day.

If she works outside the home, the ministerial wife needs more cooperation and help from her husband and children. Here the pastor walks a fine line. He can be home and to some extent subjugate his schedule to hers. But should he?

Most certainly the wife needs her husband’s support during this time. She may be suffering withdrawal symptoms as a result of her noninvolvement with the church. She may be feeling frustration because her time is more hectic—all the things she used to do during the day she must now do at night. The children also may be feeling bewildered. Yes, they have been helping and doing chores before this. Now, however, their “help” is very much a necessity.

Perhaps the most puzzling stage the pastor’s wife experiences is the fourth. Until now her goals and aims have been very straightforward; she really has had few options but the one she took. What she has done has been done of necessity. But now the children are no longer at home. The financial burden that demanded that she work outside the home has lightened to the point where she has a choice. And that creates what may be the greatest fear—the fear of making the right decision.

Until now, perhaps, the wife has taken more classwork to become eligible for better wages and positions. For personal fulfillment as well as financial security she has done her best to realize her potential in her career. Now, she must choose. Should she step back to renew the intimate working partnership she and her husband enjoyed at the onset of their pastoral ministry? Or should she continue to work outside the home and the pastoral realm and reap the just-now-ripening harvest produced by the years of hard work she has put into her career?

No one can make that choice for her. No one can say what is best. The ministerial wife may choose stage one and find a thrill and fulfillment in her relationship to God and her husband that could rival heaven on earth. She could savor the sweetness of sharing victories and answers to prayer, the joy that results when two work together as support and helpmate to one another. Sometimes, however, when a career woman used to authority tries reentering stage one, she can be totalitarian and a thoroughly objectionable addition.

Or she may choose to fully enter stage four, finding time to slip comfortably into a career-wife role that may never have been hers. This stage makes possible a beautiful blossoming of the coupleness of the minister and his wife. Both have outside interests, but they are at home alone now. They can enjoy the sweetness of a twosome knowing one another more fully.

So stage four represents an important choice, one not easily made but one that once again changes the face of the minister’s wife. This stage renews more of a willful decision than any of the others.

Stage five, widowhood, gives the pastor’s wife no choice at all. Certainly not all ministers’ wives will experience this stage. But no matter what face the minister’s wife may be wearing when stage five strikes, it is probably more traumatic for her than any other woman because of her close connection to her husband’s calling.

To a large degree, when her husband dies the minister’s wife loses her identity. Oh, she has always had one of her own, but it has been so closely related to her husband that this stage can cut a woman down to half her size.

She loses her role in her church as the pastor’s wife—for a new pastor will come. She usually loses her home, and ends up moving shortly after her husband’s death. She loses more than her man at his death. I don’t think I am being too dramatic in saying she loses almost everything. At this time her faith in and dependence on the Lord are all she really has left.

Why define these five stages? Why point out something so obvious? All ministers’ wives will face at least one of these role changes. It is comforting, reassuring to know that others have confronted these five faces and lived through them—not just subsisting, but living joyfully.

And, while we may not know one another personally, we can be sympathetic and supportive of each other, aware of the trials and victories our sisters are facing.

When we are aware of the difficulties we will face at the transition between these stages, we can regard the difficulties as challenges and successfully meet them. Satan, the “roaring lion” seeking to destroy us by destroying our homes, uses these special times of stress in his efforts. Through awareness, prayer, and love we may defeat him at our very doors. Then, when someone greets us with “Oh, I know you—you’re the minister’s wife,” we can respond, “Yes, I am; and I’m very happy to be one.”

Prayers from the parsonage

Somehow I’d always pictured Golgotha as an isolated spot that few people passed. Criminals were put on public display, of course, but I imagined that only friends or relatives (and maybe a few hardened onlookers) actually went out to the crucifixion site.

I’ve just learned that this “Place of the Skull” was at the crossroads of two thoroughfares. On that Passover weekend, caravans of pilgrims would be passing by as they arrived from Joppa in the west or from Samaria to the north to enter the western gate of Jerusalem.

