IN STEP WITH CHRIST
In this closing time of our world’s history, God calls His remnant to reestablish the ideals of His original plan of equality between men and women. (Gal. 3:28-29).
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The Bible mentions numerous examples of dedicated and sanctified women who fulfilled God’s purpose in their lives. In the Old Testament era, godly women not only were “mothers” in Israel, but faithfully served in leadership positions; for example, Miriam (Exod 15:20–21), Deborah (Judg 4–5), Huldah (2 Kgs 22:13–14; 2 Chr 34:22–28), and Esther. In the New Testament Church, we note Phoebe, a deacon (Rom 16:1) or Junia, a female apostle (Rom 16:7), and in the church in Philippi, the leaders were women (Phil 4:2–3). Priscilla assumed an authoritative teaching role (Acts 18; see especially Rom 16:3), and the “Elect Lady” (2 John) was probably a church leader in a congregation under her care.

Adam and Eve were priests in the Garden of Eden which was a sanctuary: “The LORD God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to work it and take care of it” (Gen 2:15 NIV). The assigned task was actually to “serve” (‘abad = serve, till) and “keep” (shamar) the garden (2:15), and it is more than coincidence that these are the very terms used to describe the work of the priests and Levites in the sanctuary (Num 3:7–8; 18:3–7). They were priests even after their fall: “The LORD God made garments [kotnot] of skin [or] for Adam and his wife and clothed [labash] them” (Gen 3:21 NIV). God clothed (labash) Adam and his wife with “coats” (ketonet, pl. kotnot), and these are the exact words employed to define the clothing of Aaron and his sons (Lev 8:7, 13; Num 20:28; cf. Exod 28:4; 29:5; 40:14).

Both Israelite men and women were to form a kingdom of priests: “Now if you obey me fully and keep my covenant, then out of all nations you will be my treasured possession. Although the whole earth is mine, you will be for me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. These are the words you are to speak to the Israelites” (Exod 19:5–6 NIV). Because of the people’s unfaithfulness, an alternate plan had to be instituted where only one family from one tribe of Israel was to be “a kingdom of priests.” However, the apostle Peter in 1 Pet 2:9 applies this commission of Exodus 19 to the priesthood of all believers in Christ.

Scripture foresees a multitude of women preachers: “The Lord gives the word; the women who announce the news are a great host” (Ps 68:11 ESV, NASB).

May Seventh-day Adventist women be the fulfillment of this reality by being women who not only proclaim God’s message, but fear Him, give Him glory, and worship the Creator (Rev 14:7)!

I am glad that God controls to whom the Holy Spirit is given because we may be selective, but He gives His Spirit to all faithful believers, including women: “And afterward, I will pour out my Spirit on all people. Your sons and daughters will prophesy, your old men will see visions. Even on my servants, both men and women, I will pour out my Spirit in those days” (Joel 2:28–30 NIV). The Spirit of God tears down all barriers between different groups of people in the church and gives freely His spiritual gifts to all in order to accomplish the mission God calls all of us to accomplish.

In this closing time of our world’s history, God calls His remnant to reestablish the ideals of God’s original plan of equality between men and women (Gal 3:28–29). The Advent movement should be an example of this true human relationship and genuine worship. Even though men and women are biologically different and thus have different physiological functions, the spiritual role for both genders is the same: to be the leaders in God’s church today.

May Seventh-day Adventist women pursue His will for their lives and joyfully and faithfully serve the Lord and His church because He is always faithful. He has great plans for each dedicated woman and is counting on each of you!

“In all your ways acknowledge him, and he will make straight your paths” (Prov 3:6 ESV).
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Daughter of missionary parents, Jo Ann Davidson is also a fourth generation Seventh-day Adventist. She recalls her mother saying to her, "the blessings of being a Seventh-day Adventist have surely seeped into your genes and chromosomes by now!"

Formerly a home schooling mom and music instructor, Jo Ann now teaches in the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary—the first woman to teach in the Theology and Christian Philosophy department. She earned her PhD in systematic theology from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (Deerfield, IL) in 2000.

Articles she has written have appeared in the Adventist Review, Signs of the Times, and the Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, along with a column, “Let’s Face It,” in the journal Perspective Digest. She has also authored the books Jonah: The Inside Story (Review and Herald), Toward a Theology of Beauty: A Biblical Perspective (University Press of America), and Glimpses of Our God (Pacific Press).

Jo Ann finds great fulfillment in her many roles as wife, mother, daughter, sister, auntie, teacher, musician, student and Seventh-day Adventist Christian.
COMING and GOING
INCOMING

Dr. Teresa Reeve became the first female to be appointed associate dean in the more than one hundred-year history of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. On July 1, 2014, she replaced Dr. R. Clifford Jones, whose departure created the opportunity for a distinguished scholar and theologian such as Dr. Reeve.

Prior to her appointment as Associate Dean, Teresa Reeve served as associate professor of New Testament Contexts. She was born and raised in British Columbia, Canada, and earned her first academic degrees in education (BA) and in educational and developmental psychology (MA). Later, as Scripture study grew from a Christian discipline to a central and joyful passion in her life, she completed her Master of Divinity at our Seminary and then a PhD in Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity from Notre Dame University.

Dr. Reeve specializes in the study of the books of Luke and Acts, and how the gospel transforms lives for the kingdom of God. She currently serves on the General Conference Biblical Research Institute committee, the executive committee of the new Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary currently under development. She is also Vice-President of the Adventist Society for Religious Studies, a member of the board of trustees of the Adventist Theological Society and advisor of the Seminary Women's Clergy Network.

When Dr. Reeve is not teaching or digging into Scripture, she loves to spend time with her husband, Dr. John Reeve, assistant professor of Church History, and thirteen-year-old daughter, Madeleine.

Read more about Dr. Reeve on page 20.

OUTGOING

Dr. R. Clifford Jones, associate dean, ended his tenure on June 30, 2014, as a leader at our Seminary. After nineteen years of dedicated service as professor of Christian Ministry and teacher of classes in leadership, homiletics and conflict management and ten years as Associate Dean, Dr. Jones accepted the call to be President of the Lake Region Conference of Seventh-day Adventists headquartered in Chicago, Illinois.

“We will greatly miss you as a person and your expertise,” wrote Dr. Moskala, Dean, in an open farewell letter. “The only comfort,” he added, “is that you will still live in Berrien Springs and do contract teaching for us as an adjunct professor, for which I am very grateful.”

Seminarians have also expressed their surprise and sorrow at the departure of Dr. Jones, a favorite who took time from his busy schedule to sit, talk and eat with them regularly in the Commons.

“Dr. Jones has left a great legacy of educational leadership in our church,” wrote Dr. Moskala. His colleagues have also expressed compliments regarding his spiritual influence and “continued care for our diversified student body.” We all join our Dean in wishing “him God’s guidance in his ministry” and look forward to his frequent visits.

An expert homiletician and powerful preacher of the Word, Dr. Jones will be speaking at our weekly Seminary worship (10:30-11:20) Tuesday, September 2, 2014. A campus-wide farewell get-together will be held that evening at 5:30-7pm in the Seminary Commons.

Jeanie Craig, office manager in the Christian Ministry department after fifteen years of dedicated service. She has relocated with her husband, retired professor, Dr. Winston Craig, to Walla Walla, Washington.
“Be strong and courageous!”
In Ministry Update

by Dr. Hyveth Williams, CURRENT managing editor

This second issue of CURRENT Magazine is dedicated to all women in ministry. It focuses on the courageous female candidates for the Master of Divinity, the Master of Arts in Youth and Young Adult Ministry and various PhD programs in the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. They come from the United States, Cuba, Bahamas, Canada, Australia, United Kingdom, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Korea, Colombia, Liberia, Ecuador, Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago. CURRENT also pays tribute to the female professors and pastors who have broken through the proverbial "glass ceiling.”

The Inclusiveness of Christ’s Commission

The great commission (Matthew 28:18-20) was entrusted to the entire body that became known as the Christian Church and not to any one gender or section of it. There were others, besides the eleven disciples, such as women at the historic gatherings at Pentecost. They were all empowered, anointed by the Holy Spirit, and sent to change the world (cf. John 20:19 - 24 & Acts 1:14 & 2:1). These texts affirm that the Great Commission and Holy Spirit were not given to just men – those numbered among “the twelve” (cf John 20: 24), but to all who were present and designated as “disciples.” The privilege and responsibility of presenting the Gospel to the world was committed to all disciples, male and female, as it is to the entire body of believers today.

Adventist Mission And Co-mission

The Seventh-day Adventist Church, born in America and raised on the Three Angels’ Message, was divinely designated to deliver a solemn message of God's hour of judgment to the world spinning out of control. Co-missioned (partnership with Christ to seek and save the lost) to preach the eternal gospel “to those who live on the earth, and to every nation and tribe and tongue and people” (Revelation 14:6), and as respondents, our church is truly a rainbow of all races with congregants from almost 200 countries represented in our medical and educational institutions in America and around the world. Nonetheless, diversity in our global denomination was almost always focused on race and culture until the 1980s when the inclusion of women in ministry and gender equality became part of its public discourse.

The Current Status of The Discourse

In June 2014, The Ordination Study Committee (TOSC), established by a request from the last General Conference (GC) in session in Atlanta, Georgia, created a consensus statement (by a vote of 86-8) on a Seventh-day Adventist Theology of Ordination. The statement affirms, in part that, “Seventh-day Adventists understand ordination, in a biblical sense, as an action of the church in publicly recognizing those whom the Lord has called and equipped for local and global church ministry.” The work of TOSC has been completed, but a decision on the issue of ordination will come only after their report is reviewed by the following:

- GC Executive Officers, the GC President’s Executive Administrative Council and Administrative Committee (done in June).
- The GC Administration in October for processing to the 2014 Annual Council for appropriate action.
- If voted by the Annual Council, it will be placed on the 2015 GC Session agenda for action.

As we await a GC-in-session decision on this issue, God continues to call and send women to join male counterparts in the Seminary to prepare, preach and teach the gospel with authority and change the world. Thus, the charge to women in ministry and supporters, “Be strong and courageous! Do not tremble or be dismayed, for the Lord your God is with you wherever you go” (Joshua 1:9).
1. Genesis 1 teaches us that male and female participate equally in the image of God. “So God created man [Heb. ha’adam “humankind”] in His own image, in the image of God created He Him; male and female created He them” (Gen 1:27).

This foundational passage (and its surrounding context) gives no hint of a divine creation order. Here man and woman are fully equal, with no subordination of one to the other. We find that this description of the relationship between man and woman holds throughout Scripture and beyond. No inspired writer—not Moses, Jesus, Paul, or Ellen White—teaches the creation headship of man over woman. Nor has this position ever been formally accepted in the history of Adventism.

Those who oppose the ordination of women ultimately base their argument on the creation headship of man over woman. Their case, however, rests on a fundamental misinterpretation of Gen 1-3.

2. Genesis 2 reinforces Genesis 1. In Gen 2 woman is presented as the climax, the crowning work of creation. She is created from a rib from Adam’s side, to show that she is “to stand by his side as an equal” (Gen 2:21-22; PP 46). She is man’s ezer kenegdo (“help meet for him,” Gen 2:18 KJV), which in the original does not denote a subordinate helper or assistant. Elsewhere in Scripture it is most often God Himself who is called ‘ezer (“helper”) (Exod 18:4; Deut 33:7, 26; Ps 33:20; 70:5; 115:9, 10, 11). The phrase ‘ezer kenegdo in Gen 2 means no less than an equal counterpart, a “partner” (Gen 2:18, 22 NEB).

Contrary to popular argument, Adam does not name the woman (and thereby exercise authority over her) before the Fall in Gen 2:23. The “divine passives” in this verse imply in Hebrew thought that the designation “woman” comes from God, not from man (see Jacques Doukhan, The Genesis Creation Story [Berrien Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press, 1978], 46-47). Adam does not name Eve till after the Fall (Gen 3:20).

In short, Gen 2 contains no creation order subordinating woman to man or restricting her from entering into full and equal participation with man in any ministry to which God may call her. (For further detailed analysis, see Richard Davidson, “Sexuality in the Beginning: Gen 1-2,” chap. 1 of Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament [Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2007], 15-54.)

3. Submission or submission of wife to husband comes about only after the Fall. A subjection of Eve to Adam is mentioned in Gen 3. God says to Eve: “Your desire shall be to your husband and he shall rule over you” (Gen 3:16). But it is crucial to recognize that the subjection of Eve to Adam comes after the Fall. Furthermore, it is limited to the husband-wife relationship, and therefore does not involve a general subordination of women to men.

