

HOW TYPOLOGY AFFECTS CHURCH STRUCTURE
In light of the current discussion regarding the ordination of women

Dr. Alberto R. Treiyer

September, 2012 (www.adventistdistinctivemessages.com)

The way in which Christian churches understand the typology* of Israel's ancient sanctuary services in the new dispensation has led to different church structures. Included in this problem is the current discussion regarding the ordination of women. There is only one correct typology in regards to the old and the new systems of worship. It is this understanding that can free the Christian church from falling into either of two extremes. On the one hand we find the Roman hierarchical structure—one with a visible head named the pope. The other extreme encompasses churches prone to congregationalism (as seen in many Evangelical and Protestant churches today given their tendency to avoid being subject to any head or law).

In order to better understand the problem facing Christianity today regarding church structure and the role of women within that structure, it is going to be helpful to first lay out how certain Christian churches view the typology between the old and the new orders or systems of worship. Properly understanding the correlation between both systems is critical in order to appreciate the unity of both covenants, and avoid falling into dispensationalism as have many Protestants and Evangelicals.

The Roman Catholic Church

Old system of worship	New system of worship
Earthly temple of Israel	Roman Catholic Church (ecclesiastical projection)
The Priesthood of Aaron	The Priesthood of the Roman Catholic Clergy and the intercession of virgins and saints
Animal sacrifices	Sacrifice of the Mass
The Priesthood of all Israelites	The Priesthood of all laymen (see note)

Note: the priesthood of all laymen depends on a priestly hierarchy constituted by the clergy. Christ, as head of the Church according to Scripture (Eph 1:22-23), is replaced by the pope as the visible head of the church. This imposturous earthly intercession essentially takes the place of the heavenly intercession corresponding to the Son of God (see Heb 7:25; 1 Tim 2:5-6). Similarly, the intercession of virgins and saints has a pagan origin.

Protestant and Evangelical Churches

Old system of worship	New system of worship
Earthly temple of Israel	The Church or Christ Himself (ecclesiological or Christological interpretations)
The Priesthood of Aaron	The Priesthood of all believers (see note)
Animal sacrifices	Christ's sacrifice and the spiritual sacrifices of all believers

*Typology: a doctrine of theological types holding that things in Christian belief are prefigured or symbolized by things in the Old Testament

Note: for the majority of Protestants and Evangelicals, the priesthood of all believers, unlike the Roman Catholic Church, is not structured by a priestly hierarchy. Christ in the heavenly temple (the Head of the body that is the Church), if not directly ‘decapitated’ is spiritualized away by failing to correlate the old symbolic ritual with His current intercession in heaven.

With this structure there is a tendency to avoid having to depend on anyone. Everyone can be the head or leader, even women and, in extreme cases, homosexuals and lesbians. The ancient Aaronic appearance inside the earthly temple is now at everyone’s reach, regardless of gender or social condition.

By misplacing or even denying the typology between both orders of worship, many Protestant and Evangelical churches are prone to modern dispensationalism, a movement that denies the link between both covenants—Israel’s and that of the modern Church—and via cultural arguments seeks to justify severing itself from the only covenant acceptable to God.

The virtual or open denial of Christ as head of the Church in His heavenly temple also makes these groups vulnerable to the Catholic Church structure, as it possesses a greater unity that is generally lacking in Protestant groups. By denying Christ’s ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, they open themselves up to one day allow an earthly head to assume all Christian leadership.

The Adventist Church (Biblical perspective)

Old system of worship	New system of worship
Earthly temple	Heavenly temple
The Priesthood of Aaron	The Priesthood of Christ
Animal sacrifices	Single sacrifice of Christ, non-recurring, offered around 2,000 years ago
The Priesthood of the people of Israel	The Priesthood of the church (New Israel)
Spiritual appearance of the Israelites inside the earthly temple	Spiritual appearance of the church inside the heavenly temple

In regards to the priesthood of all believers, the New Testament continues the same social structure seen in the Old Testament that is based upon the family unit, with the man as head and spiritual priest of his home. The leadership of man in his home extends to include his leadership over the clan, tribe, and general public (all of Israel). In the New Testament, man’s leadership as head of his family is also extended to the spiritual leadership of the church in the form of a bishop or elder. In both testaments, God remains the main head.

Man as the head of woman, Christ as the head of man and woman, and God as the head of Christ is clearly described in the New Testament (Eph 5; 1 Cor 11:3). Gender is not optional when it comes to pastoral leadership [a breach to this biblical emphasis occurred during the 1985 General Conference Session in New Orleans, when it was decided to ordain women as elders, without biblical support, and at a time when most delegates were out shopping].

In rejecting the biblical typology of the sanctuary, some Adventists have developed a tendency to follow Protestant and Evangelical structures that predispose them to want to ordain women and then to congregationalism (independence from a central organization) and, finally, may predispose them to reject the headship of Christ. The unfortunate final consequence is that they may someday join others in supporting an earthly head, the antichrist, as the ‘perfect’ replacement of Him whose current heavenly intercession they have rejected.

Multiple Protestant Vulnerabilities

The feminist agenda that seeks equality between man and woman, and denies or weakens the

complementarity of gender, was first introduced into liberal Protestant churches in the 1950s, and then into Evangelical churches that became liberal under the feminist movement of the 1970s and 1980s. Why? Because their understanding of the two covenants *with such a dispensationalist approach makes them more vulnerable to congregationalism and the Charismatic movement.*

Once assumed that we may now do, without regard to gender, what in the old order only Aaron and their sons could do within the temple, the divinely designed social order is easily broken. The outcome is a trend to depend only and directly from God, without taking into account or caring about the role of the church authorities. This causes them to flow easier into *congregationalism*. No wonder that the *Charismatic* movement also began with them, as through presumably divine gifts that are offered (miracles, prodigies, sensation), they can more easily overlook all social and ecclesiastical order.

