In the prologue of *Women in Ministry* the authors welcome any response and invite those who disagree with their findings to dialogue.¹ This gracious invitation I have gladly accepted. In the quest for truth a frank exchange of thoughts is very important. If others have discovered new light on the role of women in the church, we certainly should be willing to accept it.

*Women in Ministry* is divided into four parts. The first part is entitled “Ministry in the Bible.” It “explores the theological meaning of the different forms of priesthood and ministry among God’s people throughout the Bible.”² In this section the authors set forth their understanding of the biblical basis for ordaining women as ministers, making it one of the most significant parts of the book. It deserves careful consideration.

In this chapter and the three that follow, I will evaluate the four chapters of “Ministry in the Bible” in the light of the inspired writings and the time-honored principles of Bible interpretation used by Seventh-day Adventists. The following questions will receive careful consideration: Is each author’s conclusion in favor of women’s ordination based solely on the Bible (*Sola Scriptura*)—the vital principle at the foundation of the Protestant Reformation and the Advent movement? Does the author in *Women in Ministry* follow that book’s own stated principle that “the whole of the Bible message must be taken into account”³ in interpreting the Scriptures? Does the author avoid using some of the methods employed by higher
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criticism (historical-critical method) in determining the meaning of a biblical text or practice? Are the inspired writings of Ellen G. White used accurately, and are the author’s conclusions in harmony with these writings?

If all these questions can be answered positively, we should be willing to accept an author’s conclusions as new light. If the arguments do not meet the above criteria, those authors may need to rethink their positions and adjust their arguments to be in harmony with the testimony of the whole Bible.

**Sola Scriptura and the Writings of Ellen G. White**

Some may question the need for comparing the conclusions of the authors with the writings of Ellen G. White when we stress the importance of the *Sola Scriptura* principle. Does this practice not undermine our claim that we judge all things by the Bible and the Bible only?

The phrase “the Bible and the Bible only” as the basis of our faith and practice found expression with Ellen White and the Seventh-day Adventist pioneers many times. However, each time Mrs. White used this phrase she contrasted the teachings of Scripture with the traditions of men which are not in harmony with the Word of God. Nowhere in her writings do we find her contrasting this phrase with the testimonies and messages God gave to her.4

Furthermore, the Bible itself predicts that in the time of the end the Spirit of prophecy will be manifested among God’s people. This revival of the prophetic gift took place under the divine inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The Bible calls these end-time revelations the “testimony of Jesus” (Rev 12:17) which is equated with the “spirit of prophecy” (Rev 19:10). This unique phenomenon is one of the characteristics of God’s remnant that is called to prepare the world for the return of Christ. In accepting the testimony of the Bible, we Seventh-day Adventists also accept the prophetic gift that this Bible said would appear in the time of the end to guide God’s people.

Accepting this gift is in no way contrary to the claim that we have committed ourselves to follow “the Bible and the Bible only.” James White affirmed the harmony between the Scriptures and the manifestation of the Spirit of prophecy in the writings of Ellen White. He wrote, “The position that the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the rule of faith and duty, does not shut out the gifts which God set in the church. To reject them is shutting out that part of the Bible which presents them.”5

In her first book Ellen White explains the intimate relation of her writings to the Bible, stating “I recommend to you, dear reader, the Word of God as the rule of your faith and practice. By that Word we are to be judged. God has, in that Word, promised to give visions in the *last days*; not for a new rule of faith, but for the comfort of His people, and to correct those who err from Bible truth.6

Seventh-day Adventists have found that Ellen White’s writings are in full harmony with the Scriptures, leading people to a better understanding of the Bible and displaying the matchless love of Jesus as our Savior. These writings which
reveal the testimony of Jesus in the time of the end came about as a result of the same divine inspiration as that of the Bible writers.

As Ellen White’s writings are in complete agreement with the Bible, we have no reservations in using them for evaluating the conclusions of *Women in Ministry*. As we look at these four chapters from *Women in Ministry* in turn, we will evaluate each of them by the Bible and then in the light of the writings of Ellen G. White.