This is precisely the consistent interpretation of Ellen White (see especially PP 58-59, 1T 307-308, and 3T 484) and The SDA Bible Commentary. The servanthood of the husband set forth in this passage can no more be broadened to men-women relationships in general than can the sexual desire of the wife for her husband be broadened to mean the sexual desire of all women for all men. (For further detailed analysis, see Davidson, “Sexuality and the Fall: Genesis 3,” in Flame of Yahweh, pp. 55-80.)

4. Paul’s writings maintain the Eden model. Paul gives much instruction regarding the relationship between husbands and wives. As can be seen in particular by 1 Tim 2:14 (see also 1 Cor 14:34 and PP 58-59), it is ultimately in light of Gen 3:16 that he indicates the “head of a wife is her husband” (1 Cor 11:3 ESV) and calls upon wives to “be subject in everything to their husbands” (Eph 5:24). Such passages as 1 Cor 11:3-12, 1 Cor 14:34-35, and 1 Tim 2:11-12 all concern the issue of the submission of wives to their husbands and not of women to men in general.

Furthermore, in 1 Tim 2:13 Paul is not arguing for a creation headship of man over woman as has often been assumed. Rather, he is correcting a false syncretistic theology in Ephesus which claimed that woman was created first and man fell first, and therefore women are superior to men. Because of this false theology, wives were apparently domineering over their husbands in public church meetings. (For a careful analysis of the evidence for these conclusions, see Gordon P. Hugenberger, “Women in Church Office: Hermeneutics or Exegesis? A Survey of Approaches to 1 Tim 2:8-15, JETS 35 [1992]: 341-360; and Sharon Gritz, Paul, Woman Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus: A Study of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 in Light of The Religious and Cultural Milieu of The First Century [Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1991].)

Paul’s counsel for husbands and wives cannot be extended to the relationship of men and women in general. The apostle himself shows how the marriage relationship applies to the church. Husband headship in the home is not equated with male
headship in the church. Rather, the Husband/Head of the church is Christ, and all the church—including males—are His “bride,” equally submissive to Him (Eph 5:21-23).

5. In the Old Testament we see numerous women in ministry, including leadership roles over men, thus confirming Genesis 1. Witness the powerful matriarchs of Genesis. Witness Deborah (Judges 4 and 5), one of the judges over the people of Israel—women and men. Witness the leadership roles of Miriam (Exod 15:20-21), Huldah (2 Kgs 22:13-14; 2 Chr 34:22-28), Esther, and others (e.g., Exod 38:8; 1 Sam 2:22; 2 Sam 14:2-20; 20:14-22). Witness the psalmist’s depiction of a host of women preachers (Psalm 68:11, ESV, NASB)!

Although in OT Israel there did exist social inequalities for women, reflecting a distortion of the divine ideal set forth in Gen 1, yet nonetheless there are no legal restrictions barring women from positions of influence, leadership, and authority over men.

With regard to the priesthood, Adam and Eve were appointed priests in the Garden of Eden before the Fall, and reconfirmed as such after the Fall (see discussion and evidence in Davidson, Flame of Yahweh, 47-48, 57-58). God’s original plan was that all Israel be a “kingdom of priests” (Exod 19:6). Because of Israel’s sin, an alternate plan was given in which even most men were excluded—except for one family in one tribe in Israel. Yet in the New Testament the Gospel restores God’s original plan. Not a few male priests, but once more the “priesthood of all believers” (1 Pet 2:5, 9; Rev 1:6).

Joel 2:28-30 predicts a time in the last days when both men and women will have equal access to the gifts of the Spirit (see also the radical new covenant promise regarding women’s roles in Jer 31:22, 31-34).

6. Jesus called His people back to the original plan regarding the role of women. In the NT Jesus Himself set the tone for the Gospel restoration by pointing His hearers to God’s original plan “from the beginning” (Matt 19:8). He did not move precipitously, upsetting the very fabric of Jewish culture; He did not ordain women as His immediate disciples, just as He did not ordain Gentiles. But He pointed the way toward the Edenic ideal in His revolutionary treatment and exaltation of women (see John 4:7-30; Mark 5:25-34; Luke 8:1-3; Matt 15:21-28; John 20:1-18, etc.).

7. The Gospel ideal is the return to the Eden model. Paul emphatically declared: “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female: for you are all one in Christ Jesus” (Gal 3:28). This is not merely a statement on equal access to salvation among various groups (cf. Gal 2:11-15; Eph 2:14-15). Rather, it specifically singles out those three relationships in which the Jews had perverted God’s original plan of Gen 1 by making one group subordinate to another: (1) Jew-Gentile, (2) slave-master, and (3) male-female. By using the rare NT terms “male-female” (arsen-thēly) instead of “husband-wife” (anēr-gunē) Paul establishes a link with Gen 1:27 and thus shows how the Gospel calls us back to the divine ideal, which has no place for general subordination of females to males. Thus, Paul’s choice of terminology upholds the equality of men and women in the church.

Within the cultural restraints of his day, Paul and the early church (like Jesus) did not act precipitously. The subordination of Gentiles was difficult to root out (even in Peter! [Gal 2:11-14]). Slavery was not immediately abolished in the church (see Eph 6:5-9; Col 3:22; Phlm 12; 1 Tim 6:1). Likewise, women did not immediately receive full and equal participation with men in the ministry of the church. However, Phoebe is mentioned as a “deacon” (Rom 16:1), Junia was a female apostle (Rom 16:7), and leaders of the church at Philippi were women (Phil 4:2-3). Priscilla assumed an authoritative teaching role over men (Acts 18), and the “Elect Lady” (2 John) may well have been a prominent church leader with a congregation under her care. (See discussion of these persons, with bibliography, in Davidson, Flame of Yahweh, 649–650.)

Paul’s list of qualifications for elders framed in the masculine gender (“husband of one wife,” literally, “a one-wife husband” [1 Tim 3:1-7, Titus 1:5-9]) does not exclude women from serving as elders any more than the
masculine gender throughout the Ten Commandments (Exod 20; see esp. vs. 17) exempts women from obedience. Rather, these passages are again upholding the Edenic ideal—the principle of monogamy (Gen 2:24).

God does not speak directly to the question of the ordination of women in the NT, just as He does not deal directly with the abolition of slavery, with vegetarianism, abstinence from alcohol, and many other issues based on principles set forth “from the beginning.” But He has given clear biblical principles to guide our decision-making.

In these last days, when the fullness of the everlasting Gospel is to be preached, God has called His church to return to His original blueprint for every area of our lives: our diet, our day of worship—and the three human relationships mentioned in Gal 3. Our church has already taken courageous stands against slavery and racial prejudice. God also calls us to return to the Edenic ideal for male-female relationships that allows women equal access to the gifts of the Spirit (Joel 2:28-30; Eph 4:11-13). As the Spirit gifts women for ministry, “distributing to each one individually as He wills” (1 Cor 12:11), may the church follow the Spirit’s leading!

Dr. Richard M. Davidson PhD, is the J. N. Andrews Professor of Old Testament Interpretation, Department of Old Testament.
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March 31st – Dr. R. Clifford Jones, President, Lake Region Conference.

April 7th – Seminary Communion Service
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"Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting Me?" Following the appearance of a light, "brighter than the sun," the question stunned the zealous Pharisee as he traveled from Jerusalem to Damascus. Powerless, with his face to the ground, he managed to exclaim, "Who are You, Lord?" Clearly, the answer came, "I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting. I have appeared to you to appoint you as a servant and as a witness of what you have seen and will see of me." Each time I read Paul's description of his first encounter with the risen Christ, I am confounded by the fact that God called him to become His disciple. How could Jesus call Saul of Tarsus, who fiercely and brutally persecuted the early believers?

In His sovereignty God calls men and women, whom other believers may presume unsuitable. Exploring the role and status of women in ministry in this issue, we will feature seven real-life stories of women who responded to God's call. Some are currently studying at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. Others are serving God in the field. All seven believe they are walking in the path God has prepared for them.

When we asked the women how they sensed God's call to ministry, the responses varied, but one common thread became apparent. They heard God's voice speak to them personally, much in the same way Paul heard His voice en route to Damascus.

"There were several pastors who said they sensed God's call upon my life," says Judith. "I thought these were nice affirmations that all committed Christians hear eventually, but one Sabbath, while visiting a church in North Carolina, God spoke audibly to me. This was the personal invitation that I needed to see the seriousness of His intentions." Having reservation about responding to the call, Judith delayed the next steps. "However, life just seemed to go nowhere until I followed through with an application to the Seminary," she adds.

Similar to Judith, Stephanie describes her call as a consistent and increasing prodding, beginning as a small voice that became louder and louder until it could not be ignored. "At first I didn't understand it, then God began a work on my life that would bring me to the realization and understanding of His purpose for me." Thinking that denominational pastoral opportunities would be few for a young woman, Stephanie chose a different career and became involved in lay ministry. However, through various challenges in her life she began to realize more fully God's specific call for her. "When I heeded the call, I was a wife and mother of two young children, but decided that I wanted and needed to be equipped for ministry," she summarizes. Initially taking Seminary courses online, Stephanie eventually relocated to Berrien Springs to complete her studies. She expects to graduate from the Master of Divinity (MDiv) program in December 2014. "At that point it will have taken me seven years to complete the process, but seven is a perfect number, and I don't regret one minute of it," concludes Stephanie with a confident smile.

"I first sensed God calling me to ministry when I began to have a passionate desire to be involved in the ministry of my local church," explains Sara. "I had a burning desire to know God's Word and understand the deep teachings of Scripture. As I began to learn more and deepen my knowledge in the Bible, I sensed a yearning to share what I was learning with others. I wanted others to understand the amazing truths I was discovering." Akin to Stephanie, Sara responded to God's call through involvement at her church, being part of the praise team and holding church offices. She also arranged to take Bible studies with her pastor, aiming to better grasp difficult biblical passages and complex prophecies. Sara asserts that God opened the door for her to study theology and archaeology..."
While God clarified Jillian’s call to minister in California, He called Iriann while she was attending a youth conference in Medellin, Colombia. “I somehow sensed that God was calling me to allow Him to direct every aspect of my existence,” explains Iriann. “I felt assured that from that moment, He would continue to write the story of my life.” Having studied Comparative Literature at the University of Puerto Rico, Iriann planned to pursue graduate studies in the same area, but scratched her plans after sensing God’s call to serve Him. Uncertain of the next steps, she sought a pastor’s advice. At his suggestion, she searched Andrews University’s website for graduate studies in religion. “I had no idea that as a woman, particularly a Hispanic woman, I could have this amazing opportunity,” says Iriann, after discovering that she could study at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. Nonetheless, seemingly insurmountable obstacles appeared in her path, but God surprised Iriann at every corner. “He not only opened doors and gave me a specific direction in life, but He also placed in my heart an indescribable love and passion for ministry, particularly for teaching ministry.” While God stirred up passion for teaching ministry in Iriann’s heart, He also patiently worked with Melinda, who initially ignored His call in her life. “I am a pastor’s daughter and ministry was the last thing on my mind. I was not interested. I saw God through my parent’s eyes rather than experiencing Him myself,” reports Melinda candidly. “But, He did not give up on me,” she admits. Slowly, cautiously, she became involved with youth ministry, small groups, and traveled on a mission trip. A love for God and people arose in her heart, which she describes as, “another dimension of love I didn’t know I could experience.” Observing God healing broken relationships and witnessing young adults give their lives to Jesus further strengthened her response to God’s call. Concurrently, Melinda also recognized the difficulties she would face as a young Samoan woman involved in ministry. God, however, created a path through each challenge. She considers her family’s unwavering support a gift from God as she follows His call to ministry.

Different than Melinda, Shantel did not grow up in a Christian family. How could she discern God’s call at a young age when He was not a dominant figure in her life? “Not having grown up in the church, my confidence in what I thought God was saying [to me] was not overwhelming. I struggled to understand why God would call me, and yet nothing else that I wanted to do in my life made much sense,” explains Shantel. Knowing that God had delivered her from difficult circumstances, she surrendered her life to Him at the age of 16. With a gratitude-filled heart for what God had accomplished in her life, Shantel became involved in ministry at her church. As God worked in her life, church leaders and a mentor encouraged her to pursue the path God was creating. Seeking clearer direction from the Lord, Shantel prayed, “God, if You are calling me, then You will make a way. Open the door that you want me to walk through and close every other door that would take me further away from Your purpose in my life.” After that heartfelt prayer, God opened more doors, promising Shantel that He would be with her. Lack of financial...
means and family support created room for discouragement, but God kept His promise. Through scholarships and other blessings, she successfully completed her undergraduate degree in Religious Studies at Tyndale University College and the M.Div. at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary.

