



## Columbia Union College Graduate Wins Emmy Award

by Alita Byrd

Rick Swartzwelder, a 1993 graduate of Columbia Union College, recently won first place for a comedy film from the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences in their national "Student Emmy" awards. Swartzwelder received a \$2,000 grant from Kodak and \$1,000 from the Academy, as well as an all-expenses-paid trip to Los Angeles for the awards ceremony and screening, which took place on March 10, 1996.

"Things really could not have gone better," Swartzwelder said. "The ceremony was great, and the DGA [Directors' Guild of America] screening the following night was exceptional as well—an outstanding response to the film itself. I was also fortunate enough to make some incredible contacts."

Swartzwelder's film, *Paul McCall*, is a 12-minute story about a shy second-grader with a hyperactive imagination who must do battle with the class bullies, as well as his own fears, in order to succeed in getting a mysterious note from his teacher to his mom. In this film about a young boy determined to do the right thing—no matter what—the plot weaves in and out of reality and Paul McCall's incredibly creative mind.

Entries in the competition sponsored by the academy represented 138 colleges and universities from 30 states. Swartzwelder's film was

produced as his master's thesis while at the Florida State University Graduate Motion Picture Conservatory, which he attended for two years, graduating in 1995 with an M.F.A. in Motion Picture Production.

Rick Swartzwelder, presently working in the cooperative education department at Columbia Union College, has worked on more than 40 narrative film and video projects and numerous stage productions. Recently, he produced and directed a music video for the alternative band 606, and portions of his documentary *GROUND ZERO: The Making of Trinity* aired during an episode of *Movie Magic* on the cable television Discovery Channel.

### Female Chaplain's Ordination Recognized

Penny Shell, chief of chaplain services at Shady Grove Adventist Hospital, was honored December 13, 1995, by the board of Adventist Healthcare Mid-Atlantic. It formally voted to "recognize Ms. Shell for her recent ordination to the gospel ministry."

Shell was one of the first three women ordained to the gospel ministry in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The service took place September 23, 1995, at Sligo church. Shell is the first woman to be elected president of the Seventh-day Adventist Healthcare Chaplains, an association of her colleagues throughout North America.

*A graduate and current employee of Columbia Union College wins an Emmy for his short comedy, Paul McCall, and Healthcare Mid-Atlantic honors a female chaplain's ordination to gospel ministry.*

---

*Alita Byrd, a junior English and journalism major at Columbia Union College, is Spectrum's office assistant.*



## At God's Table, Women Sit Where They Are Told

by Keith A. Burton

Patricia A. Habada and Rebecca Frost Brillhart. *The Welcome Table*. Langley Park, Maryland: TEAM-Press, 1995. \$9.95 paper. 408 pages.

My interest in the role of women in ministry of the church deepened as I studied at a United Methodist seminary with a 50-percent female student population. I read and studied with such authors as Rosemary Radford-Ruether, Rosemary Skinner-Keller, Phyllis Bird, and John Scholer.<sup>1</sup> As I have probed into the topic I have come to believe that the real issue is not ordination, but officiation. Women are ordained to serve in the church, but should not be installed in the office of pastor.

This approach has led me to agree with the proponents of women's ordination that Scripture does not deny the right of women to be ordained to minister. The Bible makes it clear that the distribution of the Spirit's gifts is undiscriminating. However, I also agree with those who oppose women

occupying a certain ecclesiastical office—the pastoral ministry. Scripture and the practice of the earliest church inform us that this office—which was not determined by a person's spiritual giftedness—was occupied only by males.

In my evaluation of *The Welcome Table*, I focus on those essays that claim to be involved in the biblical-interpretive process. I will show that these essays are deeply flawed by relying on the historical-critical method of understanding the Bible.

Raymond Cottrell, in "A Guide to Reliable Interpretation: Determining the Meaning of Scripture," says he uses the historical method to interpret Scripture (as opposed to *historical-critical* or *historical-grammatical*). However, Cottrell's application of this method suggests that the qualifying term *critical* would not be amiss.