**The Priesthood of All Believers**

In this chapter I will discuss the first chapter of *Women in Ministry* dealing with ministry in the Bible, which focuses on the priesthood of all believers. The author, a systematic theologian, discusses the priesthood first in the Old Testament, then the New. He concludes his study by implying that the priesthood of all believers demands the ordination of women as ministers.

The author mentions that throughout the Old Testament, males functioned as priests, but in the New Testament a radical change took place. “A new priesthood is unfolded in the New Testament, that of all believers. The Christian church is a fellowship of believer priests.” This view of the church, he asserts, “no longer poses roadblocks to women serving in any ministry. It in fact demands a partnership of men and women in all expressions of the ordained ministry.”

To remove any doubt about the correctness of this view, he asks, “Did Paul ever indicate that some gifts are bestowed upon men and others upon women? Is there any attempt on his part, or on Peter’s, to distinguish between gift and role, between the Spirit gifting and the exercise of ministry by one particular gender?” He answers with an emphatic denial, stating that “in the Christian church distinctions of race, social position, economic status, and gender are no longer valid considerations in ordering the church’s ministry. We are all ministers within Christ’s fellowship.”

It is clear, therefore, that the author believes that the New Testament concept of the priesthood of all believers has eliminated the distinctions in roles between men and women in the proclamation of the gospel. To him, not roles, but spiritual gifts determine who qualifies for the various positions in gospel ministry, including the office of elder and minister. These gifts have nothing to do with whether one is a man or a woman.

We will now examine whether the New Testament indeed presents such a radical change in the church’s leadership structure as to demand that nearly two thousand years later the remnant church must begin to ordain women as ministers in finishing the gospel commission.

**The Old Testament Priesthood**

Ever since sin entered into the world there have been priests. “In the beginning the head of each family was considered ruler and priest of his own household.” This headship role was fulfilled by a man who had the leadership responsibility in his family. “Every man was the priest of his own household.”
This patriarchal order continued until the time of the Exodus when God delivered His chosen people Israel from slavery in Egypt. At that time the Lord sanctified the first-born males for His service (Ex 13:1, 2, 12). Then He brought Israel to mount Sinai where He instituted a covenant with His people based on the sanctuary services. God here covenanted with Israel that they were to be a “kingdom of priests” (Ex 19:5, 6).

Did this covenant allow every Israelite to function as a priest in the sanctuary services? Not at all. The responsibility to officiate as priest was at first limited to the first-born (Num 3:12, 8:1-18), but after the golden calf idolatry it was assigned to the males of the family of Aaron of the tribe of Levi (Ex 28:1, 41, 43; Num 3:10). Yet Israel continued to be a “kingdom of priests” even though not every person officiated as a priest, because those who performed as priests represented the families and the nation.

In this “kingdom of priests,” leadership responsibilities were divided among the priests, elders, rulers, prophets, and later on judges and kings. The priests led out in the religious matters, performing the sanctuary services and providing religious teaching. The elders, males occupying positions of leadership, assisted with governing the nation (Ex 24:1, 9, 14; Num 11:16; Neh 13:29), along with rulers who were responsible for groups of thousands, hundreds and tens (Deut 1:15). Then there were the prophets, both male and female, specially called by God as messengers to speak His word, counsels, warnings, and judgments. Later, judges and kings were chosen to lead the whole nation.

Despite these various leading roles, the nation of Israel remained a “kingdom of priests” because of the covenant God had made with His people. The covenant continued to be relevant throughout the Old Testament era (Jud 2:30; 1 Kings 19:14; 2 Kings 17:15, 35, 36; Neh 13:19).

During the 4000-year history of the Old Testament, despite times of great apostasy, God was directing and guiding His people. Under His wise leadership men were designated as the leaders in religious and political affairs, with the exception of the roles of prophet and judge, which could be occupied by God-fearing women as well as men.