After describing God’s call and His work in their lives as they responded to the call, we also asked the women to provide insights for other women in ministry. Here’s a synopsis in their words.

“It doesn’t get better than the God of the universe calling us into His service.”

“It may not be easy, it may seem impossible, it may be a slow process, or your journey may not look like others, but God will make a way and it will be worth it. Remember Joshua 1:9! ‘Have I not commanded you? Be strong and courageous. Do not be frightened, and do not be dismayed, for the LORD your God is with you wherever you go.’”

“Don’t let the women’s ordination debate consume your time and attention. [They] are far too valuable to waste on matters that are not actually about doing ministry. The sooner you shake off your self-consciousness about being a woman in ministry, the better. This is a waste of your attention, and you can sabotage yourself by thinking, ‘No one will take me seriously because I am a woman.’ With rare exceptions, whether or not people take you seriously has far more to do with your integrity, spirituality, work ethic, people skills, and organizational savvy than your gender.”

“I trust that as long as we rely on Jesus Christ, our life and experiences can be a blessing to humanity, whom we will serve as the image of God, more specifically, as women.”

“Remain faithful to God’s calling. He will continue to open doors for you. Stay connected to the Source for there are times when we feel alone, but God’s Word, and praying and fasting will get us through. Surround yourself with God-fearing people that will encourage and pray for you and your ministry. Grow in Christ, be courageous because He has called us!”

Journeying through the stories, I am awed by God’s work in the lives of Judith, Stephanie, Sara, Jillian, Iriann, Melinda, and Shantel. They come from diverse backgrounds, but the common thread of God’s personal call to each connects them together. Whether similar to Paul’s Damascus road experience, or persistent prodding, or help overcoming insurmountable challenges, they have recognized God’s call in their lives. It has been distinct and unmistakable, followed by His work in their lives. They are now serving the Lord in the path He is creating for them. What path is He creating for you?

1 Acts 9:4, NKJV.
2 Acts 26:13, ESV.
3 Acts 26:15-16, NIV.
4 Joshua 1:9, ESV.
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Lately, there has been a lot of talk about modesty within the Christian and non-Christian arena. Many books and articles are written on the topic. Yet, despite the popularity, some are still perplexed, while others conclude that modesty is completely subjective or just a nebulous concept. I recently attended a seminar on women’s dress reform. The attendees were interested in becoming acquainted with the cry of modesty in this present day: What does she sound like? What does she say exactly when she cries out? Unfortunately, no clear, definite, tangible answer was given. One particular young woman expressed her dilemma as such, “I feel like I am caught between two extremes. One tells me as a Christian, I ought to wear long and plain dresses, and the other tells me to show ‘what my mama gave me.’ Between these two, how do I know for sure when I am being immodest?”

This specific question propels me to ponder, particularly about the modesty issue for women in ministry. The resulting contradictory concept of modesty affects women in all walks of life. However, when it comes to women in ministry, the modesty ideal becomes even more blurred. We all have seen the array of personal preferences,
sexual struggles, low self-esteem and ignorance packaged under 1 Timothy 2:9, and 1 Corinthians 8:9 as the modesty anthem for female pastors nowadays. There are many genuine clergy women who are very diligent about dressing modestly according to the conservative status quo (plain, long, tasteless wardrobes) so as not to offend anyone. However, they can never quite get it right for some who find that there is always something lacking. What a burden! On the other end of the spectrum, we all have seen ministry sisters who are wrapped up in the bubble of modern fashion clichés. As their lips profess godliness, their sloppy, immodest wardrobes profess worldliness and attention seeking. What restless souls! I cannot help but wonder how we have allowed ourselves to become so entangled in this muddled web of modesty? Have we forgotten that, as we have been set free and entrusted with the duty of proclaiming the gospel message of freedom and love, we are called to be sober-minded, balanced women? If the message we proclaim truly reflects our identity and lifestyle, we should be the trendsetters of today.

What if we go to the source for clarity? No, I don’t mean to exegete 1 Timothy 2:9; we have already done so many times, yet we are still dubious. I am talking about the openness to learn to become acquainted with the untainted cry of modesty from the fashion experts. Granted... There is absolutely no doubt that the fashion business is a multi-billion-dollar global industry that, at its heart, is based on creative egotists, but it is also undeniable that they have a better balanced understanding of modesty and immodesty than we do. After all, in order for the industry to have such a worldwide success in promoting immodesty over modesty, a clear difference must be known inside out. Thus, I believe a short tour in the fashion design process can help us in finding clarity as we learn to train our ears to listen to the voice of modesty contextually. The early stage in the fashion design process is called the RRI (Research, Relevance, Individuality). This process guides a collection identity and hails modesty and immodesty into a tangible, practical plane of objective reality.

Research
Fashion Design requires intentional-ity, precision, and time. Designers do not design based on a spark of creativity and/or personal preference. In the pre-designing stage of a collection, before a visual board can be pasted, an initial sketch line can be drawn; two questions must be answered: “Who is this collection for? What are her values?” Following these answers, a great deal of time, energy, and money is invested in extensive research on the historical background of modesty/immodesty from previous eras to the present. A timeline of past and present styles must be collected, and a thorough market research analysis must be conducted. This plethora of information offers a concrete understanding of the different worldviews of past and present civilizations’ concept of modesty/immodesty. This understanding depicts the different faces of modesty throughout history and acknowledges that, although it is culturally defined, there is always one consistent pattern that never changes. Thus, this research phase enables the gurus to become acquainted with the relentless voice of modesty as she cries out “I am ever changing from one generation to the next, from one culture to the next, but my essence is ever constant – humility.”

Relevance
As a collection progresses into the creative stage, every piece must be designed according to the target audience’s need. Relevance is one of the most revered rules in the fashion business. It seeks to apply the timeless principle discovered in the research phase to the cultural context. For instance, during the Victorian era, fashion was a vehicle of competition among the rich to prove their wealth. Therefore, the symbol of fashion extravagance was expressed through expensive fabrics, ornaments, complicated patterns, colors, and complicated styles that required a high level of workmanship. The middle class copied the high fashion or made their own new clothes, while the poor relied on the ragged clothes that had been through several owners. As such, the face of modesty was revealed by NOT wearing one’s wealth to become the center of attention. In contrast, modern day fashion is used as a vehicle to promote sex appeal. Such manifestation is expressed through tight, sheer clothing, skin and body parts exposure that ought to remain covered. Today, the face of modesty is revealed by NOT showcasing one’s body to become the center of attention. Thus, relevance compels the experts to be attentive to the entreatying voice of modesty as she cries out “Please put some clothes on... do not flash your sexuality!”

Individuality
Respect for individuality is the bedrock of the fashion industry. Fashion gurus acknowledge that we are not “one size and cut fits all.” The sensibility in this regard is used to cater to consumers of various body types as well as different taste in styles. For instance, a modest dress that is designed for a pear body type can have a much lower cleavage without drawing undue attention to the chest since the upper area is not the focal point for that body type. On the other hand, a modest dress that is designed for an apple body type ought to have a much higher cleavage since the upper area is the focal point for that body type. Have you ever seen a woman in a pretty dress that does her body no good? Respect for the gift of individuality enables designers to tailor-make clothes with our selective bodies in mind because their ears are open to the pleading voice of modesty as she cries out “Please choose styles that you like, but pick the fit that is intentionally designed for your body type–oh, and make sure they’re your size too!”

My Take: The RRI is not foreign to us; all three elements are biblically sound.
We are encouraged to research/study thoroughly before we act, not just the Word of God, but any topic of concern or endeavor, until our hearts and minds are saturated with the facts and we are convinced (Prov 20:18; 21:5). Paul vividly sets the example of relevance in his ministry (1 Cor 9:19-22). Lastly, we are called to respect each other’s individuality, for God did not make us on a mass production line (Ps 139:13-16, 1 Cor 12:14-20). As we strive to clear the modesty muddle and learn to train our ears to listen to the cry of modesty, the application of the RRI model is a safeguard against extremism. It protects from relying solely on personal preferences, it sensitizes to the cultural need, and it boosts morale and promotes authenticity. I beseech you, therefore, to let a balanced view reflect your wardrobe as you make smart choices to dress modestly, modern, and chic. And yes, you can dress modestly, chic, simply by prayerfully remembering to:

1. Be conscious of the modern cries of modesty
2. Be intentional. The goal of dressing modest, modern, and chic is to cover up places that ought to remain covered, while enhancing your body without drawing undue attention to any specific area.
3. Embrace your body type. You must know your body type as part of being a conscious shopper. There are many different terminologies in use to describe women’s body types, but in reality, they all mean the same thing. A very helpful website is www.calculator.net/body-type-calculator.html.
4. Be simple. When it comes to ornaments and accessories, less is always better. And by that, I do not mean NONE, but LESS is really what I mean. However, when it comes to covering up places that ought to remain covered, more is always better. The aim is “simplicity with grandeur.”
5. Be honest with yourself. Reflect on the deep-seated reasons as to why you dress a certain way. Are you seeking attention? Are you being sloppy? Are you just being a follower of trends? Are you truly being a modest, modern, and chic trendsetter?
SEMINARY’S FIRST FEMALE ASSOCIATE DEAN

Up until her appointment in July this year, Dr. Reeve was associate professor of New Testament Contexts in the New Testament department. She has also taught school at several levels and worked with conference, division and General Conference departments developing materials and providing training in the areas of child and family ministries. See a more detailed biography on page 4.
The innocent suffering of Job presents the most notorious and significant objection to a belief in the goodness and fairness of God. I totally disagree with Bart Ehrman, who states: “God himself caused the misery, pain, agony, and loss that Job experienced. . . . And to what end? For ‘no reason’—other than to prove to the Satan that Job wouldn’t curse God even if he had every right to do so . . . . God did this to him in order to win a bet with the Satan. . . . But God is evidently above justice and can do whatever he pleases if he wants to prove a point.”1 What God allows He does not cause or do. The biblical text reveals that it was Satan who brought on Job’s calamities and not God (Job 1:12; 2:6–7). God is the Creator of life and created everything very good (Gen 1:31). Evil comes from another source (Matt 13:38-39). Is the author of the book of Job intending to answer the question of why the innocent suffer, as it is usually asserted? Is it a story about a bet between God and Satan; about who is right and will win? The most crucial issue in the book is not Job’s suffering, even though his suffering plays an important role in the whole drama, nor is it about a capricious bet between God and Satan in front of the sons of God. What is the primary issue explained in this cosmic scenario of the great controversy between good and evil? According to Job’s prologue (1:8; 2:3), God proclaims Job just in front of the solemn assembly gathered before Him. Twice in the first two chapters, God declares Job to be right, i.e., blameless, upright, fearing God, and shunning evil. His character is without question, but not because he is sinless (Job knows he is a sinner; see, for example, 7:21; 10:6; 14:17). He can be blameless only through God’s transforming grace. In these two encounters initiated by God, God directs His words to Satan and engages him in heightened dialogue.

God is depicted as passionately standing up for Job, but Satan does not share God’s loving affection for Job. Instead, Satan uses Job to go to the very root of his dispute with God by a frightful and seemingly innocent question: “‘Does Job fear God for nothing?’” (1:9 NIV). To understand Satan’s investigation, it is necessary to study the key words in the question: “for nothing” (the Hebrew term for this occurs four times in the book: 1:9; 2:3; 9:17; 22:6). It can be translated also as “gratis,” “gratuitously,” “without a reason,” “for nought,” “freely,” “disinterestedly,” “for no purpose,” “in vain,” “without cause.” Satan’s question can be stated thus: Does Job serve God disinterestedly? Is his piety unselfish and devotion wholehearted? Or expressed differently: Does he serve God out of love, i.e., for nothing?

This cynical inquiry introduces the whole plot of the book, because Satan categorically denies that God is just while justifying Job and proclaiming him perfect. Job’s motives are under his scrutiny, and he claims that they are not pure but selfish. At first glance, the remark appears to be directed against Job, but in reality it is an attack upon God by trying to disprove His statement about Job. Thus the main theme of the book of Job is God’s justice, the trustworthiness of His word. The real drama turns on the fact that God is for Job and proclaims him just.