Of course, we have to go directly to God for guidance. But at the same time, we have to be careful, because God may also answer our request through the appointed authorities that He placed in the church. This is what the apostle Paul had to learn when his prayers in Damascus were answered by a leader of the Christian church (Acts 9:10-19).

The apostle Paul stated that, in relation to salvation, all are equal in being, value, and importance, but not necessarily in ecclesiastical roles. He suffered more than anyone under the racial discrimination created by the Jews towards people of another race, because he was called by God to be an apostle for the Gentiles. For Jews, the divine promises were thought of as being not for others but themselves (Acts 10:34). Once Gentiles were converted, the Jews tended to forget their needs and continued to keep themselves distant from them (Gal 2). This is the reason why the apostle Paul said that “there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for... all are one in Christ Jesus” (Gal 3:28). It is a completely different thing to require equality of gender for church positions from this text. The Bible has always respected the social order that comes from creation, with man as head and leader of his family and the community. This transcends any race and culture.

Conservative Evangelical authors

Let us keep in mind that we are speaking about Protestant trends, about vulnerabilities. Among Evangelicals, there remain today conservative individuals who not only realize that there is no biblical foundation for ordination to pastoral ministry without regard to gender, but also that a denial of that distinction breaks the social model God established in Eden. Those conservative authors also warn about the consequences of breaking that divine social order, with remarkable historical documentation, because the problem began in their midst several decades ago. But for not counting on an adequate theological and typological understanding of the unity of the two covenants, it is harder for them to stop a trend that led them and continues to lead many of them to ordain even homosexuals and lesbians [see especially, Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism. A New Path to Liberalism?* (2006).

The statistics brought by these conservative evangelical authors reveal several things:

1) Pressure to ordain women to pastoral ministry comes from the outside (it is not born in the Seventh-day Adventist Church).

2) Evangelical churches that have ordained women become liberal in their interpretation of the Bible. Even those who remain conservative in some issues pave the way for the coming of a second generation that applies those liberal principles of interpretation to other doctrinal matters.

3) Denominations that ordain women as pastors have continually declined in membership and income. In some cases, those churches become divided and eventually fall apart. Therefore, the subjective argument of “experience” as something apparently good at the beginning, is not corroborated by facts as time goes by. [Although there could be debatable exceptions in some Pentecostal and Charismatic movements].

One question to ask is, would we adopt the veneration of virgins and saints on account of apparently wonderful testimonies of blessings? While it is true that at times God may extend blessings in His mercy, even when things are not done the right way (as in the case of Samson, see Judges 13-16), arguments that are based on experience rather than the Word of God are seldom conclusive. “There is a way that seems right to a man, but in the end it leads to death” (Prov 16:25).

4) The rejection of man's leadership in the church leads to the rejection of the Bible as being authoritative in moral and doctrinal issues.

5) The final step in this trend towards liberalism is the acceptance of homosexuality as being moral, which can and has opened the way for the ordination of homosexuals and lesbians. For both the ordination of women and the ordination of homosexuals, the same kinds of arguments are employed, again by making the text say just the opposite of what it says.

For more information on which churches have ordained women and then moved on to lobby for the moral acceptance and ordination to ministry of homosexuals, see also:

<http://carm.org/denominations-women-ordination-and-other-errors>

The trend to avoid man's leadership leads to a rejection of any kind of authority

Let us insist once more that we cannot speak of only one system of government in Protestantism, or of only one belief in relation to the two covenants. Nonetheless, the trend towards congregationalism (church government without a central organization, without a general head) is for the most part assumed, and comes out of a particular Protestant understanding of the *priesthood of all believers*. That understanding essentially rejects (virtually or openly) the headship of Christ as our High Priest in the heavenly temple, and undermines the need of a church authority on earth.

Under this dislocated typology the divine law found in the ark of the covenant before which Jesus officiates in heaven with the merits of His sacrifice is also neglected. This is because under that view, everything was fulfilled two thousand years ago, when Jesus died at the cross. They do not envision a permanent heavenly intercession that is there to help them overcome on earth, nor do they envision a divine law or investigative court before which they will have to render an account at the end of the world. And if there is no rendering to be done in heaven for what I do because, supposedly, "once saved, always saved," why would I ever have to render an account to the authorities of a church?

This often unconscious trend to avoid a head in Evangelical circles *also has consequences in the constitution of the family unit* designed by God at creation. Man as the priest and head of the home is undermined little by little by the rest of the family. Women are claimed to have the same rights as men, even in the church to lead as heads of the congregation. In my understanding, this problem explains, in part, why the family unit suffered greater divorce rates earlier in Protestant countries compared to Catholic ones (nowadays, however, moral corruption has penetrated all modern societies through secularism, so the greater family stability we could see in Catholic countries in the past may no longer be as readily apparent).

A priesthood of all believers that replaces that of heaven, conceals the desire of not having to live under the heavenly ministerial leadership of the One to whom we will have to give an account for our acts (Heb 4:13; 9:27; 12:22-24; Rev 11:18-19; 22:12). That implicit independence produces an irresponsible Christianity in many Protestant and Evangelical congregations, and causes them to raise churches and churches without a definite course or mission.

Protestant vulnerability to the Catholic hierarchical structure

The expression "priesthood of all believers" is not found in the Bible. Neither did Luther coin it, but rather it was his followers that coined it when they, like Luther, found that the Roman Catholic priesthood was without biblical support. Protestants thus realized that the only priesthood of the church is that of the New Israel, and called it the "priesthood of all believers," in contrast and opposition to the clerical Catholic priesthood within the Roman church. But by not finding the role of the priesthood of Christ in the midst of the church, in the midst of the priesthood of the entire New Israel, they projected an incomplete and distorted typological approach.