**The New Testament Priesthood**

The death of Jesus Christ abolished the sacrificial system with its sanctuary services in the Jerusalem temple and the work of the priests (Dan 9:27). Israel’s continued rejection of Christ’s sacrifice for humanity and its determined persecution of His followers ended the nation’s special covenant relationship in A.D. 34, at the conclusion of the prophetic seventy week period. At that time the Lord took away His kingdom from them and established the covenant with a new nation, called spiritual Israel (Mt 22:33-44). This spiritual kingdom no longer had the offices of priest, high priest, or king, for Christ had become their Priest, High Priest, and King.
After the crucifixion, however, God’s covenant promise under the Old Testament continued to be valid, but now its blessings were bestowed on spiritual Israel. Peter emphasized this by stating that the *new believers* were a “royal priesthood, a holy nation” (1 Peter 2:9).

What kind of priesthood and spiritual nation did God establish after the cross? First, the Scriptures announce that Jesus Christ, our Lord, is our Priest (Heb 5:6; 7:11, 15; 8:4) instead of the Levitical priesthood. He is our High Priest (Heb 2:17; 3:1; 4:14, 15; 9:11), representing us before the Father. Instead of an earthly priest interceding for us, there is now one Mediator, Jesus Christ, who pleads our cases. In the judgment He determines whether our names will remain in the book of life or will be blotted out (Rev 3:5). He ministers not in an earthly sanctuary but in a sanctuary in heaven. There, in the presence of His Father, He applies His blood shed at Calvary as the Lamb of God for our sins, presenting His precious righteousness for repentant sinners.

Second, the New Testament calls God’s people a royal priesthood and a holy nation. The new believers represent their Lord Jesus Christ and function as priests by delivering the gospel message to all the world. This new priesthood is to lead people to the heavenly High Priest through the gospel.

To enable His people to fulfill the great commission, Christ promised to give special gifts to this royal priesthood—to every member of His church—so believers could flourish in their divinely-assigned roles. Some would receive the gift of wisdom, others gifts of faith, healing, working of miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, languages, helps, or administration (1 Cor 12:8-10, 28). Others would receive gifts of ministry, exhortation, leadership, liberality, or mercy (Rom 12:6-8). As a result of these divine gifts some were to be “apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers” (Eph 4:11).

But this was not all Christ did. He also provided a plan for a most efficient model of organization to protect the church against heresies, prevent confusion, and integrate the various gifts He has given church members to make the church into a powerful, well-organized army to invade the kingdom of Satan. This New Testament model of leadership continues to use the Old Testament office of elder but gives it a more spiritual character.

This biblical leadership model, designating only men as the elders or ministers, is the issue some are questioning. Determined efforts are being made to eliminate it. The author of the chapter we are considering wants us to believe that now all role distinctions between male and female in the gospel ministry are abolished. Is his assertion correct?

**Harmony between Gifts and Roles in the Gospel Proclamation**

If God saw fit to have the Old Testament kingdom of priests operate on the basis of the unique roles He assigned to men and women, why would not the New Testament priesthood of all believers continue to honor role distinctions between
male and female in the operation of His church? Is there anything wrong in utilizing differences in roles or functions for accomplishing the great commission Christ gave His church?

Does the priesthood of all believers mean that since Christ’s death on the cross all role differences between male and female have been abolished? Not according to the New Testament! Our author points out that Peter did not make a distinction between gifts and roles. But Paul certainly did make that distinction. On more than one occasion Paul clearly stipulated that the office of an elder or minister in God’s church is to be occupied by men with special qualifications.

Did Paul contradict Peter? Paul’s letters, like Peter’s, teach that spiritual gifts are given to each member of the church. But in other letters, when addressing a leadership conflict, Paul specifically stresses the importance of maintaining role distinctions between male and female in the leadership of the church.

Paul reveals God’s plan of how to organize and operate the church in the most efficient manner. Under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit he presents an organizational model that continues to use the role distinctions between male and female that have been guiding God’s people since the beginning.

In interpreting the Bible it is important to keep in mind that Scripture forms a unity, revealing a harmony of all its teachings. Peter and Paul were in harmony with each other, but the kind of counsel they gave depended on the specific situation they faced. Unfortunately, the Women in Ministry chapter we are considering does not seem to recognize that the different situations the apostles dealt with reveal the harmony and unity in the gospel ministry between the operation of spiritual gifts and gender distinctions between men and women. While God bestows spiritual gifts on every believer, He also assigns the office of an elder or minister to men.