Cottrell's claim, that Paul's admonition in 1 Corinthians 14 and 1 Timothy 2 is culturally conditioned, totally rejects the fact that Paul uses the *Tanak*, and not the *Talmud*, to lend authority to his interpretation. Cottrell's assertion that Paul's views and teachings were governed by

*A dismissal of The Welcome Table because its authors accept the "historical-critical" method, followed by an appreciation of both The Welcome Table and Women and the Church.*

---

Keith A. Burton is assistant professor of religion at Oakwood College, Huntsville, Alabama.

chauvinistic culture means Paul himself was unable to determine the meaning of Scripture.

Particularly disturbing to me is the essay by Donna Jeane Haerich, which has been strongly influenced by the historical-critical conclusions of feminists such as Phyllis Tribble and Rosemary Ruether. Strangely enough, this essay is placed after Cottrell's discussion of biblical interpretation, in which he claims that, "No Seventh-day Adventist Bible scholar subscribes to [the historical-critical] method, or to its presuppositions or conclusions."<sup>2</sup> Haerich charges that the account of the creation of humans in Genesis 2 is not history. In advancing her misinformed charge that the original human was an androgyne, she completely rejects the fact that *Adam* is not only a generic term for "human," but is actually the name of the first male himself (as "Eve" is the name of the first female). As impressive as Haerich's scholarly argument may sound to the uncritical lay person, any honest biblical scholar has to admit that it is a reading of the author's views into an understanding of Scripture.

Interestingly enough, the essay that follows Haerich's completely rejects the absurdity of her thesis. In writing on "Man and Woman as Equal Partners," David Larson cautions against the tendency toward an androgynous interpretation of the Creation accounts. Larson approaches the issue systematically by summarizing the three theological prevailing positions concerning the relationship of male and female: (1) woman as subordinate and inferior; (2) woman as subordinate but not inferior; (3) woman as neither subordinate nor inferior. He then elevates the weaknesses in the first two arguments, while promoting a basis for the veracity of the third position. However, his critique of the second position is based on an extremely serious mis-

understanding of the major arguments supporting it.

I cannot speak for all who fall under Larson's second category, but I do not agree with his assertion that "this interpretation rests upon a distinction between equality in being and value on the one hand and inequality in role and function on the other."<sup>3</sup> Larson deliberately obscures the position of many adherents of this interpretation when he uses the term *inequality*, instead of *difference*, to describe the unique, divine roles assigned by God to male and female. Just because a man cannot have a baby does not make him physiologically unequal to a woman—just different. Similarly, because Scripture portrays an order in the family structure that is gender-based does not mean that a woman is spiritually unequal to a man; her spiritual role is different—complementary.

Paul does not "reject" the male-female hierarchy, as Larson claims, but simply puts it into perspective. In fact, Larson himself says it best: "[Paul] does not abolish these roles and functions [between husband and wife]. He transforms their moral meaning with the theme of mutual submission."<sup>4</sup> I agree with Larson that Paul would have voted in favor of the ordination of women, but he would not have supported their occupying the office of episcopos, or senior pastor.

Fritz Guy's essay, describing "The Disappearance of Paradise,"

---

*I believe these essays are deeply flawed by relying on the historical-critical method of understanding the Bible.*

also betrays the influence of historical-critical ideologies. Not only does he constantly refer to the two Creation stories seen by those who adhere to the documentary hypothesis, but judging by 12 of his 25 footnotes, his understanding of the Creation story is chiefly derived from Phyllis Tribble's charge of the misogynous nature of the biblical texts. It appears that Guy feels it his duty to continue the legacy of Tribble and elevate the female as the more rational partner of the original pair. In forwarding his image of a strong egalitarian female, he diminishes the male to a compromising wimp. Adam does not have the ability to think for himself, quickly shifting the blame to the female. By contrast, Eve, confronted by God, avoids the male's scapegoating excuses.<sup>5</sup>

A further betrayal of Guy's dependence on the presuppositions of historical-critical ideology is seen in his assertion that the curse on the original humans was "descriptive" rather than "prescriptive." If, as I suspect, this thought is borrowed from Carol Meyer's monograph *Discovering Eve* (which he does allude to in a footnote), then he is among those who see Creation as a story, rather than as history.