In their distorted concept of the priesthood of all believers, Protestants became vulnerable not only to a congregationalist church organization, but also to a Catholic church structure, because both replace the heavenly priesthood of Jesus with an earthly priesthood. They do not realize that the Aaronic priesthood is fulfilled only by the heavenly priesthood of Jesus and, therefore, they essentially replace it with a priesthood of all believers on earth. Thus they detach themselves from the Head of the Church that is Christ and become

unable to follow Him in His heavenly ministry. This then makes them incapable of appreciating all the prophetic and practical implications for the church.

As a matter of fact, many of the arguments used by Protestants and Evangelicals in promoting the ordination of women are the same ones used by Catholics to ordain a counterfeit priesthood in the midst of their church. Egalitarian feminist Evangelicals as well as Catholic theologians admit that in the NT there are no explicit statements against either the ordination of women or the Catholic priesthood, as well as the worship of Mary and the saints. The problem is that Protestants base their arguments on the possibility of a female future pastoral ministry, and Catholics on a future clerical priesthood, simply because in their view the Bible is silent on the matter. Against all evidence they pretend to find Biblical grounds for such a future social or clerical development.

It is no wonder that modern feminism within Protestant circles is leading some to admire the virgin Mary more and more. In Germany, we can see more and more Protestant temples with images of the virgin and other saints. Dr. H. Douglas, in his book *Red Alert: Hurtling Into Eternity* (PPPA), p. 11, brings several samples of Protestant admiration of Mary facilitated by their adoption of a feminist agenda.

As a matter of fact, “the re-emergence of the Virgin Mary is not only an attraction for Roman Catholics. The cover story for *Time*, March 23, 2005, entitled ‘Hail, Mary,’ focused on the extraordinary emphasis on Mary within the Protestant world. Some of these events include the increased emphasis on Feminism and the role of the divine feminine (think Red Tent and The Da Vinci Code) and the remarkable interest within Protestantism in the practices and texts of the Christian church’s first 1500 years that was immersed in Marianism. ‘Ancient-modern’ is the catch phrase.

“For about 300 years, the Protestant world, while clearly emphasizing that the Virgin Mother was indeed the mother of Jesus regarded any further emphasis was sheer “Mariolatry”—the elevation of Mary to a status approaching Christ’s. (Their emphasis was to forestall any attempt to suggest that Jesus was not preexistent, that he was only an ordinary baby.)

However times are changing! For instance, Brian Maguire, pastor of Westminster Presbyterian Church in Xenia, Ohio, made news in 2005 by combining an emphasis on Mary as well as Jesus in his Easter remarks. He joined the day of the Annunciation (when Mary was told by the Angel Gabriel that she would give birth to the Messiah) with his Easter celebration. Maguire called it a ‘beautiful, poetic opportunity.’ After all, he said, Mary was “the first and the last disciple to reach out during his [Christ’s] life.’ But Beverly Gaventa, a professor New Testament literature at Princeton, portrays Mary as the victim of ‘a Protestant conspiracy: theologically, liturgically, and devotionally.’ In other words, Protestants drag her out for a few weeks in December and then pack.”

Protestants feel the need of a head to face secularism in the world

The denial of the priesthood of Christ among Evangelicals leaves them without a priesthood between them and God, something similar to what happened when Old Israel rejected the Aaronic priesthood in their midst. As such, they open themselves up to follow the Roman Catholic counterfeit that counts on an imposturous headship and priesthood. Protestants feel the need of a head to unify them, but instead of accepting Christ and His pontifical direction from heaven, they feel attracted by other earthly heads, especially the Catholic one. For this reason, in recent times, they have been trying to receive Roman Catholic support for their struggles against secularism.

In fact, the World Council of Churches has been changing its structure in order to integrate the Roman Catholic Church into its core (which has mainly represented Protestant Churches). Pat Robertson (Pentecostal: Club 700), said about John Paul II, after visiting him in 1995: “We all greatly admire the Holy Father. All of us want to build bridges with the Catholic Church” (in *Fundamental Baptist New Service*, October 10, 1995). Billy Graham, the great Baptist preacher, interviewed the pope by this time, and said of the pope that “he has been the strong conscience of the entire Christian world” (for testimonies of the evangelical world in admiration of the Catholic Church, see A. R. Treiye, *The Final Crisis in Rev 4 & 5*, chap 5). Through the years some have suggested that we should make use of all the talents God has presumably given each and every church. When it comes to the Roman Catholic Church, they attribute to it the gift of organization.

Let us insist on the fact that, like Catholics, Protestants and Evangelicals correlate the Aaronic priesthood with an earthly Christian priesthood. But instead of the literal sacrifice of the Mass offered by the Catholic priesthood, Evangelicals offer spiritual sacrifices without relating them to a particular priesthood within their churches. The Christian sacrifice was consummated for them in the crucifixion of the Son of God and, therefore, there is not a heavenly temple today where the blood of Jesus is offered on our behalf, in correspondence with what the old priests of Israel did in the earthly temple. In its stead, they spiritualize that sacrifice in the church by having each one offer his own spiritual sacrifice. This is the reason why many Protestant and Evangelical authors, as well as Catholic interpreters, adopt a purely ecclesiological or Christological interpretation of the heavenly sanctuary (See A. R. Treiye, *The Day of Atonement and the Heavenly Sanctuary. From the Pentateuch to Revelation*, chap 7).