A tide of pressing, pushing people surged, their spirits dampened by the sight of three Roman crosses where Jews hang in agony. Men look away, women cover their faces, and children stare in horror. Most do not know who is dying or why.

You suffered in public, Lord. No secluded courtyard and quick execution. No black hood and anonymity. No privacy.

Naked before gawking spectators. Shamed before followers and family. Humiliated before mocking priests and soldiers. Tortured before curious bystanders. Surrounded by swarming life, You had to fight pain for every breath. While others took life for granted, You willed to stay alive in order to suffer to the extreme.

Jesus, I’m so sorry.

Yet, how like You to be in the midst of people. “God with us” till the end.
worldly-wise, unconverted ministers and teachers who do not have the Holy Spirit's power and the truth of Jesus in their hearts. Was it the laity or the clergy who initiated the leadership crisis the article talks about? I agree that we need the unity of the Spirit in the church. However, the Holy Spirit does not lead to the tearing down of the church and its teachings, but to a deeper consecration to it.—Pansy O. Long, Sandstone, Minnesota.

**Staffed to grow**

Sing Handel's "Hallelujah Chorus" and the doxology all at the same time! Don Jacobsen's article "Is Your Church Staffed to Grow?" (December, 1983) has hit upon the fundamental problem of administration and management within our denomination. We have forgotten that the conference, union, division, and General Conference offices and officers exist to support the local church in the carrying out of the gospel commission. Instead, we have acted as if it were the other way around. Huge sums of money are spent to maintain support systems, but relatively little goes to the "production line." In our own conference, which I believe is not atypical, only 30 percent of its tithe funds are expended in field salaries and expenses. Have we forgotten that it is the local church, and not the conference, union, or General Conference office, that generates souls and income?—Forrest L. Howe, York, Pennsylvania.

"Is Your Church Staffed to Grow?" presents a dilemma that frustrates many of us. An increased staff, paid for by the tithe, is a delightful prospect for the local church. But it is not, nor ever has been, God's provision for church growth.

It seems to me that God's plan is for larger churches to plant new ones. If an eighty-member church grew to two hundred and then could grow no further with existing staff, surely God's work would be further ahead to plant another church by dividing the congregation rather than to increase local staff.

Addition and consolidation are contrary to church growth. Division and multiplication promote growth.—Freberin P. Baerg, Dowagiac, Michigan.

I agree wholeheartedly with the article "Is Your Church Staffed to Grow?" My personal experience confirms the truth of what it says. In a church I pastored, I came across an individual who (1) had secretarial skills, (2) was a committed church member, and (3) had lots of free time. She took over my typing, filing, phoning, scheduling, correspondence, etcetera. It was amazing to find out how much time I had been spending doing these things. She even became a part-time Bible worker, filling in for me when I couldn't meet a Bible study appointment because of workers' meetings or other conflicts. The number of visits I could make increased markedly, as well as the time I could spend on personal Bible study and sermon preparation.

Then an unfortunate thing happened. She had to find gainful employment in order to send her children to church school! This simply points up a fact of life in the churches: Competent, dependable volunteer help is hard to find.

I have been amazed also at the resistance on the part of the local church to the idea of the pastor's having a secretary paid from local church funds. This has been true even of such persons as church school principals and teachers who are denominationally employed and who have a secretary in the school to care for their needs!

A pastor could actually pastor several small churches with ease if he had an administrative assistant/secretary. I believe, with Jacobsen, that such a person should be paid from the tithe funds just as are secretaries at the conference or union office. A formula could be worked out based on tithe figures so that districts of churches could be formed to support such a person financially.

If pastors are called to preach, evangelize, and care for the congregation, then surely we should free them from mundane administrative duties so they can devote more time to prayer and the ministry of the Word. In fact, a model for this very thing can be found in Acts 6.—Rollin Shoemaker, Brooklyn, New York.