Edwin Zackrisson's essay, "Inclusive Redemption," is concerned with elevating the significance of what he terms the "horizontal" implications of Galatians 3:28. He suggests that Adventist "folk religion" has affected the official decisions of the institutional church, particularly with regard to women's ordination. Like many liberals—who desire to win the sympathy of Europeans who are afflicted with a guilt complex caused by their racist attitudes toward non-whites—Zackrisson suggests that in the same way the "church" was wrong in its support of the notion of white

superiority, it is also wrong in its practice of male superiority.<sup>6</sup>

Like many interpreters, Zackrisson has totally misapplied the way in which Galatians 3:28 is to be contextually understood. In the passage within which the text appears, Paul is speaking primarily about "vertical redemption." Paul in no way intended to promote the dissolution of social, ethnic, and biological distinctions. That this was not his intention is evident from the many places in the Pauline corpus where he affirms these differences. Of course, while Galatians 3:28 does not teach that all humans are the same, it does herald the fact that all humans are of equal worth. In that sense, the concept of equality is definitely present in this manifesto of Paul's.

Zackrisson's essay raises many questions, the chief of which is, "Who is the church?" Like many well-minded liberals, Zackrisson still appears to be unconsciously molded by the notion that Europeans are supposed to define the church's agenda. He fails to see that women's ordination is chiefly a white, middle-class concern. (Charles Bradford's brief forward is the only contribution of non-whites to this collection.) It appears to me that Zackrisson and his associates have not yet experienced the type of "horizontal redemption" that is inclusive enough to listen to what non-white Adventist theologians have to say about the issue.

Halcyon Westphal Wilson's article claims that the status and role of women in earliest Christianity has been forgotten.<sup>7</sup> She paints a picture of Christianity giving voice to the marginalized women in a chauvinistic Palestinian society. She correctly points out that the disciples of Jesus included both women and men. Also helpful is her observation that every believer in Christ was a disciple, and conse-

quently a minister.

However, Wilson fails to ask the fundamental question of whether the inclusion of women among the disciples meant that gender distinctions were no longer important in God's religion. After all, many women were attracted to Judaism, and any convert to Judaism was considered a disciple (proselyte). Therefore, the inclusion of women in Jesus' band of disciples was in no way a violation of societal mores. One could further ask, If Jesus were intending to go against societal mores, why didn't he include women among his apostles? Wouldn't this have been an even stronger witness?<sup>8</sup>

Unlike Wilson, I fail to see how the Adventist Church is mirroring the chauvinistic attitudes of many of the inhabitants of first-century Jewish Palestine. In fact, "Appendix 6" in this collection shows that from the very beginning of our movement women have played an important role both internationally and locally.

---

*For whatever reason, God decided to designate the male as the spiritual head of the family and the church. I will never know why he instituted this apparent hierarchy. I simply accept my limited understanding and allow God to be God.*

The title of Sheryll Prinz-McMillan's essay poses the question, "Who's in Charge of the Family?" After conducting exegeses of several passages, Prinz-McMillan concludes that Christ is in charge of the family, and therefore any hierarchical structure among human beings is built on the fallacy of male superiority. Prinz-McMillan's chief objection is with the concept of "male headship," which she feels is responsible for abuse of power in male-female relationships.<sup>9</sup> It appears to me that with this approach, Prinz-McMillan "throws out the baby with the bath water." It reminds me of the reactionary stance taken by the Nation of Islam which, by its rejection of Christianity, demonstrates an ignorant acceptance of the distortions placed upon Christian doctrines by European imperialists. Christianity is no more a "white man's religion" than is biblical "headship" a concept that gives men permission to abuse their women.<sup>10</sup> In expressing the mutual dependence of woman and man later on in the chapter, Paul establishes that this divine order does not provide a precedent for abuse or privilege; it is merely the way things are.<sup>11</sup>