Mutual accusations

It is true that Protestants do not have an imposturous visible head like the pope in the Roman Catholic Church. But Catholics blame Protestants for the divisive outcome of their belief in the priesthood of all believers without a central head. They hold against them the multiplication of Christian churches that are permanently dividing themselves into new organizations, because they supposedly lack an ecclesiastical hierarchy. The scandal of a divided Christian world is, in their view, the cause of the current increasing growth of secularism and skepticism [I further develop this point in my book *The Final Crisis in Rev 4 & 5* (chap 5). There I show the contrasts between the Catholic, Protestant, and Adventist typologies of the sanctuary, and the consequences of these differences as seen in the ecclesiastic structure of their respective churches].

Displacement or denial of the covenant in the sacrifice of all believers

In the typological scheme offered often in Protestant milieus we find a problem of understanding the covenant that God made with His people in both dispensations. Is there more than one covenant? This is what dispensationalists believe, for whom, in the extreme case, the Jews would be saved by works, and Christians by faith.

But God has always had only one method of salvation, and that is by faith in the vicarious sacrifice of the Redeemer (Rom 3:28). The Israelites obtained salvation in what became called the “old covenant,” through belief in the promised Redeemer (Rom 4:2-3,20-25). On that basis they offered lambs. That covenant grew old because with the coming of that promised Redeemer, the symbolic animals were no longer offered (Heb 8:6; 9:1). If that “old covenant” is also linked to the infidelity of the people as a whole, it is because they eventually rejected the promised Redeemer, and in that way their covenant as a nation was invalidated (Heb 8: 8-12; cf. Jer 31:31-14). Similarly, the “new covenant” has to do with the sacrifice of the Redeemer, but already come and sacrificed for us (1 Cor 5:7). It has to do with the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world” (John 1:29; Rev 12:11; 14:1, etc).

So how do Evangelicals deny or displace the connection between the two covenants? They do it in many ways. In the subject under consideration, they argue that today we offer “spiritual sacrifices” thanks to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Pentecost. They reason that because the old Israelites did not pass through the experience of Pentecost, they could not offer those spiritual sacrifices as we can today. They instead had to offer material animal sacrifices. But what exactly are those spiritual sacrifices? Are we sure they were not also offered up by the converted Israelites of old?

The physical sacrifice offered up by the sons of Aaron was also physically offered by Jesus as He was both priest and victim (Heb 7:27; 9:11-12,24). Similarly, the spiritual sacrifices offered by the people in the old temple are the same ones we offer today in that spiritual dimension. The difference is that in the old order such spiritual sacrifices were offered as substitute animals that represented the Lamb to be offered in the future. Today, however, we offer up ourselves (our life, our body) by identifying with the sacrifice of the Lamb that already came and offered Himself once for all (Heb 10:10-12).

Once more we see here the dichotomy imposed by many Protestants and Evangelicals regarding the royal priesthood of all Israel in the Old Testament (which according to their argument did not encompass all believers), and the royal priesthood of the entire church in the New Testament (which includes all believers).

a) The spiritual sacrifices of all believers in the New Covenant (1 Peter 2:5)

The etymological origin of the Hebrew term *qohen*, “priest,” has not been clearly defined. It has to do with a spiritual service upon the people that could be performed by both the sons of Aaron and at times other individuals from among the people, like for instance the sons of David (2 Sam 8:8: *qohanim*: “priests” interpreted as “heads [*rosh*] in the side of the king”: 2 Chr 18:17; see also the LXX and the Targum of 2 Sam 8:8). Its more common usage in the Bible is given, however, in connection to someone who offers a sacrifice and mediates between God and men. For such reasons, some French versions render the word *qohen* as “sacrificateur.”

We offer spiritual sacrifices today not because we are priests like the sons of Aaron, but because we offer ourselves in the sacrifice of Christ, in a spiritual dimension, when we share the gospel of the sanctuary to unbelievers. This is what the Israelites also did when they shared the 'gospel in shadows' to the other nations (Heb 4:2). This is true in spite of the fact that many had a problem of faith that led them to harden their heart (see Heb 4:1-2).

The sacrifices that we offer today have the purpose of enabling us to more efficiently perform that priesthood of mediation between God and the world, as we share with the world the message of the gospel (1 Pet 2:9: “that you may proclaim the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light”).

“I have been crucified with Christ. It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me” (Gal 2:20)

“We know that our old self was crucified with him...” (Rom 6:6; see vv. 10-11).

“I appeal to you ..., to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship” (Rom 12:1).

“Walk in love, as Christ loved us and gave himself up for us, a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God” (Eph 5:2).

“Through him then let us continually offer up a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips that acknowledge his name. Do not neglect to do good and to share what you have, for such sacrifices are pleasing to God” (Heb 13:15-16; see Philip 4:18).

“Even if I am to be poured out as a libation upon the sacrificial offering of your faith, I am glad and rejoice with you all” (Phil 2:17).

“I am a minister of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles with the priestly duty of proclaiming the gospel of God, so that the Gentiles might become an offering acceptable to God, sanctified by the Holy Spirit” (Rom 15:16).

b) The spiritual sacrifices of all believers in the Old Covenant (Exod 19:5-6)

The plan of God for His people in ancient Israel was to make them “a kingdom of priests and a holy nation” (Exod 19:6). Israel as a whole was His first born among the nations (Exod 4:22), as He at one point conveyed to the prince of this world (at that time the pharaoh of Egypt). He then established a priesthood within the people, and in their behalf (Num 18). This way they would be able to offer sacrifices that would enable them to fulfill their priesthood or mediation among the nations. In the substitutive sacrifice of the innocent victim that they immolated before the altar of burning sacrifices, all of the Israelites offered themselves up as a living sacrifice to the Lord. Only in this way could they be transformed into priests or mediators between God and the world, to proclaim the good news of salvation.