Jacobsen's article addresses an issue of vital importance to our church. We must see again and again articles that remind us that the real church is the local congregation, not the organizational structure. The more of our resources we invest in the local church, the more we will reach the goals toward which we have striven for so long.—David Thomas, Amesbury, Massachusetts.

**Hospitals here and there**

"Adventist Hospitals Can Be Different" (December, 1983) pointed out the ability of hospitals outside North America to support the church's mission in providing health care. It seems easier, in some ways, for such a hospital to do so since it is staffed with employed Seventh-day Adventist physicians and dentists. In North America our hospitals have few denominationally employed physicians and no closed medical staffs, yet they still do a tremendous work.

I hope in a future issue the editors will interview the president of one of the church's four health system corporations in the United States.—Jim Culpepper, Moberly, Missouri.

**Church should take stand on abortion**

I appreciate the good articles in MINISTRY. Dr. Provonska's article "How Much Is a Fetus Worth?" (January, 1984) particularly brings to light the most important ethical issues involved in abortion and should prove to be an added incentive for our church to take a decided stand on the conservative side of this matter. I pray that the Lord will guide MINISTRY and the church in bringing this subject to light. The church is going through some unusual times, and God's power must bring us that Pentecostal experience of powerful witnessing and unselfish service.—Richard A. Hansen, Poland Spring, Maine.
Caesar's schools?

A few years ago the observant Charles Clayton Morrison editorialized in Christian Century that the nation's public schools are secularizing schoolchildren faster than the churches can Christianize them. His remark has never been successfully refuted.

One of the finest compliments to be paid any people is that they deliberately act in keeping with their faith and convictions. This is precisely what many Seventh-day Adventist parents and church workers have done in setting up Christian schools to share the Christian faith and its implications for life and learning with their children. They have seen what happens when a child is educated apart from God, and at considerable financial sacrifice they have sought to honor their understanding of God's expectations.

Jesus was once asked by questioners (who really didn't want to know) whether it was proper to give tribute to Caesar. Jesus, of course, acknowledged a dual citizenship and taught His followers the same. But never did He imply that these allegiances were of equal rank. You recall the story: Jesus called for a piece of money and asked whose image was on the coin's face. Told it was the image of Caesar, Jesus appropriately replied that they should give back to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and added emphatically, "... and unto God the things that are God's."

Gordon Oosterman wrote: "Christians must take a good look at the faces of their children. If you see the image of Caesar, then by all means send your children to Caesar's school. If, however, you see what Christians have long spoken of as the 'image of God' on those faces, well, to which school do you think you should direct them?"

The annual Educational Day Offering is scheduled for April 28. These funds are used to offset the high costs of education, especially at the elementary level. Pastors are encouraged—indeed, expected—to promote Christian education in their churches. Promotion of the offering on April 28 is good and proper, but urging and encouraging our youth to be in God's schools is truly the acid test.

Women of the year

The Association of Adventist Women is seeking nominations of women to be recognized at its national convention July 13-15 at Andrews University. Nominations should be of women who have made outstanding contributions to the Adventist Church, the home, career, and community. With each nomination include your name, address, and telephone number along with the reason for the nomination and the category (homemaker, writer, secretary, musician, et cetera). Also provide three references including the local pastor or elder. Submit nominations before June 1 to: Association of Adventist Women, P. O. Box 3884, Langley Park, Maryland 20787.

Did Ellen White take the ideas in The Great Controversy from Milton?

Is the White Estate keeping secrets in the "Z" file?

Do you know how to take the worry out of money management in your church?

Does the Jews' return to Palestine fulfill Bible prophecy?

You will find the answers to these—and many other—vital questions Adventist ministers are facing by subscribing to Ministry Tape of the Month in 1984.