The elders and ministers, under Christ as the Head and Shepherd of the church, function as undershepherds overseeing the operation of the church. In this office they are responsible to see that the spiritual gifts of the believers are most efficiently used. As leaders “they should arrange matters so that every member of the church shall have a part to act, that none may lead an aimless life, but that all may accomplish what they can according to their several ability.”

In evaluating the author’s arguments we notice that he does not follow Women in Ministry’s own recommendation that Scripture is an “intrinsic unity” and that “the whole of the Bible message must be taken into account.” In studying the whole biblical counsel one discovers that, when the New Testament affirms the priesthood of all believers, it also recognizes that God uses the spiritual gifts of all His people as well as the unique characteristics of the sexes in carrying out the gospel commission. When one perceives that God created men and women with complementary natures, one can appreciate that such a delegation of responsibilities in the gospel ministry not only makes good sense but is the best way to finish the remnant’s mission.
**Biblical Foundations of Church Leadership Roles**

When Paul was faced with a leadership conflict, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit he spelled out how Christians “ought to conduct” themselves within the church (1 Tim 3:15).

Paul warns that he cannot permit a woman “to usurp authority” over a man (1 Tim 2:13, KJV). He supports his admonition with two biblical events that took place at the very beginning of the human family. First, he appeals to God’s order in creating the human race. Then he points to the order of transgression at the fall.

Paul’s first reason for male leadership in the church is that “Adam was formed first, then Eve” (1 Tim 2:13). God’s order in the way He created men and women is not without significance. After creating Adam, God taught him the importance of implicit obedience, forbidding him to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil upon the penalty of death. In naming the animals Adam discovered that “there was not found an help meet for him” (Gen 2:20, KJV). Now Adam became aware that he was created to be a “social being” who “without companionship” would fail to achieve “perfect happiness.”

So God made a “help meet for him” (Gen 2:18, KJV). Here we get a glimpse of the role of the woman. She functions as Adam’s companion and provides support by assisting him in the execution of his responsibilities. In this role she did not function as an inferior but was to be treated as an equal without doing away with Adam’s unique role.

We see the special relationship between the sexes in the way God created the woman. She was formed from Adam’s rib (Gen 2:21), indicating that she was “not to control him as the head, nor to be trampled under his feet as an inferior, but to stand by his side as an equal, to be loved and protected by him.” The difference in physical features between them accentuated Adam’s role as protector. Ellen White observed that “Eve was not quite as tall as Adam. Her head reached a little above his shoulders.”

After Eve’s creation Adam fulfilled his role as protector and leader. As God had instructed him at the very beginning not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen 2:16, 17), it would only be natural that Adam in his role as protector would instruct Eve that safety was in obeying God’s command.

The New Testament’s second reason that God chose male leadership comes from the fall and is connected to the transgression order. “Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression” (1 Tim 2:14). The woman, the first to leave her God-appointed sphere and leading the way into transgression, could again be accepted by God by taking her original God-assigned supportive role (1 Tim 2:15).

Ellen White gives further insight into the reason why Eve left her God-ordained sphere. Said she, “Eve had been perfectly happy by her husband’s side in her Eden home; but, like restless modern Eves, she was flattered with the hope of entering a higher sphere than that which God had assigned her. In attempting to rise above her original position, she fell far below it.”
Eve’s experience has been repeated by many others not willing to recognize God’s plan in the distinct role differences between men and women. Tragically, the result of discarding God’s plan will be the same. Mrs. White wrote, “A similar result will be reached by all who are unwilling to take up cheerfully their life duties in accordance with God’s plan. In their efforts to reach positions for which He has not fitted them, many are leaving vacant the place where they might be a blessing. In their desire for a higher sphere, many have sacrificed true womanly dignity and nobility of character, and have left undone the very work that Heaven appointed them.”

The experience of the Fall affirms Adam’s role as leader. After Eve had sinned, he realized his failure as her protector. “He mourned that he had permitted Eve to wander from his side.” Further, God recognized Adam’s leadership responsibilities. Although Eve sinned first, the Creator held Adam accountable. After the couple had eaten of the forbidden fruit, God called Adam, not Eve, to accountability as leader (Gen 3:9-11).