Unfortunately, the people of Israel ended up concealing under a bushel the light of the gospel that God gave them through the use of symbols and representations, and invalidated the covenant by refusing to obey its provisions (Heb 8:9: “because they did not remain faithful to my covenant, and I turned away from them”). Even so, God continued to promise them a new covenant if they returned to Him, something that as a nation they did not do. Instead, they rejected the Lord and only Guarantor of the foretold covenant, together

with the sacrifice of that New Covenant. This promise, however, is still standing for those who, like us, want to make a covenant with God, as long as we do not harden our hearts today as did our Israelite ancestors (Heb 8:10; see 3:8-13). The Lord promised them: “you shall be called the priests of the LORD; they [the nations] shall speak of you as the ministers of our God” (Isa 61:6-8). Those nations would enjoy the good news that would be proclaimed before them (see Isa 2:3).

God has never accepted anything other than “spiritual sacrifices” in His temple, be it the earthly one of old or the heavenly one. Denying this fact implies denying the link between the two covenants, as well as failing to realize that there is really only one covenant God accepts for salvation. If it is hard for us to grasp this fact in the Levitical laws of old, let us go to the Psalms and to the testimony of the prophets that express how the converted Israelites lived the spiritual experience of offering themselves up via the sacrifices that they brought to the sanctuary.

“Offer right sacrifices, and put your trust in the LORD” (Ps 4:5).

“At his tabernacle will I sacrifice with shouts of joy; I will sing and make music to the LORD” (Ps 27:6).

“For you do not delight in sacrifice, otherwise I would give it; you are not pleased with burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, you will not despise... Then will you delight in right sacrifices, in burnt offerings and whole burnt offerings; then bulls will be offered on your altar” (Ps 51:16-19).

“I will not reprove you for your sacrifices or your burnt offerings, to have been continually before me. I will take no bullock out of thy house, nor he-goats out of thy folds. For every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills... Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving..., and call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver you, and you will glorify me” (Ps 50:8-15).

“With what shall I come to the LORD and bow myself before the God on high? Shall I come to Him with burnt offerings, with yearling calves? Does the LORD take delight in thousands of rams, in ten thousand rivers of oil? ... He has told you, O man, what is good; and what does the LORD require of you. But to do justice, to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God” (Micah 6:6-8).

“Has the LORD as much delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to heed than the fat of rams” (1 Sam 15:22).

The corruption of the spiritual sacrifices

As a whole, the people of Israel unfortunately misinterpreted the divine covenant and eventually forgot the purpose of the sacrifices. But their example of unbelief and hardening of heart (as revealed in their crucifixion of the Son of God) may likewise be repeated in those who, presuming to now live under a new covenant, again proceed to invalidate it (Heb 4:1; 10:26-31).

““These people honor me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me. They worship me in vain; their teachings are but rules taught by men”” (Matt 15:8-9; cf. Isa 29:13).

“He who slaughters an ox is like one who kills a man; he who sacrifices a lamb, like one who breaks a dog’s neck; he who presents a grain offering, like one who offers pig’s blood; he who makes a memorial offering of frankincense, like one who blesses an idol. These have chosen their own ways, and their soul delights in their abominations” (Isa 66:3; compare it with Heb 10:29).

“I hate, I despise your religious feasts; I cannot stand your assemblies. Even though you bring me burnt offerings and grain offerings, I will not accept them. Though you bring choice fellowship offerings, I will have no regard for them. Away with the noise of your songs! I will not listen to the music of your harps...” (Amos 5:21-26).

“The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the LORD, but the prayer of the upright is acceptable to him” (Prov 8:15).

“What are your multiplied sacrifices to Me?” says the LORD. “I have had enough of burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed cattle; and I take no pleasure in the blood of bulls, lambs or goats. When you come to appear before me, who has required of you this trampling of my courts? Bring no more vain offerings;

incense is an abomination to me. New moon and Sabbath and the calling of convocations—I cannot endure iniquity and solemn assembly. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hates; they have become a burden to me; I am weary of bearing them. When you spread out your hands, I will hide my eyes from you; even though you make many prayers, I will not listen; your hands are full of blood” (Isa 1:11-15).

Let us conclude here by stating that the Holy Spirit did not come down only during Pentecost to establish the faith of the Church, causing the apostles to prophesy and speak in tongues. He also came down upon the seventy elders, who prophesied in the name of the Lord at Mount Sinai to help establish the foundation of the faith of the people of Israel (Num 11:16-29). On the other hand, the Holy Spirit's descent upon the apostles during Pentecost (to inaugurate the heavenly sanctuary) was equivalent to the descent of the divine fire upon the earthly sanctuary (to inaugurate it in the time of Moses as well as in the time of Solomon). In all those cases fire came down from heaven (Lev 29:23-24; 2 Chr 7:1-3; Acts 2).

Let us not look for cheap Evangelical dichotomies between the typology of the nation of Israel and the church. Let us not misinterpret the typology of the sanctuary as several Protestants have been doing, and let us be cautious lest we deny the priesthood of Jesus and thus drift away from the Seventh-day Adventist Church and its God-given mission.

Why do some Adventists also become vulnerable?

Some Adventists have also adopted the typological dislocation of the Evangelicals' priesthood of all believers. They seem to believe that they live in the era of the priesthood of all believers, as if this was something new that never existed before, and that grants gender privileges that were not formerly granted (see R. Dederen, *The Priesthood of All Believers*, in Nancy Vyhmeister, ed., *Women in Ministry* (Andrews University, Berrien Springs, 1998). The implicit and explicit argument is that, while all the sons of Aaron were men, now, by supposedly having the same rights of Aaron, all may eventually become pastors, including women. But no one seems to care about defining what "the priesthood of all believers" was and what it is today.