The influence of the form critical branch of historical criticism on Prinz-McMillan is evident in her assertion that Ephesians 5:21-6:9 is derived from the Greco-Roman "household codes," and not applicable to our contemporary situation. What she fails to see is that Paul provides a theological rationale for comparing the husband to Christ and the woman to the church.<sup>12</sup> This comparison supports the notion of male headship and does not suggest the absence of hierarchical roles among the several parties comprising a family. One can ask Prinz-McMillan if the egalitarian American family can or



should be transferred to the ecclesiastical family.

Joyce Hanscom Lorntz's article addresses the issue of "Spiritual Gifts and the Good News." Lorntz reasons that since every Christian receives spiritual gifts, the church does not have the right to restrict the occupation of any church office to the male gender. I agree with Lorntz.

Lorntz, though, is under the mistaken assumption that spiritual gifts are the sole criteria for ordination and, consequently, the holding of church office. While I agree that the silence of the Scriptures means the church can ordain those who possess certain gifts, Scripture is not at all silent on the subject of who holds church office.

In building her case, Lorntz proposes that the biblical model of ministry is based on mutuality rather than hierarchy. A key foundation of her discussion is the concept of the "priesthood of all believers" that she finds in 1 Peter 2. She asserts: "The priesthood of all believers, . . . discredits any system which teaches that a man or priest must mediate between humans and God."<sup>13</sup> But the priesthood of all believers is derived from Exodus 19:5, 6, and originally applied to the nation of Israel, which had an elaborate gender-restricted priestly system.

For whatever reason, God decided to designate the male as the spiritual head of the family and the church. I will never know why he instituted this apparent hierarchy. Neither will I know why he chose to rest on the seventh day rather than on the fourth; or why he designated certain animals clean and others unclean; or why he chose a woman to be the prophet to the remnant. I simply accept my limited understanding and allow God to be God.

Probably one of the more objective essays is that of V. Norskov

Olsen, who basically offers a report of the New Testament records of people in ministry.<sup>14</sup> He makes no value judgment of the evidence, and does not attempt to push a hidden agenda. He simply states that, "The record clearly indicates that women were deeply involved in ministry in the early Christian church."<sup>15</sup> In his objective reporting, Olsen gives us the opportunity to discuss whether or not the evidence supports the inclusion of women in particular ecclesiastical roles.

In his informative essay, Ralph Neall addresses the issue of "Ordination Among the People of God." Neall proposes that, since all in the New Testament church are priests, there is no longer a need for specialized offices. If this is indeed the case, I would like to know how Neall understands the functions of the *episkopoi* (bishops), *diakonoi* (deacons), and *presbyteroi* (elders). While I acknowledge that Jesus was indeed the embodiment of the

---

*An unfathomable divine mandate requires that at God's table, men sit in their assigned seats and women in theirs. Regardless of who the members call pastor, only those who have remained faithful to the end will bear the blessed "well done" from the Father.*

Israelite priesthood, none can deny that his establishment of an apostleship—along with the Spirit's guidance of the early church—marked the institution of a new organizational system.<sup>16</sup>

In my opinion, Ginger Hanks Harwood's discussion of "Women and Mission" provides the most compelling case for the ordination of women to the Seventh-day Adventist ministry. Although she does not want to admit that much of the current discussion has been fueled by arguments from the feminist movement,<sup>17</sup> she is justified in her lamentation over the backward movement of the Seventh-day Adventist Church which encouraged and supported women in ministry in the 19th century, but now has policies that restrict the divine right of women to fully practice ministry. In her chastisement of the church, Harwood raises a serious concern with her observation that ecclesiastical restrictions on women's ordination could have a negative effect on opportunities to evangelize, particularly in the area of chaplaincy.<sup>18</sup>

Harwood also presents sensible rationales for ordaining women. Ordination is a recognition that the individual has been trained and adequately examined and is therefore worthy to represent the official church. As Harwood warns, to encourage women (or men) to minister independently without qualification by ordination could have disastrous effects on the stability of the church in matters of dogma and praxis.