At stake in the cosmic controversy is the ultimate question of whether or not God can be trusted and if His judgments are valid. Is God just while justifying us? In front of the whole Universe, it must be demonstrated that God is the God of love, truth, and justice, and that He is the guarantor of freedom. If His word is not trustworthy, God’s whole government will collapse.

Why is Satan’s question so evil? When the motives of Job’s behavior are questioned, he cannot immediately defend himself. Only a long period of time and the difficulties of life will reveal who is correct. In order to prove that Job’s motives are impure, Satan demands that God allow him to take everything from Job, because only in this way will God see the real Job: “‘He will surely curse you to your face’” (v. 11 NIV), so God responds: “‘Very well, then, everything he has is in your hands’” (v. 12 NIV).

God’s answer irritates me. I do not like it. We naturally revolt against such a reaction by God. Those who believe
in a good, loving, just, and all-powerful God have an immense problem with this picture of Him. Believers confess that the Creator and the King of the Universe is the Protector of life, Giver of happiness, Prince of peace, Intervener in human affairs, and Friend of humans. It seems that Job’s God is a different kind of God, as revealed in other parts of biblical revelation. Faith makes no sense and, to some extent, it makes the situation even worse.

Why didn’t the Omnificent God protect His servant? This is the real scandal in the story. We would like to see the Omnificent and loving God intervene and immediately silence Satan’s accusations and prevent him from harming Job. We wish that God would stop at once the abuse of children, rape of women, concentration camps, murders, suffering, car accidents, plane crashes, collapses of towers, pain, violence, hurricanes, tsunamis, and many other tragedies. People ask a poignant yet seemingly a simple question in times of tragedy, loss, and war: “Where is God?” The only answer to questions of suffering is that God was exactly in the same place where He was when His Son was murdered on the cross. God is always on the side of the oppressed, suffering person. In our suffering, He suffers. “In all their distress he too was distressed, . . . In his love and mercy he redeemed them” (Isa 63:9 NIV).

The book of Job begins with a tension. On the one hand, God put a hedge around Job, protecting him from any harm, blessed him so generously that he had become the Bill Gates of his time. On the other hand, Job is for a time abandoned by God and given into Satan’s hands. There is no logic to this situation and seems self-contradictory. In this world evil reigns, and evil is irrational. Let us not try to find a logical answer to the problem of evil. We need to learn how to live with our unanswered questions. From that angle, the book of Job is really a quest for God’s visible presence in life.

We often ask imprecise, misleading, or even false questions. The real issue can be expressed in the following way: How can Satan be defeated? This question needs to be answered to shed greater light on the whole issue of theodicy and the conflict in the
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he loved God above all, God was vindicated and His justice prevailed. God is just while justifying us because His grace and presence, even though very often unseen and silent, sustains His people. The beauty of God’s character brilliantly shines, because our God is a God of love, truth, and justice.

The first task of the followers of Christ is to present a right picture of God, His character, to this world. This is the work needing to be accomplished before the second coming of Christ, because Satan has grossly distorted the character of God from the very beginning (see Gen 3:1–6), and the postmodern attacks on God, His character, and the Scriptures are more sophisticated and stronger than ever. Our task is to be witnesses for God and let His glory shine through our characters (Rev 14:7).

Revelation 18:1 states that at the end of world history the glory of God will shine throughout the world. The last work of God’s people will be to let God illuminate the world with His glory through His people. This will be the most powerful argument in favor of God’s existence and love, and His true character will be defended. If God is alive or dead among people depends on the lifestyle of God’s followers. His people need to live to the glory of God, reflecting in their character the loving character of God. According to 2 Thess 1:3–5, the evidence that God is true and His judgments are just is the living faith and love of believers!

If God’s followers are spiritually dead, then God is dead too, and Nietzsche’s slogan “God is dead” would be right! We are a spectacle to the world and to the whole universe (1 Cor 4:9)! Ellen G. White powerfully explains our role in the parable about wise virgins when she interprets the work of wise virgins:

So the followers of Christ are to shed light into the darkness of the world. Through the Holy Spirit, God’s word is a light as it becomes a transforming power in the life of the receiver. By implanting in their hearts the principles of His word, the Holy Spirit develops in men the attributes of God. The light of His glory—His character—is to shine forth in His followers. Thus they are to glorify God, . . . It is the darkness of misapprehension of God that is enshrouding the world. Men are losing their knowledge of His character. It has been misunderstood and misinterpreted. At this time a message from God is to be proclaimed, a message illuminating in its influence and saving in its power. His character is to be made known. Into the darkness of the world is to be shed the light of His glory, the light of His goodness, mercy, and truth. . . . The last rays of merciful light, the last message of mercy to be given to the world, is a revelation of His character of love. The children of God are to manifest His glory. In their own life and character they are to reveal what the grace of God has done for them. The light of the Sun of Righteousness is to shine forth in good works—in words of truth and deeds of holiness.2

Many biblical texts assure that God is abundant in love (Exod 34:6–7; Ps 100:5; 117:2; 136:1–26; Rom 5:5, 8; 1 John 3:1; 4:16). “Or do you show contempt for the riches of his kindness, tolerance and patience, not realizing that God’s kindness leads you toward repentance?” (Rom 2:4 NIV). “Taste and see that the LORD is good; blessed is the man who takes refuge in him” (Ps 34:8 NIV). The God of the Bible is the God of love, truth, justice, freedom, and order!

In the time of deep trouble, there are no easy answers and often there are no answers. In those situations, we need to focus on the big picture of God’s revelation that ultimately testifies about the goodness of God. An inscription was found on a wall in a cellar in Cologne, Germany, where Jews hid from the Nazis. The anonymous author, who perished with many others, left behind the following profound words: “I believe in the sun even when it does not shine. I believe in love, even when I do not feel it. I believe in God, even when He is silent”3

The best proof of God’s existence and His goodness is our personal experience with Him. Only our appreciation of Christ’s ultimate sacrifice for us on the cross can give us inner peace and assurance of His love in times when calamities, struggles, and tragedies of life strike. Christ-like Christians are the best proof for God’s presence among us. Loving Christians are the ultimate argument for the God of love.

1 Bart D. Ehrman, God’s Problem: How the Bible Fails to Answer Our Most Important Question--Why We Suffer [New York: HarperOne, 2008], 168.
In the United States, 80 percent of the population lives in urban areas, with 8 percent living in the inner cities. However, it is estimated that only 30 percent of the Adventist churches are based in urban areas. This is an unfortunate statistic, particularly because more churches in other denominations are discovering the needs that exist in these urban communities and are fast positioning themselves to meet these needs. At the same time, it seems that Adventists are lagging and not leading on this front.

Urban areas, and particularly inner cities, are a harvest field of incredible potential because of their unique characteristics. Though potent, this mission field has been greatly misunderstood and, in some cases, misrepresented. Most of the misunderstanding is partly due to the confusion that exists from the caution by Ellen White about the evils of the cities. This, mingled with the advice to run from cities because of the anticipated persecution in the closing days of earth's history, has shifted our members’ focus from the very specific instructions left by Christ Himself in the Gospel Commission (Matthew 28:19-20). People have become so heavenly focused, we are of no earthly good.”

This may seem harsh, but let us look at the facts. Many of our church members are commuters. We do not live in the communities where our churches are located. Thus, we drive in once or twice a week, on Sabbath and, maybe prayer meeting. We rarely have interactions with the surrounding communities, but wonder why our churches are not growing! It is because we are not building relationships in communities surrounding our inner-city churches.

As the Remnant Church of God, entrusted with a unique message for the last days, we should be running TO the cities, not away from them; for Jesus said, “This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world as a testimony to all the nations, and then the end will come” (Matthew 24:14). We may run to the mountains, the hills, and the countryside, but until we have preached the Gospel to ALL peoples, our running away from the cities only serves to prolong that which we desperately need and want; the coming of our Lord and Savior. But how should we position ourselves for the Second Coming?

**A New Vision for City Evangelism:**

Wherever there exists an underserved community, one will likely find non-profit organizations in said communities. Although some of these organizations have made a real impact, they mostly exist to serve the physical needs of the communities. But what greater need could possibly exist, than the need for a living Savior? While we commend these organizations for leading out where we, as a church, have not, organizations are only treating symptoms and not the real disease of sin. Recognizing this, means acknowledging that our traditional methods of evangelism, though effective in the past, and perhaps still effective in many scenarios today, cannot be the only interaction that we have with these urban communities. The 21st century, with all its woes and ills, demands a bolder approach, a more glaring presence, and an unapologetic demonstration of Christ's love and care for the welfare of all people. Therefore, churches need to be architects and builders of their community's infrastructure, not just maintenance workers.

Whereas some theories suggest that institutions such as universities, sports venues, hospitals, etc., should be the anchors of the development in the inner cities...
I am suggesting that the church should assume this responsibility and take the lead in shaping the cities in which they exist. What a world it would be if this were the case. What a world we would have if the church were to embrace the communities in which they exist, to shape the narrative of our communities. Christians are called to be the "light of the world," the "cities on a hill." This language is "stand out" language! God is calling His church and followers to stand out in their communities. To be the ones that lead the change, not just talk about how the world is coming to an end. The church is being called to be proactive and not reactive. The days of reactive ministries are over! As ministers of the Gospel in these last days, God is calling us to join Him in the harvest field; He is calling us to partner with Him in the mission field; God is calling us to go into the cities and the urban areas: He is calling us to renew our focus!

City evangelism need not be a daunting enterprise, because it brings several advantages with it. The dense population, transportation networks, technological resources, and communication infrastructure can work to the church's advantage. People are so well connected these days that it could literally take seconds for something to go round the world, even faster than the spreading of bad news. We need to preach and live the Gospel with such power and conviction that it will spread like wildfire and people will hardly be able to contain themselves as they speak of Christ and Him crucified.

Means for The Mission
Perhaps, our greatest resource in this endeavor is our Adventist Community Resources arm: This ministry, if properly developed and utilized, can prove to be a great evangelistic tool. A church can survey the talents and skills that exist within its members and leverage them for community services. For example, if there are medical personnel, a health fair featuring basic health checks for the community may be something to be looked into: or there are artists, an art fair that invites local artists to showcase their work would be a great way to be involved with your community while showing them how much their God-given abilities are valued.

In addition, the church can be opened during the week to offer services to the community, such as GED classes, senior citizens' activities, host after-school programs, etc. One church in Benton Harbor, Michigan, opens its doors to young people from the community to play basketball one day a week. Another church in South Bend, Indiana, hosts seminars such as Dave Ramsey's Financial Peace University, as well as a 4th of July barbecue for its community. Such activities may seem unconventional, but they offer great opportunities for interaction with community members in a non-threatening environment. It also allows the members of the community to know that the church cares about them and their welfare. "Christ's method alone will give true success in reaching the people. The Saviour mingled with men as one who desired their good. He showed His sympathy for them, ministered to their needs, and won their confidence. Then He bade them, "Follow Me." (Ministry of Healing, p. 144). Christ mingled with men, as one who desired their good; and this should be our modus operandi. Our communities should know us as people who are invested in them. However, while it would be simple to just adopt a number of strategies that sound innovative and exciting in our communities, the truth is, for city evangelism to be successful, the minister and church members need to take time to know their community and seek God's plan for it. Reading an article with good ideas may be informative, but the Bible indicates that God is not big on re-runs: He never does the

“The Saviour mingled with men as one who desired their good.”
same thing twice! Hence, there is only one talking donkey, one burning bush, and one walking on water miracle in the entire Bible. Therefore, nothing can replace the time spent in prayer and supplication, seeking God and His vision on behalf of our communities.

This is probably what led Ellen White to pen these words: “As a people we need to hasten the work of cities, which has been hindered for lack of workers and means and a spirit of consecration. At this time, the people of God need to turn their hearts fully to Him; for the end of all things is at hand. They need to humble their minds, and to be attentive to the will of the Lord, working with earnest desire to do that which God has shown must be done to warn the cities of their impending doom.”

Won’t you answer God’s call to do a mighty work in His cities?

2 Review and Herald, January 25, 1912.

---

Did you know? There are over 320 female pastors in the worldwide Seventh-day Adventist Church. Of the more than 4,000 male pastors in the North American Division, approximately 120 are women in active pastoral/parish ministry. A few women have been approved by their Union and ordained by their Conference although the majority hold a “commissioned” credential that does not permit or lead to ordination, while most males hold a “ministerial” credential that does.