Israel as a first born

Dederen brings into consideration that the Levite priests took the place of the first born who, in his view, would have formerly represented the priesthood of all believers (Exod 13:1-2, 13; Num 3:5-13, 12-13, 45; 8:14-19). He then suggests that the priesthood of all believers represented by the first born of Israel is recovered in the New Testament. He says, literally: “In the background, however, the vision of the priest-people remained, waiting to become the ‘priesthood of all believers’ under the one New Testament High Priest, the Lord Jesus Christ.” Unfortunately, Dederen seems not to realize that in this case we can affirm that the original priesthood of all Israel was represented by first born men, and therefore that the priesthood of the New Israel would likewise be performed only by men.

We have to be more careful with these associations. God considered all of Israel as His first born son among the nations (Exod 4:22). This meant that the other nations could be converted and also become sons of God (see Isa 2:2-4; 19:19-25). But only the nation of Israel was the first born, that is, the principal nation of the world before God, through which the blessings promised to Abraham for all the nations would be fulfilled (Gen 12:1-3). Therefore, the blessings of the primogeniture would come only through the mediation of Israel. Later on, David would be called by God His Son (Ps 2), His first born son among the kings of the earth, personifying all Israel before the nations (Ps 89:27).

This truth is repeated with other words a little later in Exod 19:5-6. God made a covenant with Israel as a nation, and they became a kingdom of priests to mediate between God and the world. All the Israelites were expected to be priests before the nations. However, the mediation in the temple “in the midst of the Israelites,” between God and His people, was not granted to the first born sons of the tribes of Israel. That mediation was only granted to the tribe of Levi. Nevertheless, the first born sons of the tribes of Israel continued being first born sons, that is, “heads,” “leaders,” and “princes” among their people, even if they did not officiate within the temple.

Something similar happens with the New Israel that received the same call of becoming a holy nation, a kingdom of priests out of the nations of the earth (1 Pet 2:5,9; Rev 1:5-6). Like David, Jesus is the first born Son of God (Heb 1:6; see Hos 11:1; Matt 2:15), the head of the church that is His body (1 Cor 12:12-14; Eph 5:23; Col 1:18-24, etc). Likewise, only Jesus is the High Priest among this New Israel, previously represented by the sons of Aaron in the Old Israelite priesthood. Thus, we are all “the church of the firstborn whose names are written in heaven,” and “Jesus is the mediator of the new covenant” within His people in the heavenly temple (Heb 12:23-24).

OLD ISRAEL	NEW ISRAEL
Israel and David as God’s first born son	Christ as God’s first born son and the church as body of Christ
Represented by the first born sons of Israel (“heads,” “elders,” “princes,” and kings)	Represented by the “heads” of homes and “elders” or “bishops” of the church
Israel as God’s priestly kingdom	Church as God’s priestly kingdom

Current confusion

The recent (mid-2012) votes of most Unions of the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church have respected the position formerly taken by the General Conference against the ordination of women to pastoral ministry. Nevertheless, several of these Unions are still promoting and expecting the ordination of women at some point in the future, all on the basis of the New Testament's "priesthood of all believers." No doubt that this argument is borrowed from the article of Dr. Raoul Dederen. The implicit argument is that, in the old covenant, only some people could become priests, but now the priesthood belongs to us all.

Did women in ancient Israel form part of the Israelite priesthood? The Bible is clear. Israel as a whole formed part of a kingdom of priests (Exod 19:5-6). But did this fact qualify women to be heads of their families, and princes and pastors of their community, like the first born sons of Israel? No it did not. Then on what basis could women in the priesthood of all believers become pastors? From a biblical perspective, there is no basis for that. Only by adopting a dispensationalist model that is Protestant, not biblical, may ordination to ministry without regard to gender be claimed.

Is ordination a requisite for the outpouring of the Spirit?

Some Adventist preachers, among them Dr. Dwight Nelson (the pastor of Andrews University who on January 21, 2012 preached at the Pioneer Memorial Church on this topic), have even suggested that God will not pour out His Spirit before the church acknowledges the presumed right that women should be ordained to pastoral ministry. This begs the following question, were women ordained to ministry before the outpouring of the Spirit of God at Pentecost? Also, will this outpouring of the Spirit at the end of time only be granted to ordained pastors? Should women wait to be ordained to the evangelical priesthood in order to receive the Holy Spirit? According to Scripture, even children and young people will receive the Spirit in the latter times (Joel 2:28-32; Acts 2:14-21). Should children or young boys then be ordained for that reason? Of course not!

Did E. G. White have to wait to be ordained to pastoral ministry in order to be called to the prophetic ministry? Did the church ordain her to pastoral ministry because she was called directly by God to be His messenger to the remnant? She never baptized or married people. She was never president of a Conference, or of a Union, or of the General Conference. She never sought such a pastoral administrative position, because God did not call her for that. Furthermore, she stated that we do not have to wait to be ordained in order to share the gospel.

“Do you think that it is those men only who have been ordained as gospel ministers that are to work for the uplifting of humanity?—No, no! Every one who names the name of Christ is expected by God to engage in this work. The hands of ordination may not have been laid upon you, but you are none the less God's messengers” (RH Nov. 24, 1904).

The gift of prophecy and the outpouring of the Spirit do not necessarily qualify a person for pastoral ministry. This is because the Spirit distributes the gifts “as He wills,” and He does not call all for the same position (1 Cor 12:27-30). The same Spirit who inspired the Bible left clear directions regarding the configuration of ecclesiastical leadership in both dispensations.