Third, the New Testament shows that Adam, not Eve, was responsible for the entrance of sin and death into the world. “Through one man sin entered the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men” (Rom 5:12). Had Adam remained faithful, God could have created another companion for him. But he lacked “faith in his merciful and benevolent Creator” and he failed to think that God, “who had created Eve to be his companion, could supply her place.” When Adam followed Eve’s pathway into disobedience, the floodgates of suffering and death were opened. The damage was irreversible, bringing the human race under Satan’s dominion.

Qualifications of an Elder or Minister

Having clearly pointed out that it is not God’s plan for women to have the leadership authority of the church, Paul tells us who would qualify for this position: an elder or minister who is responsible to oversee the operations of the church.

In his letters, Paul presents two lists of qualifications for elders or ministers. One list is addressed to Timothy, who is to appoint the leadership in the church of Ephesus, and the other is addressed to Titus, who is to select leaders in the church in Crete. Both lists state that the leadership position of elder or minister is assigned to men, not women. Scripture plainly states that an elder must be a husband of one wife (1 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:6).

Before making any recommendations regarding women’s ordination, the author whose chapter we have been considering should have explained why the New Testament teaching that a man is to occupy the office of an elder is no longer valid. This he did not do, because he felt that the New Testament priesthood of all believers had made role distinctions between men and women irrelevant. The New Testament, however, continues to uphold the role distinctions between men and women in church leadership.

The author is also completely silent about how the New Testament distinguishes between gifts and functions or roles. According to the Bible, some leader-
ship roles in God’s church are gender specific. The New Testament requires that the one who aspires to the office of an elder must first be successful in the leadership of his home before he qualifies to administer the church (1 Tim 3:5; Titus 1:6). The Bible assigns the leadership role in the home church to the husband as priest and head of the home.

Does this mean that women cannot lead out in a church office? Certainly not. A woman with the gift of leadership or administration can be a great blessing in the various departments of the church. However, when it comes to the office of elder or minister whose task it is to oversee and guide the total operation of the church, a woman does not meet the biblical qualifications.

The reason is plain: God’s plan for humanity was that men, not women, were to be the head of the home. Consequently, women were not to develop the kind of leadership experience associated with that role. The woman’s role in the home is to be her husband’s companion and support so that he will be a successful leader and develop the kind of experience that prepares him to lead and serve others, perhaps even in the office of an elder or minister. Her task is not insignificant; it is of vital importance for the stability and happiness of the home and for his success as a leader. Without her dedicated and supportive role, no man would qualify as a church elder or minister.

The qualifications for the office of an elder do not consist simply of administrative and organizational gifts. The Bible requires proven leadership in the home—a miniature church—before one qualifies for a larger sphere of influence in the local church. This means that not just any man should be appointed as elder or minister. Only a man who successfully demonstrates his spiritual leadership over the little flock in the home should be elected to lead a larger flock of believers. Strife and disharmony in the home would disqualify him from functioning as church leader.

Ellen G. White fully affirmed the requirements in 1 Timothy 3 and Titus 1 for elders and ministers. She believed strongly in distinct roles for men and women, as the Bible teaches.

Commenting on the importance of home influences on the church, Ellen G. White said, “Every family is a church, over which the parents preside. . . . When the father and mother as priest and teacher of the family take their position fully on the side of Christ, a good influence will be exerted in the home. . . . No man can bring into the church an influence that he does not exert in his home life and in his business relations.”

The home is the place where men and women learn how to behave in church. Mrs. White points out that “the home is a school where all may learn how they are to act in the church. . . . Let there be peace in the home, and there will be peace in the church. This precious experience brought into the church will be the means of creating a kindly affection one for another. Quarrels will cease. True Christian courtesy will be seen among church members. The world will take knowledge of them that they have been with Jesus and have learned of Him. What an
impression the church would make upon the world if all the members would live Christian lives.”