After decades of no growth in the ranks of female pastors in the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, today there are five female faculty members and approximately 130 female seminarians. There was a similar situation in Protestant churches in America until the last decade. A new Barna study (www.barna.org) shows that women have made substantial gains in the last ten years. From the early 1990s through 1999, just 5% of senior pastors in Protestant churches were female. Since then, the proportion has slowly, but steadily grown to 10% in 2009.
Professor of Homiletics and director of the Homiletics Program, she is also a pastor and prolific author. She is the first black female pastor, the first female senior pastor in the Seventh-day Adventist denomination and the first female professor of homiletics at the Seminary. Prior to her 2009 appointment as professor, she served as an adjunct professor of Religion in the Loma Linda University School of Religion and the Seminary. For almost fourteen years, she served as the senior pastor of Campus Hill Church in Loma Linda, California, eight years at Boston Temple, Massachusetts; three years as associate pastor at Sligo Church, Takoma Park, Maryland, and one year as pastoral intern at All Nations Church in Berrien Springs, Michigan.

Her books include: *Will I Ever Learn?: One Woman’s Life of Miracles and Ministry*, *Anticipation: Waiting on Tiptoes for the Lord*, and *Secrets of a Happy Heart: A Fresh Look at the Sermon on the Mount*. Her fourth book, published in 2008, is co-authored with Dr. Dorothy Minchin Comm and entitled *The Celt and the Christ: A Fresh Look at the Book of Galatians*. Articles by Dr. Williams have appeared in numerous magazines, and she is currently a monthly columnist for the *Adventist Review*. 
Did you know? In 2012 we had a record of 115 active women clergy. 13 were senior pastors, 49 associates and 32 chaplains.

The 2013 Annual Statistical Report does not separate female and male clergy, but there were 281 commissioned minister credentials reported.

Statistics from the NAD.
Introduction
In order to thrive, every human society must establish its own organizational and authoritative structures. Eventually, if someone desires to know something about a particular nation, family, or association, they are most likely to inquire about the nature and use of its authority. Human groupings may thus be described as “dictatorial,” “authoritarian,” “democratic,” “egalitarian,” “republican,” “laissez-faire,” and so on. Each of these designations reflects the way in which authority is used within a particular community.

While different from a nation, family, or association, the Church is also a human society that must have organizational/authoritative structures in order to disseminate its message and thus fulfill the Great Commission given to it by Christ. Because of this, it is legitimate to inquire about the nature and use of authority within the community of believers. Such inquiry is of vital importance, as much depends on the way authority is understood and exercised within the Church. Even such foundational Christian teachings as the nature of God and salvation are influenced by the way authority is defined.

Any discussion on the nature of Christian authority, however, tends to be muddied by our cultural context, as the way we view authority is shaped by the way in which authority is exercised within the society of which we are a part. For many people, the term “authority” carries few positive connotations. A simple class exercise proves the point. When I teach on the subject of ecclesiology, I sometimes flash the word “authority” on the screen and ask students to tell me what immediately comes to their minds. Invariably, I hear words such as “dominance,” “power,” “control,” “abuse,” “rule,” or “final decision making.” Then we check the dictionary definition of “authority” and, indeed, we find that the most prominent way in which authority is defined follows the same line of thinking, i.e., “the power or right to give orders, make decisions, and enforce obedience” or “the power to determine, adjudicate, or otherwise settle issues of disputes; jurisdiction, the right to control, command, or determine.” Authority defined as such demands submission, which is defined in the dictionary as “the action or fact of accepting or yielding to a superior force or to the will of another person.” In my personal experience, I have yet to meet a person who likes to submit in such a manner. On the contrary, it almost seems as though we arrive in this world with an inborn tendency to resist this type of authority – just ask parents whose children have entered the teenage years or think about our inner reaction when we are flagged by an officer for speeding.

Very rarely do my students consider “authority” a positive thing in the life of a society. And yet, authoritative structures are essential, as they provide society with continuity, stability, safety and boundaries. Without some form of authority, no human society would or could exist; this includes the Seventh-day Adventist Church. It is the combination of our sinful nature and
the abuse of authority that causes us to develop negative attitudes towards authority. Unfortunately, all too often abuse, disguised by the addition of the adjective “spiritual,” happens in the church, the community Christ established to be different from any other human society on Earth.

In recent years, the issue of authority has received a fair amount of attention in Adventist circles. As we have experienced the delay of the Second Coming of Christ, we have become increasingly concerned with issues related to Gospel order, organization, ranking, and policy, all the while attempting to be faithful to Scripture. The nature of authority and its use has surfaced most prominently within the context of the discussion on women’s ordination. The most sensitive question raised in these debates is whether women can or should hold authoritative positions within the church structure. Should women be allowed to preach/teach or lead in the church? Would not ordination place them in headship positions over their male counterparts?

Responses to these questions vary. Some believe that women can never be placed in any position – be it pastor, theology professor, university or hospital president – that would situate them in authority over men. Others would allow women to fill leadership roles within the greater Adventist organization but not in the church. Accordingly, women must not be allowed to teach or preach in the church when men who are able to do so are present. Still others go so far as to allow women to preach in the church providing that they stand under the authority of an ordained male senior pastor. All of these positions have one common denominator: the position of “spiritual headship” in the church must be limited to men alone. Ordination is believed to raise a particularly gifted man to a position of spiritual headship in the church, and since the Bible speaks of male headship alone, the position of pastor (or senior pastor) is closed to women; no woman, it is believed, can have authority over any man.

Observing the debate for a number of years and listening carefully to both sides, I ask myself several questions: Are we certain that we truly understand what we mean when we use the word “authority”? Am I possibly making the false assumption that when I utter the word “authority,” you know exactly what I mean and vice versa? What informs the concept of authority that resides in our minds? Is it our culture (both secular and religious) or is it careful attention to the words of Jesus?

Like many good things in life, the concept of authority has its counterfeits. The purpose of this paper is to explore two opposing views of authority. This is necessary to tease out the essential elements of the New Testament view of authority and thus help us avoid the ecclesiological pitfalls – of which many of us may not be aware – that modern Christianity inherited from post-Apostolic Christianity and which are deeply ingrained in both Catholic and Protestant traditions. For this reason I will, first, explore the characteristics of a counterfeit kind of “authority” as it evolved in Christianity from the second century onward, and which continues to be the foundation of both modern Roman Catholicism and Protestant fundamentalism; second, I will explore the concept of authority flowing from the teachings of Jesus; and finally, I will provide a response to the counterfeit view of authority.

The Post-Apostolic Church and a Counterfeit View of Authority

Faced with the death of its pioneers, the delay of the Second Coming, schism, the rise of heretical teaching, as well as persecution, the early post-Apostolic Christian Church searched for ways of maintaining its unity and defending itself against various heretical teachings. Such a goal could be accomplished through providing the church with strong leadership.

Going beyond the Gospels and the writings of Paul, writers such as Ignatius (d.ca. 110-130AD), Irenaeus (d.ca. 202AD), Tertullian (c. 160 – c. 225AD), Cyprian (d.ca. 258AD), and Augustine (354-430AD) gradually endowed Christian ministry with special authority, which was available only through the rite of ordination. The Christian ministry that emerged from this era was far removed from what we find in the pages of the New Testament; the authority of the ministry was (and continues to be) marked by the following characteristics:

First (A), it was hierarchical; i.e., conceived in terms of order, ranking, or chain of command. The church became divided into two classes of individuals – clergy and laity – separated from each other by the rite of ordination. At the head of the church was a monarchical (mon – one, archerule) bishop, surrounded and assisted by a group of elders as well as deacons, who were at the bottom of the hierarchical ladder. The bishop – or the senior pastor – was placed at the center of religious activity and was endowed with complete control over the affairs of the local church. His duties included preaching, teaching, administration of the community, and money management. Without his presence, no Christian rite, such as baptism or the Lord’s Supper, could be conducted. Believing this system to be established by God, Christians were expected to submit to the decisions of their bishop-pastor. The bishop-pastor’s position and prestige in the church was significantly strengthened by the doctrine of Apostolic Succession developed by Irenaeus, who taught that the twelve apostles passed on their leadership and teaching authority to the bishops.

This system of early church governance was largely modeled on the way in which the Roman Empire was governed. While it was originally established for the sake of order and unity in the church, it eventually became an end in itself, to be protected and perpetuated at any cost. Such concentration of power in the church in the hands of the ordained elite led, of course, to the eventual establishment of the papacy. There is no need to elaborate here on the prophetic significance of this development.

Second (B), it was sacramental; i.e., the spiritual life of the believers, and thus their salvation, in some way depended on their pastor. It was during this time that the Christian minister began to be referred to as a priest. The writers of this period came to the conclusion that the Old Testament priesthood was a type of Christian ministry. An ordained Christian pastor, thus, became a mediator between
God and other believers. This mediation was enabled through the rite of ordination when the pastor received a special seal — known as dominicus character — which enabled him to re-enact Christ's sacrifice each time he celebrated the Lord's Supper. In such a system, the existence of the church itself depended upon the existence of the ordained ministry. As with the previous point, the prophetic significance of this development cannot be overestimated and will be elaborated on below.

**Third (C), it was elitist;** i.e., divided into two classes of individuals, those ordained and those un-ordained. As mentioned above, it was gradually accepted that, through the rite of ordination, the minister became separated from the rest of the community. The laying-on-of-hands endowed the pastor with special authority from God and enabled him to provide spiritual and mediatiorial leadership to the believers. This teaching, first introduced by Tertullian, stated that there are two groups of people in the church: the ordained and the un-ordained, otherwise referred to as clergy and laity. Only those who were ordained could provide spiritual leadership in the church. In line with this thinking, the church could not be conceived as egalitarian. It was not a community of equals in terms of leadership roles. This is clearly reflected in the documents of the First Vatican Council (1869-1870). The Constitution on the Church thus states:

> The Church of Christ is not a community of equals in which all the faithful have the same rights. It is a society of un-equals, not only because among the faithful some are clerics and some are laymen, but particularly because there is in the Church the power from God whereby to some it is given to sanctify, teach, and govern, and to others not.

The act of ordination, therefore, an elite group of leaders was created in the church and only members of this elite could take the office of pastor in the church. As we shall see below, this view is contrary to the teachings of the New Testament.

**Fourth (D), it was oriented towards male headship in the church;** i.e., only men could fulfill headship roles in the church. Ever since its beginnings, the Christian Church has taught, and continues to teach, that Jesus Christ is the Head of the Church. However, faced with the reality of the physical absence of Christ on earth, the post-Apostolic Church felt it needed someone who could take His place, represent Him to believers and the world, and represent believers to God. Viewing themselves as separated for special ministry via the rite of ordination, early Christian ministers assumed the position of headship in the church in place of Christ. This is the actual meaning of the widely used Latin phrase in persona Christi Capitis (in place of Christ the Head).

Another phrase, Vicarius Filii Dei (in place of the Son of God), expresses the same belief. The acceptance of ministerial headship through the rite of ordination was accompanied by a developing theology of male headship in the church. The reasoning was very simple: in the New Testament, the relationship between Christ and the Church is represented in nuptial terms. Christ is represented as a bridegroom, a male, who marries His bride, the Church, a female. If the pastor serves his church in persona Christi Capitis, i.e., taking the role of headship in place of Christ, he also must be a man. It follows that the ordination rite is not a simple blessing but a conferral of headship powers and duties and, as such, it is a type of a marriage ceremony; the church becomes the pastor’s spouse. In short, through the rite of ordination, the pastor assumes a headship position in the church. All this means that women cannot be ordained as ministers in the church because they must remain in hierarchical submission to male pastors. This ancient theology is clearly expressed in John Paul II’s Apostolic Letter Mulieris Dignitatem (On the Dignity and Vocation of Women) issued in 1988, in which the late pope takes the biblical teaching of male headship in the home and applies it to the church. As we shall see below, there are significant problems with applying male headship terminology to relationships within the church.

**Jesus on the Authority of the Christian Leader**

Does the evolution of Christian minstry into papal hierarchy, as documented above, mean that the church should be deprived of leadership and organization? Or that authoritative structure should not exist within the community of faith? By no means! In order to exist and disseminate its mission the church must have organization and leadership. Rather than modeling its organization upon secular structures of authority, as early post-Apostolic Christianity did, the church should first of all look to Jesus to search for ways in which authority in the church should be exercised. It is Christ who founded the church and He knows best what Christian authority is and how it should be exercised. Thus, His followers must take His teachings on authority seriously. Other New Testament teachings related to the issue of authority, including difficult Pauline passages (eg., 1 Timothy 2:12) must thus be read through the prism of Jesus’ understanding of the term rather than vice versa. So what did Jesus have to say about authority?