I find two major weaknesses in Harwood's argument. The first is in her categorization of the various schools of thought about women's ordination that are present in Adventism. She neglects those who believe that women should be ordained to minister in whatever area they have been

called. However, this would not include the office of pastor, since it is an office restricted to appointed men; being a pastor is not a spiritual gift, but an ecclesiastical function.

Harwood is also to be challenged for her reasoning that the ordination of women would provide good public relations for the church. Many biblical doctrines held by Adventists are peculiar to onlookers—such as Sabbath observance, dietary restrictions, and dress. However, if the theological position of the church can be fully substantiated from the Bible, and is not based on tradition or opinion, there is no need to fear the response of onlookers.

Habada and Brillhart have set a table that already accommodates those who have attacked the relevance of biblical authority; those who wish to pretend that the gnostic image of the primeval and eschatological androgyne is the one toward which Adventists should be moving; those whose interest is in the acquisition of corporate power rather than the evangelization of a dying world; and, finally, those who confuse the indiscriminating distribution of the Spirit's gifts with the discriminating limitation of the familial and ecclesiastical roles that have been defined by the same Spirit. Of course, God has also already set a place at his table for women ordained to serve as evangelists, teachers, assistant pastors, chaplains, departmental directors, etc.

The two essays by Bert Haloviak and Kit Watts that commence the collection remind us that the Adventist Church of yesteryear was fully cognizant of the ministerial roles that God *expects* women to occupy in his church.<sup>19</sup> However, one thing they fail to acknowledge is that an unfathomable divine mandate requires that at God's table, men sit in their assigned

seats and women in theirs. Since all seats are in the esteemed presence of the Almighty, neither complain because they realize that none is of greater or lesser worth—both are equal in his sight, both are uniquely needed in his divine plan. And when all is said and done, regardless of who the members call *pastor*, only those who have remained faithful to the end will hear the blessed “well done” from the Father. Maranatha!

---

1. These are some of the outstanding spokespersons on the status of women in the Bible and the church (Scholer is the foremost evangelical spokesperson on women in ministry).

2. Cottrell, “Interpretation,” p. 84.

3. Larson, “Equal Partners,” p. 120.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 128.

5. Note his comments about Adam: “More like a sheep than a shepherd, he simply takes the fruit and eats” (Guy, “Paradise,” p. 141). “He pictured himself as the victim of circumstances: the woman gave him the fruit; what else could he do but eat it? For her part, the woman did little better. She ignored the man, and she didn't explicitly blame God” (*ibid.*, p. 145).

6. See discussion in Zackrisson, “Inclusive Redemption,” pp. 155-177.

7. “The Forgotten Disciples: The Empowering of Love vs. The Love of Power.”

8. Another pertinent question would compare how the role of women in earliest Christianity compares with that of women in Judaism and other religious systems of the first century?

9. See “Family,” p. 199: “Headship, as a catchphrase for relational hierarchy, not only has the potential for abuse, but also for idolatry as well.”

10. Before Prinz-McMillan builds an argument on Stephen Bedale's work, she needs to take a firsthand look at the work of Wayne Grudem who has conducted a detailed study of the semantic range of *kephale* based on the extensive *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (Does *kephale* [“Head”] Mean “Source” or “Authority” in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples,” *Trinity Journal* 6 [1985], pp. 38-59. It is obvious that Prinz-McMillan has never even

read the important sources she cites in her footnotes since she includes Grudem as one who supports *source* as a meaning of *kephale*.) Grudem proves that there is absolutely no instance in Greek literature where *kephale* can be understood as “source” (see also the article by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Another Look at *Kephale* in 1 Corinthians 11:3,” *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989), pp. 503-511). In the context of 1 Corinthians 11, *kephale* can only be understood in hierarchical fashion (compare this passage to Ephesians 5:22-33 where *kephale* is again used metaphorically and conveys the meaning of literal *head*, as is deduced from the corresponding use of *soma* [body]).