As a pastor, you will likely spend more than 500 hours in your car this year! Ministry Tape of the Month will let you read as you drive. It provides you with an anytime, anywhere resource of sermons and lectures from our international forum of speakers. Ministry Tape of the Month sounds like a great value. I'd like to try it out on a no-obligation basis. I have enclosed $52.95 for one year's subscription. I understand that if I am not satisfied, I can return the tapes and receive a full refund.

YES, I agree that Ministry Tape of the Month will keep you abreast of theological issues and improve your administrative skills as well as help your preaching.

And Ministry Tape of the Month offers a tremendous value. A subscription brings you two C-90 cassettes each month for one year—at less than half the price per cassette of other tape clubs for ministers!

**NO-RISK TRIAL OFFER**

We are so convinced you will find this service irresistible that we are making a no-risk trial offer. Start your subscription with us—and if you do not wish to continue after you have listened to the first month's cassettes, you can simply mail them back, and we will return your money.
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Recommended reading

The Service of God: How Worship and Ethics Are Related

In the preface the author briefly recounts his own worship pilgrimage, moving from little concern about worship and involvement in social activism during seminary days to the current "I wonder what a rather tame, introverted, acculturated church can learn from a reconsideration of its worship. Wherewith can an otherwise bland and unsavory ecclesia be salted if not by new encounters with its God? Back to the sanctuary."—Page 12.

With that gambit he begins his discussion of the relationship between corporate worship and Christian ethics.

Willimon suggests that after two decades of intense involvement of the Christian church in social and moral issues of national and international import, it is losing its identity and its integrity because the world has been permitted to transform the church. Allowing the world to set the agenda, the church forgot why it came to the meeting (p. 49). His response to this tragic situation is: "In the rites of the church our story is told and retold. This is where the Christian vision is seen and shared. The liturgy of the church thus becomes a primary source of inspiration; that is, the prophet receives his information from the Lord largely in the form of dreams and visions. The author is quick to add that this model is scriptural, having its basis in 2 Peter 1:20, 21. But not all Bible writers were prophets.

Since the prophetic model does not explain all inspired writings, Rice proposes a second model of inspiration, the "Lucan model." In assessing its importance, he states: "Without it our teaching on inspiration is not presented 'in its entirety.' Without it our understanding is fragmented."—Page 16. Based on Luke's Gospel prologue in Luke 1:1-4, this model suggests that the Bible writer utilizes sources as he writes and that he is guided by the Holy Spirit in his choice of materials—both inspired and uninspired.

After introducing the problem and then defining this second model of inspiration, Rice spends the remainder of the book comparing Luke's Gospel record with that of the other Gospel writers. Rice candidly states that significant variations exist among the different Gospel accounts and that these variations are not simply "minor discrepancies" (pp. 71-82). He feels such variations are often the result of theological purposes of the writer.

Making TV Work for Your Family

Christian ministers often decry the violence and suggestive scenes portrayed on television, but they also know that most members own televisions—and do little monitoring of what the family watches.

Into this chasm between pulpit put-downs and member viewing habits steps William Coleman and Making TV Work for Your Family. Coleman, a pastor-turned-writer, likes television: "Our television set is one of the most interesting things in our home." But he is no network shill whitewashing television. He is concerned about the types of heroes television portrays and the disruption of family life.

Making TV Work searches for ways to let television be a useful servant for the family, just as the car and hot-water heater can be. To do so, Coleman proposes questions—clearly the best part of the book—at the end of each chapter. For instance, questions in the chapter explaining average television set usage ask the reader to evaluate his own television use. Coleman recommends that the book be read and discussed for family worship; the questions provide a fertile field for parent-child interaction.

Luke, a Plagiarist?

Written for thinking people and not for those who simply want pat answers, this book wrestles with the question What should be the Seventh-day Adventist concept of inspiration in light of recent controversies? According to the author, the root cause of present controversies is a one-sided view of how inspired writings originate. For more than one hundred years Seventh-day Adventists have operated with a "prophetic model" of inspiration; that is, the prophet receives his information from the Lord largely in the form of dreams and visions. The author is quick to add that this model is scriptural, having its