Does everyone have to be a pastor in order to participate in the priesthood of the New Israel?

The dislocated or misinterpreted typology under consideration was the basis of a recent sermon preached by Dr. Randy Roberts, senior pastor of the University of Loma Linda (March 17, 2012). Its ironic title was “The priesthood of *some* believers.” Let us answer that our church believes, as did the early church, in the priesthood of the whole of Israel, and that this has nothing to do with the ordination of women to pastoral ministry. Just as the priestly ministry of Christ is better understood in light of the ritual that represented it, so also is the priesthood of the New Israel better understood in light of the priesthood that the entire people of ancient Israel represented.

A path towards disunity and loss of mission

Underlying these new arguments we may see not only a dispensationalism that arbitrarily breaks the correlation between the two covenants as only one that God accepts, but also a kind of cultural dispensationalism. That cultural dispensationalism (debatable even on a cultural basis), requires changes that are not in line with the Bible, but rather seek to align themselves with the surrounding societies and cultures. Once this step is taken, the following one becomes easier. All church structure is laid aside, as is all leadership, as was already seen in the discussions recently raised in the North American Division regarding the ordination of women and/or their aptitude to lead churches, conferences, unions, and divisions.

The problem is that if a Union decides to go its own way and completely disregard the decisions of the entire church body (as represented by the General Conference, for example), what moral authority will that Union have to stop a Conference from doing the same thing? In addition, who will be able to prevent a local church from voting on other policies such as refusing to send tithes to that particular Conference? What about those churches that want their homosexuals to lead out in church?

Let us share just one example from the evangelical world to point out what could very well occur in our church if we proceed to follow other churches in ordaining women. “The American Baptist Churches of the Pacific Southwest voted unanimously to withdraw from the ABCUSA. This action removed some 300 churches in Southern California, Arizona, northern Nevada, and Hawaii... The American Baptist Evangelicals renewal group, reportedly representing some 500 churches, recently announced that there is no hope left for Bible-based renewal of the ABCUSA; leaders disbanded it...” “Other regions are considering withdrawing as well, and it appears the denomination may soon be only a shell of its former self. The end of the slippery slope is the destruction of a denomination” (W. Grudem, 244).

I believe there is no reason to speculate who is behind all of this in our church. It has to do with someone who tried to destabilize the divine government in heaven, and pretended that God was the one who caused all the mess, until he was expelled from there. The same division he sought to create above, he seeks to do here below today. He wants emancipation, not subjection to God's leadership and to His law.

The outcome of failing to preach our distinctive messages

Few perhaps grasp the theological root of that evil, besides the evident pride and loss of church mission seen with such behavior. These discussions and behavior are the result of failing to preach our distinctive messages, especially the gospel of the sanctuary in its true typological correspondence. I admire in this

context the current president of the General Conference of our church, because he grasps, in a practical dimension, that the church may be disbanded by theological approaches like this that are strange to the Adventist movement, and which lead to the evangelical congregationalism or to the admiration of the imposturous administration of the Roman Catholic Church. No doubt that we are entering the predicted “omega” of apostasy.

I believe that our president needs our prayers more than ever before. There is power in prayer. “The prayer of a righteous man is powerful and effective” (James 5:16). It is also the duty of every leader of the church to raise the hands of our president as Aaron and Hur did with Moses, lest we end up collapsing altogether (Exod 17:12).

It will be fitting at this time to open our eyes, and realize like E. G. White at the beginning of our organization, that Evangelicalism and Protestantism have been trying to interpose more and more antithesis between the shadows of the OT and the realities of the NT, so as to avoid ending up in the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

“Many and earnest were the efforts made to overthrow their faith. None could fail to see that if the earthly sanctuary was a figure or pattern of the heavenly, the law deposited in the ark on earth was an exact transcript of the law in the ark in heaven; and that an acceptance of the truth concerning the heavenly sanctuary involved an acknowledgment of the claims of God’s law and the obligation of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. Here was the secret of the bitter and determined opposition to the harmonious exposition of the Scriptures that revealed the ministration of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary” (GC 435).

Importance of the Adventist typological approach in its ecclesiological projection

Our understanding of the priesthood of Jesus in heaven, in correspondence with the old Aaronic priesthood which represented it, allows us to see that there are two basic moments and places in the heavenly priesthood. The first moment was given in the year 31, when Jesus started to officiate in the holy place of the heavenly temple. We call this the “continual intercession,” because it is correlated to the office *tamid* (“continuous”) which was performed in the holy place by the old Aaronic priesthood. The second moment started in 1844 and has to do with the “final intercession” of Christ in “the time of the end” (Dan 8:14,17,19), before the ark of the covenant in the most holy place, where the original divine law is found (Rev 11:18-19).

In contraposition to this message that projects the heavenly intercession to two moments and two definite places in the heavenly temple, Protestants and Evangelicals interpose a priestly antithesis between the Aaronic priesthood and that of Christ. How? By denying the priesthood of Christ in His heavenly temple and relating the Aaronic priesthood to that of the entire church. In doing so they assume that the Israelites could not appear in the most holy place of the earthly temple, a right we now supposedly have in our “priesthood of all believers” since Jesus went to heaven (see Heb 4:14-16; 10:19-22).

This is a mistake. The presumable dichotomy that many Protestants try to impose on the Aaronic priesthood’s literal, corporeal, and material appearance into the most holy place in ancient Israel, and the supposed direct appearance of the church in the most holy place in the Christian dispensation (from the very beginning in the year 31), breaks the biblical typological scheme in several ways. The problem lies in failing to recognize that there are two kinds of appearances, a spiritual one and a material one. Since Protestants do not appropriately tie the two ministries together, they end up restricting the intercession of Christ to His earthly ministry of two thousand years ago, or simply are unable to appreciate the different moments of the heavenly intercession. In their view, Christ’s priestly ministry should have been consummated by His vicarious death. As a result, they do not grasp the reality and importance of His current heavenly priesthood, by virtue of that past sacrifice.