11. Further evidence of Prinz-McMillan's inability to conduct responsible hermeneutics is seen in her reference to Dionysus as “. . . a prominent goddess in Corinth” (“Family,” p. 208).

12. See Ephesians 6:1-3, where the command for children to honor parents is based on the fourth commandment and not the Greco-Roman house codes.

13. Lorntz, “Spiritual Gifts,” p. 232.

14. “Ministry: A Place for Men and Women.”

15. Olsen, “Ministry,” p. 249.

16. If the apostles comprised the core of the new system, then it is likely that the gender restriction continued with the New Covenant. There is no obvious New Testament reference to a female apostle. Some suggest that Junia[s] in Romans 16:7 was an apostle, but the meaning of “among the apostles” has been much debated. Furthermore, whether Junia[s] is a male or female is debatable, since the accusative form “*Junian*” may suggest either gender. Another perturbing factor in Neall's essay is his uncritical reliance on the conclusions of Richard and Catherine Clark Kroeger in their recent book (*I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence* [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1992]). The Kroegers theorize that in 1 Timothy, Paul is responding to a Gnostic heresy being taught by some of the women in the Ephesian congregation. Therefore, they assert, Paul's teachings regarding male/female relationships are culturally conditioned, and do not apply to a modern audience. Not only do the Kroegers see 1 Timothy as deuterono-

pauline, but the major Gnostic texts upon which they build their thesis are all second century. Furthermore, their exegesis of the term *authentein* (which provides a major platform for their thesis) is terribly misconstrued. The Kroegers base their exegetical license with the claim that *authentein* means "to be the perpetrator and author of something." This translation is not even a lexical option. They also break all syntactical rules in their translation of the double infinitive found in the verse (*didaskein* and *authentein*). (For the definitive study on *authentein*, see L. E. Wilshire, "The TLG Computer and Further Reference to *Authentein* in 1 Timothy 2.12," *New Testament Studies* 34 [1988], pp. 120-134. Another earlier helpful study is G. Knight, "*Authenteo* in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2.12," *New Testament Studies* 30 [1984], pp. 143-157. Both conclude that the contextual understanding of *authentein* is "to exercise authority.")

After summarizing the Kroegers' argument, Neall concludes, "If [the Kroegers] are right, the passage does not give a universal prohibition of women from the ministry, but instead a refutation of Gnostic error" (Neall, "Ordination," p. 264). Given the probability that the Kroegers are wrong with their cultural exegesis, I wonder if Neall will be willing to accept the hermeneutical implications of the alternative exegesis?

17. See Harwood, "Women and Mission," p. 269: "Despite the prevalent impression, the question far pre-dates the rise of feminism in the United States in the 1960s and 1970s."

18. *Ibid.*, p. 276.

19. Tracing the trajectory of women in Adventist ministry, the sequential essays are appropriately titled, "A Place at the Table: Women and the Early Years"; and "Moving Away From the Table: A Survey of Historical Factors Affecting Women Leaders."

female leader as an example of the capabilities of women. We ignore the implications of God's appointment of a woman whose writings have shaped both the practicing pastorate and the governing bodies of the church. We are able to see her as an exception that in no way invalidates the rule of an exclusively male ordained pastorate. How ironic—but life in the 1990s has made us comfortable with irony.

The debate that has swirled around the issue of women's ordination has deepened the irony. Much of the written contribution to this debate has come from men. Women have participated in the commissions that were formed to study the issue, and some have written insightful papers and reports (Rosa Banks, Iris Yob, Josephine Benton, Karen Flowers, and Carole Kilcher, for example), but this is only a beginning. Women scholars from other denominations have contributed mightily during the past 20 years to the discussion of women and their roles in ministry and society. We need to hear more from Adventist women.