What are the dynamics that operate in the home church? It is important that the family structure reflect the role models that God has designed for it and not those superimposed by the general practice of society. The priesthood of all believers does not negate the father’s function as priest of his home church. As priest, he conducts the daily morning and evening worships by presenting spiritual sacrifices, laying “upon the altar of God the morning and evening sacrifice, while the wife and children unite in prayer and praise. In such a household Jesus will love to tarry.”

We see the importance of the father’s leadership role highlighted in the name “husband.” Mrs. White wrote, “The meaning of ‘husband’ is house band. All members of the family center in the father. He is the lawmaker, illustrating in his own manly bearing the sterner virtues, energy, integrity, honesty, patience, courage, diligence, and practical usefulness.”

His performance as priest and lawmaker of the home either qualifies or disqualifies him for the office of elder or minister.

Clearly then, the death of Christ at Calvary and the establishment of a New Testament priesthood of all believers did not do away with the distinct roles for which the Lord created men and women. On the contrary, God uses these distinctive roles to His glory in the finishing of the gospel commission. Any departure from His plan brings confusion into God’s work and delays the proclamation of the last message of mercy.

Conclusion

The Scriptures as well as the writings of Ellen G. White reveal that God has given men and women their own roles that are necessary in the proclamation of the gospel. In the New Testament, God brings about a new nation—spiritual Israel—characterized by the priesthood of all believers. The leadership of spiritual Israel is in the hands of Jesus Christ. To assist His people, He has promised to give them special gifts in carrying out the gospel commission. Within this general priesthood He recognizes that men and women are by nature different and He utilizes these differences for the growth and prosperity of His church.

These distinctions become clear in His recognition of the home as a model church. The father of the home is to function as priest of his household, supported by his wife and children. As priest he is to lead out in worships and is responsible for the spiritual tone and for establishing and implementing just laws in the home that help the family government function successfully. This unique experience qualifies him for leadership in the church. In this light we can understand the New Testament requirement that only those who are successful in home leadership are eligible for being set aside as elders or ministers by the laying on of hands.

In my conversation with the author of the chapter we are considering, he mentioned that he limited himself to the subject of the priesthood of all believers and its implications for women’s ordination. He felt that it was the responsibility of others to deal with the specific New Testament requirements for elders and ministers. To
him, from the viewpoint of the priesthood of all believers, there were no obstacles to women’s ordination. This position is understandable in the light of Women in Ministry’s assumption that “church organization is not spelled out in the Bible.”

One can only regret that the author did not see the relevance of addressing the biblical qualifications for elders and ministers. This omission explains why he could quickly move from the discussion of the priesthood of all believers to the subject of women’s ordination without devoting attention to what the Bible teaches regarding the distinct roles the Lord has assigned men and women in the home as well as in the church.

This approach is clearly flawed. The chapter’s recommendations conflict with the New Testament church leadership model. Its assertion that the priesthood of all believers “demands partnership of men and women in all expressions of the ordained ministry” is unsound because it is not based on the whole message of Scripture.

Examining the appropriateness of women’s ordination in light of the whole Bible does indeed require investigating the biblical view of the priesthood of all believers. However, one must then also determine what passages of Scripture are relevant to the subject of women’s ordination. Finally, the researcher needs to put the two together, making a study of these texts in connection with the priesthood of all believers. This involves asking how the priesthood of believers relates to the specific requirements for the office of an elder or minister, the relations between gifts and gender roles, the position of the man as the priest of the home, the consequences of the fall, and the nature of the equality and submission of the woman.

Only after a discussion of these subjects can one draw conclusions whether women’s ordination is biblical or not. If these subjects are beyond the scope of the assignment, one ought to refrain from endorsing the ordination of women until after having seen the results of a complete investigation into all its aspects in the light of the priesthood of all believers.

By not dealing with these issues so relevant to women’s ordination, the chapter under consideration has not provided the evidence that women’s ordination is in harmony with the Bible. No doctrine can be called biblical unless it is studied in the light of the whole testimony of Scripture. The chapter’s findings, therefore, do not meet the criteria for new light which we have outlined at the beginning of this chapter. Consequently, the concept of the priesthood of all believers cannot be used as a sound biblical basis to establish the legitimacy of women’s ordination.
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