In preparation for this presentation, I decided to once again re-read and think through the Gospel passages where Jesus speaks about authority. His views are truly astounding. For most of us, immersed in hierarchically-oriented cultures, Jesus’ message continues to be counterintuitive and difficult to comprehend, much less to accept. For this reason, we tend to gloss over the passages dealing with authority without much thought. And yet, these passages, if understood and applied, have the potential to revolutionize our personal and communal lives.

During His earthly ministry, Jesus’ disciples had shown a tendency to be preoccupied with status and ranking in the kingdom of God. This is
understandable, as their attitudes reflected the prevalent cultural and religious conceptions of authority. The Kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus presented such a breathtakingly different understanding of Christian authority that it took the death of Jesus for the disciples to understand His teachings. Jesus’ teachings on the authority of the Christian leader are most crisply articulated in a conversation that found its way into the three synoptic Gospels.22

The concept of authority in Jesus’ Kingdom was to be governed by two words: servant (diakonos) and slave (doulos). From our modern perspective, these two words, often translated as “minister,” have lost much of their force. For a person familiar with ancient society and its institutions, however, Jesus’ words must have been appalling. So much so that the disciples were unable to understand Jesus’ words, and to the last moments of His life, during the Last Supper, they argued about “who is the greatest” (Luke 22:24). This is because, in the first century milieu, servants (diakonoi) and slaves (doulai) represented the lowest class of human beings, beings who had few rights, and whose job was to listen and fulfill the wishes of those whom they served. Among slaves “there [was] no place for one’s own will or initiative.”23 “Ruling and not serving is proper to a man” believed ancient Greeks.24 Thus, whatever the metaphors of servant and slave were meant to convey it certainly was not exercising authority, spiritual or otherwise, over others (katakurieusin) and having status in the community.

Why did Jesus use these two metaphors if he could have compared His disciples with other leadership groups in society? I believe that Jesus was keenly aware that His Kingdom would be doomed if the disciples incorporated into it the authority structures prevalent within contemporary society. For His mission to succeed, all “pecking order” in the church had to be abolished. Murray Harris grasped this well: “Jesus was teaching that greatness in the community of his followers is marked by humble, self-effacing servanthood or slavery, modeled on his own selfless devotion to the highest good of others.”25 All this shows that Jesus certainly did not desire to abolish all authority in the church; He just radically redefined it and distanced it from the kind of “authority” that advocated submission to a higher authority. Instead, the church was to be a place where those who desired to follow His example were willing to serve in the lowest positions. In Philippians 2:5–7 Paul thus states, “Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: Who, being in very nature God … made Himself nothing, taking the very nature of a slave (doulos).” In the church of Jesus, therefore, it is not ordination to an office, a title, or a position that makes a leader, but the quality of a person’s life and his or her willingness to be the least of all. Following His lead, the despised terms diakonos and doulos later became the quasi-technical descriptions of apostolic and ministerial leadership in the church.26 Taking all of this into consideration, it is not surprising that to the question, “Who is the greatest? (Mark 9:33–35; Luke 9:46–48), Jesus answered: “For he who is the least among you all – he is the greatest” and “if anyone wants to be first, he must be the very last, and the servant (diakonos) of all.”

Two other terms, exousia and dynamis, are commonly translated as authority. Exousia appears to be related to Jesus’ teaching ministry and His ability to forgive sins (e.g., Matt 7:29; 9:6; Mark 1:22; Luke 4:32). The authority (exousia) that Jesus exercised, thus, brought words of life and healing to those who were willing to listen. Dynamis is usually associated with Jesus’ power to perform miracles and drive out demons (e.g., Luke 4:36; Luke 9:1). Nowhere in the Gospels do the terms exousia or dynamis appear to be associated with exercising any form of headship, or having authority, over others. Such thinking was simply not part of Jesus’ worldview. It is exousia and dynamis that Jesus bestowed upon the entire community of believers, and it is these two terms that are often confused with a secular understanding of ministerial powers.

There is a unique usage of exousia in Matthew 28:18, “All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me.” He does not hand over this authority to the disciples for it cannot be done. This is the absolute authority of the Almighty, Omniscient, Creator God. And how does the Almighty...
Creator God exercise His authority? Does He force His human subjects to be obedient? Does He take away their free will? In Ephesians 5:1-2, Paul provides an answer to the question of how God exercises His authority: “Follow God’s example, therefore, as dearly loved children and walk in the way of love, just as Christ loved us and gave Himself up for us as a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God.” The absolute authority of Christ, thus, represents a supreme example of love, servant-hood, and self-sacrifice.

Thus, the concept of authority within New Testament Christianity, founded upon the words and actions of Jesus, does not represent any form of headship in terms of authority over others where submission is expected. Clearly, Jesus always allowed the exercise of free will. Instead of exercising authority over others, His kind of authority can be expressed in terms of serving others. This he demonstrated most forcefully when He knelt to wash the disciples’ feet and when He died on the cross, thus giving a supreme example of the true conception of Christian authority. Thus, the Christian rite of ordination, properly understood, is ordination to slavery; it is not going up in rank; it is not about status or having authority over others; it is about being the least in the community of believers. Only understood as such can the ministry in the church fulfill Christ’s vision for leadership.

The early, post-Apostolic Christian Church soon forgot Jesus’ words and introduced pagan concepts of authority into Christian practice. “Pecking order” was established where it did not belong, all in the name of protecting the church’s unity and its teachings. Modern Christianity, including Adventism, inherited these patterns of authority. It would serve us well to return to the words of Jesus and attempt to view ministry in the church through the prism of His teachings, rather than merely adding the adjective “spiritual” to foreign authoritative patterns. What, then, were the characteristics of the New Testament community of Jesus?

**The New Testament Church: A Community Like No Other**

First (A1), ministry in the New Testament church was non-hierarchical; i.e., the organization of the church was not conceived in terms of a chain of command. There seems to be no doubt that, during His earthly ministry, Jesus endowed some of His followers with the special task of sharing in His mission of proclaiming God’s Kingdom. They were chosen to be His representatives and were to continue His mission and to reproduce in their own lives the central characteristics of Jesus Himself, namely total commitment and service to God and to fellow human beings. Their witness, however, was not based on their position, rank, or status but on the mission they had received from Christ. Their special authority was based on the fact that they had been eyewitnesses to the presence of Jesus on earth. Thus, with the aid of the Holy Spirit, this authority entailed preserving and passing on a reliable and trustworthy account of Jesus’ life and teachings in a reliable and trustworthy manner. “On this basis … rested the special and unique respect accorded to the apostles within the Church.”

The written accounts of many of those eyewitnesses were eventually collected into the canon of the New Testament and thus their writings became normative for Christian believers and expressed in a well-accepted Protestant axiom sola scriptura. The New Testament, however, does not provide any evidence that the special position of expertise held by the twelve apostles within the community of faith was transferred to other leaders in the Church.

What we do see in the New Testament, however, is a community like no other. It is a community whose leaders eschewed any form of hierarchy that would place some above others. In fact, following Jesus’ example, the New Testament leaders proclaimed what we can only describe as a reverse hierarchy. Following the lead of Jesus, its leaders routinely referred to themselves as doulos and diakonos of both God and the church. Accordingly, in 1 Corinthians 3:5, Paul writes: “What, after all, is Apollos? And what is Paul? Only servants (diakonoi), through whom you came to believe.” In 2 Corinthians 4:5, he emphatically declares: “For we do not preach ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, and ourselves as your slaves (doulos).”

We thus constantly find him lifting Christ and others up, while speaking of himself in unflattering terms such as “chief of sinners” (1 Tim 1:15). Elsewhere he writes: “...and last of all He appeared to me also, as to one abnormally born. For I am the least of the apostles and do not even deserve to be called an apostle” (1 Cor 15:7-9).

In 1 Corinthians 4:1 Paul refers to himself and his co-workers as under-rowers (hupēretas). An image of an ancient Greek or Roman war galley with three banks of oars comes to mind. Paul places himself in the lowest place on a trireme: he is under other rowers.

While Paul was commissioned to proclaim the Gospel, to teach, exhort, and rebuke, it appears, therefore, that he purposefully desired to avoid positioning himself in a role above his fellow believers. Instead, and despite his special position as an Apostle of Christ, we see him wooing people to follow Christ, not through the authority of his “office,” but through the witness of his life.

“Follow my example, as I follow the example of Christ” (1 Cor 11:1; 1 Cor 4:16; Phil 3:17, 4:9; 1 Thess 1:6; 2 Thess 3:7). With a clear conscience, therefore, Paul was able to write to the Corinthians that when his young disciple Timothy visits them, he would “remind [them] of his [Paul’s] way of life in Christ Jesus, which agrees with what [he taught] everywhere in every church” (1 Cor 4:17). Thus, it was the way he lived his life, rather than his position, that resulted in Paul’s having genuine authority in the church.

Within the context of being slaves in the church, the New Testament writers were remarkably egalitarian. Everyone could be a slave of the Lord! In Romans 12:11, Paul encouraged all believers to “serve the Lord as His slaves” (tō kyrιō douleuontes). In Galatians 5:13 he urged believers “to serve one another as slaves (douleute) through love.” Every believer, thus, was to serve as a doulos of Christ and of each other.

While all believers were called to be slaves of God and one another, this especially applied to leaders in the Christian community who, according to the teaching of Christ, were to consider themselves “the least of all,”
and thus examples to those under their care. Peter echoed Jesus when he wrote to the leaders in the church: “Be shepherds of God’s flock that is under your care . . . not lording it over (katakurieontes)32 those entrusted to you but being examples to the flock” (1 Peter 5:2-5). This was the primary reason why Paul, James, and Peter often introduced themselves to their congregations as slaves (doulos) of Christ (Rom 1:1; Jam 1:1; 2 Pet 1:1). All this suggests that New Testament leadership was not about having “authority” over others, about having the “last word,” or having an “office.”33 Instead, it was all about having the attitude of Paul, Peter, and other leaders of the New Testament church, who led by the example of their devotion to their Lord and to each other. This was the bedrock of genuine Christian authority.34

Viewing church leadership from the above perspective, the overseers (episcopēs in 1 Timothy 3:1) or elders (presbyteros in Titus 1:9) were indeed to be special persons: they were to be servants (doulos) of the Lord and the community; they were to lead by example rather than by the authority of their position; they were to have good names in the community; they were to have stable, monogamous marriages; they were to manage their households well; they were be protectors of the community. One thing was quite certain, however: these slaves of the Lord did not have to be males.35

If ministry is to be understood as slavery to Christ and others, another passage must be highlighted. As stated above, Paul’s favorite description of his own ministry and that of his co-workers (such as Timothy) was “slave of the Lord” (doulos Christou).36 We find others, such as Peter and James, also referring to themselves as “slaves of the Lord.”37 The same wording, this time spoken by the Lord Himself, however, appears in Acts 2:18 where Peter quotes the prophet Joel: “Even on my slaves, both men and women, I will pour out my Spirit in those days.” Most frequently, this passage is used to highlight the fact that the gift of prophecy was not limited to men. However, we also find in this verse the masculine doulos and the feminine doula. In both cases, the pronoun mou (my) is added. Considering that, in other places in the New Testament, doulos is most often translated as “minister,” this passage could legitimately be translated as speaking of both “male ministers” and “female ministers,” who are God’s own. Is Peter making the point that, in the New Testament church, both males and females could slave the Lord equally? And that both, males and females, were to receive specific gifts of the Spirit that would enable them to fulfill their ministerial calling? Whatever interpretation we place on this particular passage, one thing is clear: the Holy Spirit is not concerned with the gender of the person upon whom He bestows His gifts. Should we be?

It is indeed tragic that soon after the disciples died, post-Apostolic Christianity abandoned the charismatic understanding of Christian ministry and, instead, incorporated a pagan understanding of authority.

Second (B1), ministry in the New Testament was not sacramental; i.e., neither salvation nor the life of the community depended on the presence of ordained clergy. While the early post-Apostolic Church created a system where ordained clergy were essential to the existence of the church, we do not find such a requirement in the New Testament. From the New Testament point of view, it was Christ alone who was the mediator between God and humanity. Leadership in the New Testament, thus, fulfilled a purely functional role, i.e., its existence contributed to church order and the laying-on-of-hands simply acknowledged the gift of leadership already present in a person.