Unfortunately, women in the ministry are easy targets. A woman who writes in support of the ordination of women is often accused of seeking after worldly glory for herself or her compatriots. Her motivation may be suspected, her integrity questioned. Some women feel that it is much better for them to follow God's call quietly, discussing the issue of ordination only with friends on Sabbath afternoon. Given the circumstances, this may be a reasonable decision, but what a loss to the discussion! What a loss to our church.

Both *The Welcome Table: Setting a Place for Ordained Women* (TEAM Press, 1995) and *Women and the Church: The Feminine Perspective* (Andrews University Press, 1995) represent a solid and welcome addition by women to the

## Welcoming *The Welcome Table* and *Women and the Church*

by Alayne Thorpe

Lourdes E. Morales-Gudmundsson, ed. *Women and the Church*. Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press, 1995. \$11.99 paper. 211 pages. See also Habada and Brillhart, eds. *The Welcome Table*.

"Who is Silvia? What is she?" When Shakespeare wrote these words, his patron was a woman who ruled one of the most-powerful empires in the history of the western world. Unfortunately, even Elizabeth I's effective example

did not change the social conditions of women during her time. Nor did it still the debate over what societal roles women could and should play. For centuries, men have written treatises, essays, and poems about women in an attempt to answer those questions given poetic form by Shakespeare 400 years ago. Women didn't enter the fray in a concentrated way until the 19th century, when a true movement toward self-definition began.

One hundred years ago, God appointed another woman, Ellen G. White, to lead his people and to help establish his remnant church. We, as Seventh-day Adventists, are proud of Mrs. White and the effectiveness of her ministry. However, like England during the Renaissance, we are unable to accept our

---

Alayne Thorpe, vice president for education at Home Study International, Griggs University, received her Ph.D. in English from the University of Maryland. She has lectured at Oxford University on her academic specialty, the poetry and thought of W. B. Yeats.

discussion of women's ordination. A collection of essays edited by Patricia A. Habada and Rebecca Frost Brillhart, *The Welcome Table* was sponsored by Time for Equality in Adventist Ministry (TEAM) and written, in large part, to support the North American Division request that divisions be given the freedom to decide whether or not women pastoring in their territories should be ordained. The essays included in the collection cover the range of issues associated with the ordination of women: Ellen White's views on the role of women, what the Bible says about the role of women in ministry, the "headship" issue, the concept of ordination itself.

Perhaps the primary theme of *The Welcome Table* is best expressed by a quote from Ellen White (*Review and Herald*, July 9, 1895) that a number of the authors refer to: "Not a hand should be bound, not a soul discouraged, not a voice should be hushed; let every individual labor, privately or publicly, to help forward this grand work." Each essay stresses the inclusiveness of the call to ministry. To underline the idea of inclusiveness, the editors have used the metaphor of the round banquet table of ministry as the organizing principle for the book. Each essay (or chapter) tries to further this metaphor and to emphasize that women want nothing more than a place at the table. In the final essay, Iris Yob even envisions what the banquet table of ministry peopled by both men and women would be like.

In the true spirit of inclusiveness, the editors have also been careful to choose essays written by men, as well. Two notable contributions by men are "A Place at the Table: Women and the Early Years" by Bert Haloviak and "The Disappearance of Paradise" by Fritz Guy. However, the most powerful essay in the collection is "Genesis Revis-

ited," in which Donna Jeane Haerich addresses the plurality of creation. Whether or not you agree with Haerich's conclusions, her exegesis draws from many interesting contemporary sources that are worth consideration.

*The Welcome Table* makes its greatest contribution to the body of knowledge about women in Adventist ministry with its appendixes. The nine appendixes provide, in one convenient resource, information concerning Mrs. White's statements on ministry, questions and answers concerning the ordination of women, past church decisions regarding women in ministry, and, in the most moving and telling section, a selected list of 150 women serving the Adventist Church in pastoral roles.

As with Samson, what makes *The Welcome Table* strong also makes it vulnerable. Because it was clearly written in enthusiastic preparation for the General Conference Session in Utrecht with hope for a positive vote on the North American Division's proposal, readers today will have to contend with poignant reminders of that disappointment. Some of the essays also tread over the same ground. Repetition is understandable, and even desirable, in works written out of political urgency, but less forgivable as time passes. It would be

---

*It would be interesting to see a post-General Conference edition of The Welcome Table. This book deserves a wider readership than the delegation that met in Utrecht.*

interesting to see a post-General Conference Session edition of *The Welcome Table*. This book deserves a wider readership than the delegation that met in Utrecht.

The issue of the ordination of women is a recurring topic in *Women and the Church*, edited by Lourdes E. Morales-Gudmundsson, but the scope of this book is not limited to an analysis of the role of women in ministry. Morales-Gudmundsson writes in the preface that "the book grew out of an increasing need to know what Seventh-day Adventist women were thinking about their church, their beliefs, and the evolving roles of women in contemporary society." What that "need" has given birth to is an eclectic collection of essays that cover topics from the feminine aspects of God's character to the feminization of poverty. Each essay is a testimony to the rich intellectual life of Adventist women.

Four essays stand out for their creativity and insightful contribution to literature produced about, for, and by Adventist women. In "Relationships in the Godhead: A Model for Human Relationships," Beatrice S. Neall suggests that the unity of the trinity and the concept of three distinct beings acting as one should serve as the blueprint for marital relationships. Iris Yob, in "Coming to Know God Through Women's Experience," shows how our understanding of God's character can be enlarged by an appreciation for biblical metaphors that describe God as tender, loving, self-sacrificing.

The two most thought-provoking essays are "Women, Music, and the Church: An Historical Approach" by Estelle Jorgensen and "Machismo, Marianismo, and the Adventist Church: Toward a New Gender Paradigm" by Lourdes Morales-Gudmundsson and Caleb Rosado. Both of these essays foray



into interesting territory. Jorgensen draws a parallel between the development of church music and the roles that women have traditionally played both in the church and in society—a juxtaposition that may never have been explored before.

The editor has made an admirable attempt to reflect the multicultural nature of women in the Adventist Church. The results of the informal survey distributed to African-Americans concerning their beliefs about the role of women in the Seventh-day Adventist Church and reported by authors Frances Bliss and Jannith Lewis open the door for follow-up studies. The issues of poverty and abortion are also addressed in thoughtful essays by Ramona Perez Greek and Ginger Hanks-Harwood.

It is hard to criticize such a courageous effort to promote seri-

ous scholarship among Adventist women. However, the editor seems so aware of the vast number of issues affecting Adventist women, that she is unable to limit her collection, and it is weakened by its variety. Each essay could become the first in its own collection devoted to women and poverty or the issue of abortion or gender myths and the church. Indeed, the greatest tribute to *Women and the Church* would be a series of essay collections that deepen the discussions begun on these pages.

*The Welcome Table* and *Women in the Church* show us what women can bring to our continuing debate. However, more women need to write and their works need to be read until there is a strong feminine voice in the Adventist community. I have often seen a parallel between women in the Adventist Church and William

Wordsworth's Lucy who "dwelt among the untrodden ways/ . . . A maid whom there were none to praise/And very few to love." The problem with being a Lucy is that anonymity begins to pall. Women begin to avoid the untrodden path, searching for busy boulevards where they are able to use the talents God has given them to help move the traffic of humanity toward the cross.

And as the Lucys wander off, what happens to the church? Perhaps a man should have the last word after all:

She lived unknown, and few  
could know  
When Lucy ceased to be;  
But she is in her grave, and, oh,  
The difference to me!

—William Wordsworth  
*"She Dwelt Among the Untrodden Ways"*