A sacramental view of ministry, of course, was prophetically significant, as the mediatorial work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary was replaced by the work of an earthly priest. In other words, the early post-Apostolic church sewed back together the earthly sanctuary’s curtain rent by the divine hand at the time of Jesus’ death. Consequently, every Catholic church on earth became a sanctuary with its own priest. This development clearly corresponded to the prophetic utterance of Daniel, “Yea, it magnified itself, even to the prince of the host; and it took away from him the continual burnt-offering, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down” (Daniel 8:11 ASV). It follows that any attempt to apply priestly language to the work of the ministry in the church takes away from the one unique priesthood of Christ and has direct, negative implications on the Adventist sanctuary message, which emphasizes that all have special access to the risen Christ without the need of spiritual mediators.

Third (C1), ministry in the New Testament was not elitist; i.e., the laying-on-of-hands did not create a spiritual elite in the church. The New Testament understanding was that functions, or roles, in the church were to be filled according to spiritual gifting. Ordination, thus, can be defined simply as “the action of the church to publicly recognize those whom the Lord has called to and equipped for local and global church ministry.”38 Disagreements begin to appear when we ask the question: Who can serve in the church as ordained elders or pastors?

The church of God described in the pages of the New Testament was decidedly non-elitist. In His sayings, Jesus focused on the non-elite of the day and proclaimed them to be the children of God (Matt 5:3-8). In Matthew 23:8-13, he said to His followers: “But you are not to be called ‘Rabbi’ for you have only one Master and you are all brothers. . . . The greatest among you will be your servant” (Matthew 23:8-11). In modern terms we could paraphrase this saying as follows: “But you are not to be called “pastor,” “elder,” “professor,” or “doctor,” for you have only one Master and you are all brothers.” It is truly unfortunate that in Christian history the lowly term “pastor” has become a symbol of status.39

Paul’s favorite imagery for portraying the Christian community, i.e., the Body of Christ, represented a markedly non-elitist ecclesiology (1 Cor 12:21-31; Rom 12:1-8; Eph 1:22). Central to this imagery were unity of the Church and the Church’s vital relationship with its Head, Jesus Christ. Paul’s insistence that the church functioned like a human body served to remind believers that they were completely dependent upon Christ for their growth and
life. While unity and the headship of Christ were Paul's main concern, his discussion of the church as the body of Christ was framed within the context of spiritual gifting. The recipients of spiritual gifts were all who were part of the body of Christ, and the unity of the body of Christ depended on the presence, recognition, and use of these spiritual gifts (Eph 4:1-13). Any exclusive claim to these gifts was precluded, because their distribution was dependent upon the Holy Spirit and not on the church (1 Cor 12:11). Any form of elitism was settled by Paul's masterful discussion on the mutual interdependence of believers who exhibited various spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12:12-31). Furthermore, in none of the four listings of spiritual gifts (Rom 12:6-8; 1 Cor 12:8-10, 28-30; Ephesians 4:11) was Paul exclusive in any way. Notably, in Romans 12:8, the gifts of teaching and leadership were tucked in among other, seemingly insignificant gifts. It would be ludicrous to claim, on the basis of this passage, that the gift of encouragement was lower on the scale of giftedness, while the gift of leadership was higher and thus could only be endowed upon a certain class of believers in the church. Certainly this could not have been Paul's intention.

Paul's use of the Body of Christ imagery helps us to understand the reality of the church and the way it should function. Within such a community, all solidarities of race, class, culture, and gender are replaced by an allegiance to Christ alone. The old way of relating is replaced by a new relatedness in Christ (Gal 3:28, 29). In this community, all people are equal members of the Body of Christ, because all have experienced the risen Christ and all are gifted with a variety of spiritual gifts of equal value (1 Cor 12), which are to be utilized for the benefit of believers and the world (Rom 12:1-8). Thus, we do not find a hierarchy where some people rank above others according to status; neither do we find a division between ordained clergy and laity. What we see is a new community, the Body of Christ, a New Creation (2 Cor 5:17), where all relationships should hail back to the Garden of Eden. This is what the early post-Apostolic Church forgot soon after the death of the Apostles, introducing instead a notion of an un-equal society in which leadership in the church was restricted to ordained male clergy. The Holy Spirit was thus quenched!

The reality is that if anything apart from commitment to Christ and His church, spiritual gifting, and maturity determine fitness for various functions in the church, then, whether we intend it or not, we create an elitist community. No pious designations attached to the "office" of pastor—such as "servant," "spiritual authority," "spiritual leadership," or "spiritual headship"—can change this reality.

Fourth (D1), the ministry in the New Testament church was not male headship oriented; i.e., there was no room for male headship in the Body of Christ. While Scripture testifies that women were not restricted from leadership positions (Deborah, Phoebe, Junia, Lydia, Priscilla, Nympha), history without say that man's headship in the home in some way extends to relationships in the church. Paul's meaning is clear: as a husband is the head of his wife, his bride, so Christ is the Head of the Church, His Bride. In both cases, the nuptial language is clearly restricted to specific relationships: that between a husband and wife and that between Christ and His church. It would be absurd to conclude that Paul meant to say that as Christ is the Bridegroom of the Church, so men in the Christian congregation are bridegrooms of women in the church. Neither is it scriptural to say that the pastor "marries" the church and becomes its head upon his ordination, just as Christ married His Bride and became its Head.

From this it follows that any idea of headship in the church, be it male or female, apart from that of Christ, usurps the headship of Christ. Thus,
amount of tinkering with the text “according to the ideas they happen to entertain upon them,” adding the word “spiritual” to headship, can change this reality. As noted above, sacramentalism is primarily a hallmark of Catholic Christianity, but it also exists within those Christian denominations that choose to replace the pope (also referred to as “Holy Father;” from the Latin papa) with a male figure of a pastor/elder. Christian communities that embrace female headship in addition to male headship follow the same pattern.

So I have a question: Can we, as Seventh-day Adventists, really afford to flirt with applying the male headship principle to the ordained pastor/elder? I believe that this principle is a seemingly innocuous Trojan horse that has the potential to destroy the very heart of Adventism. It is telling that Ellen G. White never once used 1 Timothy 2 or 3 and 1 Corinthians 11 or 14 to support male headship in the church. The developments in early post-Apostolic Christianity, discussed in the first part of this paper, clearly show the dangers of extending the biblical notion of male headship in the home to male headship in the Church and must be avoided at all costs among true followers of Christ.

Conclusion

In conclusion, there can be no doubt that early Catholic Christianity incorporated various characteristics of the Old Testament priestly ministry into the theology and practice of Christian ministry. Christian ministry, thus, became hierarchical, sacramental, elitist, and oriented towards male headship. To a greater or lesser degree, most Christian communities, including Seventh-day Adventists, continue to perpetuate some of these characteristics in their communities.

All these characteristics, however, were fulfilled in Christ who, by virtue of being our Creator, stands over us and has no successors to His divine authority; who died sacramentally on the cross and thus became the sole provider of salvation; who, through His ministry on earth, made all humans equal in the eyes of God in terms of authority and endowed them with the gifts of the Holy Spirit to fulfill the Great Gospel Commission; and who, through His sacrificial death on the cross, became the sole Head of the Church, His Bride. He shares His headship with no one! Post-New Testament Christianity, unfortunately, denied the sole headship of Christ in the church and contributed to the integration of a counterfeit view of authority in church organization and, thus, to the birth of an apostate religion.

I began this paper with a discussion on the nature of authority. Our God, who is a God of order, created a world in which human beings, the crown of His creation, were to live according to the authoritative patterns that governed the universe prior to the creation of the Earth. Then sin entered the world. The way God exercised His authority was challenged and a counterfeit notion of authority was introduced. This is the notion of authority that the “prince of this world” taught the first couple; this is the notion of authoritative persons in my life were not ordained ministers.”

I believe that this principle is a seemingly innocuous Trojan horse that has the potential to destroy the very heart of Adventism. It is telling that Ellen G. White never once used 1 Timothy 2 or 3 and 1 Corinthians 11 or 14 to support male headship in the church. The developments in early post-Apostolic Christianity, discussed in the first part of this paper, clearly show the dangers of extending the biblical notion of male headship in the home to male headship in the Church and must be avoided at all costs among true followers of Christ.

Now, I understand that “slavery” has few positive connotations, as it implies no honor, no glory, no status, and no ranking. Nobody likes that; in fact, I am repulsed by the concept. And yet, this is the word that Christ used to describe Himself and His work; this is the word that the apostles used to
describe themselves and their work as well as that of their co-workers, both men and women; this is what Christ is calling us – Adventist pastors, deacons, elders, presidents of divisions, conferences and unions – to be; not to have authority over people but rather over the task of fulfilling the Great Commission of Christ. Gospel order in the church does not require hierarchical headship, spiritual or otherwise. For true Christian ministry is not about status, rank, gender, equality, rights, or having “spiritual authority” over others; it is about being slaves of Christ and His people; not to rule over others but to be examples and, through the witness of our lives, to woo others to follow Christ. No human laying-on-of-hands can provide this kind of authority; only the work of the Holy Spirit in a person’s heart can! While all Christians are to be ministers, those who are set apart for special ministry, both men and women, are called to be chief examples of slavery to Christ and others. I am convinced that when we embrace this understanding of authority and ministry, Christ’s vision for His community will be fulfilled, revival and reformation will follow, and the problem of women’s ordination will disappear.

So I want to leave this short investigation of the nature of Christian authority with a question: Are we going to follow culture, both secular and religious, which has taught us a hierarchical and elitist understanding of authority? Or are we going to follow Christ, who said, “Not so with you!”?
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Did you know? Each program of the Seminary is committed to the following general objectives:

- to furnish the Seventh-day Adventist Church with competent, highly motivated and consecrated pastors and church workers for service in the worldwide mission of the church
- to equip men and women for the various phases of ministry with sound methods, principles, and procedures of biblical interpretation and scholarship
- to provide a firm basis for an intellectual and spiritual understanding of religion, morality, and ethics as set forth in the Bible (accepted as the propositional word of God) and as understood in Christianity in general and the Adventist Church in particular
- to transmit a belief in the relevance of biblical faith and teaching to modern men and women and to their preparation for the future kingdom
- to develop skills required for effectively proclaiming biblical faith through preaching, teaching, writing, and leadership in corporate worship and all phases of church life
- to teach methods and procedures for leading a congregation or group to accomplish its own task of disseminating the faith by word and deed
- to encourage the development of professional and pastoral skills necessary to create an atmosphere of mutual care within the Christian community in order that harmony and unity may be maintained, the common good fostered, and Christian commitment deepened
- to encourage appreciation for, and sympathetic understanding of customs different from one’s own, and responsiveness to change
- to promote personal involvement in the spiritual life of the Seminary community, to aid in the formation of a strong devotional life, to inspire a profound deepening of the student’s vocation and commitment to serve God and humanity in harmony with the teachings set forth in Scripture as understood by the Adventist Church
- to foster, within the Adventist framework, a stimulating academic and professional environment; to provide the necessary tools required for learning; to emphasize sound method, sharp critical thought, and an eager approach to discovering ultimate truth, thus forming an adequate foundation for lifelong competence and integrity
- to lay the foundations for lasting friendships, productive of mutual assistance and confidence, and to promote professional collegiality that creates a willingness to transcend personal bias and accept counsel from one’s peers
Kathleen Beagles is assistant professor of Religious Education. She also directs the PhD in Religious Education and coordinates the children's ministry emphasis for the religious education programs. Her teaching areas are discipleship, spiritual growth, and the ministry of teaching. She has taught at the secondary and university levels, both in Africa and the United States. Her first academic discipline, composition and rhetoric, quite naturally flowed into education. She spent 10 years developing and editing various non-formal Bible study curricula for elementary, middle and high school, and doing training for those curricula around the world. Her “third” career as a university professor has allowed her to bring all her previous experience into the classroom as she trains and encourages those going out into the fields of ministry and education to be intelligent and intentional about educating every one of God's children properly for the Kingdom. Her most fulfilling roles to date, however, are those of mother, mother-in-law, and grandmother.
Although not a new phenomenon, the issue of poverty and how we need to address it can be quite a polarizing topic. This is due to the varied perceptions of what poverty is and how it should be addressed. In the United States alone, 46.5 million people were reported to be living in poverty, and one in sixteen, living in deep poverty.1 The 2014 Summit on Social Consciousness featured Poverty in America, raising awareness on the issue and the many forms it has taken and can take. A variety of speakers reminded us of our vulnerabilities, our insufficiencies and informed us that poverty is real and possible, not just for the least of us, but for all of us.

By starting with a demonstration on the difficult choices that everyday people have to make in order to survive, the simulated game “Spent” showed how virtually impossible it was for someone living on minimum wage in the U.S. to survive in this flawed economy. It brought home the reality of how millions of people have to do incredible juggling acts, on a daily basis, just to have their basic needs met, such as food, medical care, rent and electricity. The screening of the film “Inequality for All,” a documentary which followed the stories of many Americans as they go through their daily financial routines, highlighted an astounding fact. It reported that U.S. ranks 4th in income inequality in the whole world despite being one of the wealthiest nations on earth.2

What was most shocking about this film is the fact that, contrary to popular belief, the people who are categorized as poor are educated, hard-working regular folk who, for some reason or other, end up on the wrong side of the financial ladder and once there, find it impossible to climb out. This is difficult to imagine, but statistics show that 47% of the poorest people in America owned 0% of the nation’s wealth, meaning that, they owed more than they owned. This is a stark difference to just a couple of decades ago, in 1983, when the poorest 47% in America owned 2.5% of the nation’s wealth.3

Also highlighted in the film was the fact that most Americans are living paycheck to paycheck. These are so dependent on their paychecks that if they were to be laid off, or their check delayed, or any be stricken by other unforeseen circumstance, such as illness or layoff, they would basically be on the street.

Perhaps the most disconcerting thing to learn from the Summit on Poverty was the number of children that were dependent on school meals because they hardly had any food at home. The Federal Education Budget Project, in its report...
“If we are to be like Christ, we need to care about the things that matter to Him.”

on the Federal School Nutrition Program, reported that at least 31 million students received five billion meals just for the 2013-2014 school year. Of these, about 70 percent or 21.7 million students were eligible for school lunches that were either free of charge or served at a reduced price. The 2014 Summit on Poverty was a jolt into reality for its participants. As children of God, charged with the responsibility of caring for one another, that weekend was a good reminder that we cannot be passersby. We need to become involved in the fight against poverty. These statistics bring to mind the words of Christ, “For I was hungry, and you didn’t feed me. I was thirsty, and you didn’t give me a drink. I was a stranger, and you didn’t invite me into your home. I was naked, and you didn’t give me clothing. I was sick and in prison, and you didn’t visit me” (Matthew 25: 42-43).

Though we do not like to be confronted with the ugliness of some of these issues, we need to be reminded of what Christ made clear in Mark 14:7: “Ye have the poor with you always”. This is why we cannot afford to sweep this issue under the rug. As more and more of our children, our peers, our friends and neighbors are sucked into this never-ending cycle of poverty, we need to do what we have been called to do: “love your neighbors as yourself” (Mark 12:31). This means we cannot afford to ignore this issue any longer, nor pretend like it isn’t happening around us.

When Christ shared His ministry philosophy, He thought about the poor and made sure not just to include them, but to begin with them as He recited His ministry fundamentals: “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me to preach good news to the poor, He has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim freedom for the captives and release from darkness for the prisoners, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor and the day of vengeance of our God, to comfort all who mourn” … (Isaiah 61:1-2).

If we are to be like Christ, we need to care about the things that matter to Him. We can start with the Poor Next Door.

2 http://inequalityforall.com/fact-4/.
3 http://inequalityforall.com/fact-3/.
“...establishing community among women in ministry...”

President
• Tanya Loveday

VP, Administration & Mentoring
• Loreal McInnes

VP, Operations
• Darnisha Thomas

VP, Communications
• Linda Tambunan

VP, Spiritual & Social Affairs
• Amber Cheatham
"The mission of the Women’s Clergy Network of Andrews University is to encourage intimate friendship, foster personal, spiritual, and professional growth of women in spiritual leadership. We seek to provide an atmosphere of support, mutual respect, and fellowship celebrating life to the fullest while using the unique gifts God has given us.” These are a few words found in the constitution of the Women’s Clergy Network club. However, the founders and current leadership consider this group as more than a club. It is a ministry.

Our history reflects this. In April, I had the opportunity to sit down with the founder, Dilys Brooks, chaplain of Loma Linda University, to hear about our beginnings. While a seminary student years ago, Brooks became aware of some of the specific needs of female seminarians and women in ministry. After several conversations with fellow students, colleagues in ministry and seminary professors, Brooks was impressed that somehow, these issues needed to be addressed. She decided to speak to the Seminary Dean at that time who gave her his blessing to do just that. Thus the Women’s Clergy Network was born as a means of establishing community among women in ministry and building healthy working relationships with male colleagues.

The WCN executive body for 2014-2015 has a positive plan for change. Our focus this year is to get back to the basics of nurturing a sense of camaraderie and collegiality among men and women in ministry, as we seek to lead souls to Christ and prepare for His Second Coming."

Against the chatter of pop psychology and the latest list of must-have motivational habits, twenty Bible scholars and ministry professionals thoughtfully grapple with what the Scriptures, in their totality, actually have to teach us about the essence of true leadership. It also includes a chapter by Stan Patterson, Chair of the Christian Ministry Department.

Skip Bell is professor of Christian Leadership and director of the Doctor of Ministry program. He is the author of numerous academic and professional articles and one book, A Time to Serve. His primary focus has been leadership and administration, serving the church in pastoral, administrative, and academic roles.


Christianity, Judaism, and Islam have sometimes been more closely identified not for what they offer to save the world, but for what they bring to destabilize it. It is one of the depressing paradoxes of religion, supposedly a force for good, that it is all too frequently the occasion for conflict instead of peace, generosity, and better treatment of neighbors. This book explores what articulating such regardful difference, as well as commonality, might mean for future faith relations.


This encyclopedia examines the topics Ellen White discussed, the people she knew, and the places she visited. According to George Knight, it is “the most important reference work produced by the Seventh-day Adventist Church in half a century.”

Dr. Denis Fortin is professor of Theology & Christian Philosophy and Dr. Jerry Moon is professor of Church History.


This book is the result of a three-day brainstorming session of 23 pastors, researchers, practitioners, and academics. Included are papers and resources discussing why some youth and young adults stay in the church while others leave, as well as how to help them come back. Case studies on churches that are successfully attracting youth and young adults back to church serve to highlight how to reach and connect with the younger generation while creating a culture of acceptance. The concluding appendices explore Church of Refuge, an association of churches devoted to actively retaining youth and bringing back those who have left.

Dr. Kenley D. Hall is associate professor of Christian Ministry, director of the Theological Field Education and associate pastor, One Place, Berrien Springs, Michigan. Dr. S. Joseph Kidder is professor of Christian Ministry and Discipleship.


This edition reflects the authors’ current thinking and experience of Jesus’s grace and love. As it walks readers through a healing journey, it includes current thinking in the area of neuroscience and includes exciting new information on forgiveness.

Dr. David Sedlacek, professor of Family Ministry and Discipleship is the husband of Beverly who serves as assistant professor in the Andrews University Department of Nursing.


In today’s world, no other part of the Bible inspires so much interest, speculation, sensationalism, and confusion as the book of Revelation. In this concise reader’s introduction, Revelation expert Ranko Stevanovic makes it all plain and simple, leading readers chapter by chapter, section by section, scene by scene through this amazing panorama of cosmic war and glory.


This book presents a biblical worldview of what the Beatitudes and Christian life truly are while challenging the secular worldview many Christians have unconsciously adopted. It breaks down the Sermon on the Mount into palatable pieces that will leave the reader fulfilled and nourished.

Dr. Hyveth Williams is professor of Homiletics and director of the Homiletics Program. She also serves as senior pastor of The Grace Place (tgpthegraceplace.org) a community church plant she started in South Bend, Indiana. She is also author of four books and co-author of The Celt & The Christ, a commentary on Galatians.

Would you like to be part of an exciting hands-on, life-changing experience next Spring?

Travel to Communist Cuba and be part of an evangelistic team that will preach the gospel in unprecedented ways!

Join the Cuba Study Tour during the Spring Break (March 12-23) of 2015 and receive up to 4 credits.

There will be only one informational meeting:
**August 28, 2014, @ 10:30 am—Seminary Chapel**

If you would like to receive a message with relevant information, courses to be offered, costs, early bird dates etc., please email Luz at luzdelAlba@andrews.edu

Or contact the MDiv office at 269-471-3538
Having pastored for 28 years in Illinois, Maryland, and Michigan, Esther brings much experience to her roles as associate director, NAD Ministerial, and director of InMinistry Center located at the Seminary. Responsibilities include, being a pastor to the pastors across NAD, program director for MA in Pastoral Ministry, and developing a system for continuing education for all pastors in NAD. Esther serves as the Division liaison with the Seminary. Esther holds an MA in religious education (1987) and is working on a PhD in the same field.

Writings include articles in *Ministry*, *Adventist Review*, *Woman of Spirit*, and *Celebration* magazine and in books: *Shall We Dance?, Over and Over Again Vol. 2*, *College Faith*, *In Granite or Engrained* (Study Guide) and *Contagious Adventist*. Esther is a contagious Adventist through her involvement with Rotary, Big Brother/Sisters, Christian World Service's CROP Hunger Walk.

Wife of Ronald Alan Knott, director of Andrews University Press, mother of Olivia, a senior religion and communication major at Andrews University where she is serving as president of the Andrews University Student Association (2014-2015).

Dr. Helena R. Gregor, director, Seminary Distance Learning Center, received her PhD from Andrews University. The Seminary Distance Learning Center develops and administers the delivery of selected courses by a variety of delivery methods: traditional correspondence, the Internet, satellite, video-conferencing and various other means as they become feasible. The goal is to make it possible for students in all Seminary programs to do a portion of their study at a distance, if that would be advantageous to them.

Prior to joining the Seminary faculty, Dr. Gregor worked for four years as an associate professor at Northern Caribbean University, School of Religion and Theology in Jamaica. She has authored and co-authored many articles and books. Some of her latest publications include: *Toward Understanding God, Issues Concerning the History of Ancient Israel*, and *Understanding Youth: Saving a Generation*.

She is married to Paul, chair of the Old Testament department and professor of Old Testament. They have one adult son, Samuel, and daughter-in-law, Kristyn, and a grandson, Luka.
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- **Director:** Fernando Ortiz, N209, 269-471-3416, ortizl@andrews.edu
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- **Chair:** Stanley Patterson, S228, 269-471-3217, patterss@andrews.edu
- **Admin. Assist.:** Sylvie Baumgartner, S220, 269-471-6371, sylvie@andrews.edu

**Church History**

- **Chair:** Jerry Moon, N332, 269-471-3542, jmoon@andrews.edu
- **Admin. Assist.:** Fran McMullen, N327, 269-471-3541, fran@andrews.edu

**Discipleship and Religious Education**

- **Chair:** Allan Walshe, N218, 269-471-3318, walshe@andrews.edu
- **Admin. Assist.:** Beatriz Velasquez, N210, 269-471-6186, beatrizv@andrews.edu

**New Testament**

- **Chair:** Richard Choi, N128, 269-471-6573, choir@andrews.edu
- **Admin. Assist.:** Rachel, Sauer, N125, 269-471-3219, sauerr@andrews.edu

**Old Testament**

- **Chair:** Paul Gregor, N114, 269-471-6344, pgregor@andrews.edu
- **Admin. Assist.:** Katie Freeman, N111, 269-471-2861, katie@andrews.edu

**Theology and Christian Philosophy**

- **Chair:** Darius Jankiewicz, N315, 269-471-3438, darius@andrews.edu
- **Admin. Assist.:** Melanie Beaulieu, N311, 269-471-3607, beaulieu@andrews.edu

**World Mission**

- **Chair:** Bruce Bauer, S210, 269-471-6373, bbauer@andrews.edu
- **Admin. Assist.:** Boubakar Sanou, S203, 269-471-6505, sanou@andrews.edu
True education means more than the perusal of a certain course of study. It means more than a preparation for the life that now is. It has to do with the whole being, and with the whole period of existence possible to man. It is the harmonious development of the physical, the mental, and the spiritual powers. It prepares the student for the joy of service in the world and for the higher joy of wider service in the world to come.

Ellen G. White

(ull Education, p13)
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