An important point to highlight is that the ancient Israelites also appeared spiritually in the most holy place of the earthly temple (Ps 27:4-6; 31:19-22). This is expressed often in the ritual laws under the term *lipene’ Yahvé*, “in the presence of [face or before] the Lord.” [I develop this point extensively in my books on the services of the sanctuary in both dispensations]. However, this does not imply that we can now physically enter the inner rooms of the heavenly temple. The physical entrance of the old high priest into the most holy place on the Day of Atonement is fulfilled today only by the Son of God, our High Priest (Heb

8:1-2). Furthermore, His physical entrance into the heavenly temple in the year 31 is seen by the apostle Paul as one of a forerunner (Heb 6:19-20), implying that our spiritual entrance now (Heb 10:19; Eph 2:5-6,18) is to be followed by a future physical entrance at His second coming (Heb 9:27-28; Rev 7:14-15).

For practical ecclesiastical purposes, the denial of a heavenly sanctuary and ministry leads many to believe that we are supposedly free from the law that is in the ark of heaven, and thus that we are not accountable to anyone in heaven or on earth, because everything was consummated on the cross. There is the notion that there is no customs office in heaven through which those who have received their passport to the heavenly kingdom will have to pass, with the purpose of verifying their aptness to live in the country of the saints (Rom 14:10; 2 Cor 5:10). Therefore, many mistakenly believe there is no future investigative judgment or priestly intercession or law in heaven.

When the investigative judgment is denied, several questions arise. Does the Lord deserve to be acknowledged and praised in heaven for His vicarious sacrifice and redemption? (Rev 5:8-10). Do we have to deprive Him of the joy and privilege of offering His blood before His Father and the angels of heaven in our favor, in order to bring out the value of His vicarious death on earth? (Heb 7:25; 9:12). Do we deserve to one day be acknowledged above as being righteous for the merits of our Savior, in the midst of a world that condemned our faithfulness to the Lord? (Rev 6:9-11; 12:11).

The Catholic church's accusation that Protestants have supposedly introduced chaos into Christianity cannot be used against Seventh-day Adventists, because we accept the biblical model of Christ as fulfilling the Aaronic priesthood of the new temple. In principle, everyone in the Protestant world agrees that Christ is the head of the church. But because we as Seventh-day Adventists follow Him where He really is today (in the Most Holy Place before the ark that contains the divine law), we accept Him as a transcendent head (not purely and simply as an existential head). This gives us specific guidance from heaven, and offers us a definite prophetic trajectory. In contrast, the spiritualized and existential typological dislocation of Protestantism can and has opened the door to all sorts of charismatic movements that lead to avoiding or rejecting any kind of headship.

When we acknowledge that we do not now have the same position or authority of Aaron the high priest, it is easier for us to subject ourselves to the heavenly priesthood of Christ as occupying the place of that ancient earthly priesthood. This will help us realize that the priesthood of Aaron is not now the priesthood of all believers. Unlike the Aaronic priesthood, the priesthood of all Israel has always implied a priesthood without castes (i.e.: it does not belong to a particular tribe, people, or gender), and has always consisted of representing God before the nations. However, the new projection of this priesthood does not imply an elimination of the social structure that centered around the leadership of man in both the family and the community. As the priesthood of all Israel was under the headship of the earthly temple centered around the Aaronic priesthood, so today is it under the headship of the heavenly temple that is centered around the priesthood of Christ.

As Seventh-day Adventists we know where we stand, and believe that Jesus Himself raised us to proclaim the final message to the world that requires a correct understanding of the typology of the sanctuary. That message consists of warning the world about the heavenly judgment that is now taking place, and is to conclude just before the coming of the Lord. This is how our church can avoid falling under the leadership of a counterfeit head like that of the Roman papacy, and how it can continue to maintain the unity that Protestantism lacks. It is Jesus Himself who spoke to us and continues speaking to us from the court of heaven in the Most Holy Place, as He continues the final intercession for mankind. Even today His voice continues to speak to us through the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy (Rev 12:17; see 19:10). Through these written words He has requested that we organize ourselves with a structure that can reach the entire world, in spite of any defects that can affect any social human structure.

Our church has thus far maintained incredible unity in love. In fact, we are admired by other religious organizations for having a united world mission that, aside from the Roman Catholic Church, no other church can claim. The problem is that such a church structure can become fragile if dislocated typological patterns are introduced into it, together with the typical destabilizing and corrupting principles of modern society. Why would we ever want to bring the restlessness and uneasiness of those who have lost the course into our midst? The issue of women's ordination has nothing to do with our prophetic mission.

The priesthood of all believers, incorrectly understood as now granting everyone the authority that

previously belonged exclusively to the Aaronic priesthood, is the foundation of modern congregationalism which Korah, Dathan, and Abiram tried to introduce in ancient Israel (Num 16). It is also the foundation of the modern Charismatic movement which does not recognize any earthly authority, and claims to be exclusively under God (supposedly, because via false miracles and prodigious events they expose themselves to the deceptions of he who sought to occupy God's place in heaven: 2 Thess 2:8-11; Rev 13:13; 16:16). To do so they have to deny that a priesthood of all believers also existed in ancient Israel, and that it is projected to the New Testament with the same social structure that centers around man as head of the family and the Christian community.

Recovering the true typological correlation of the sanctuary

Recovering the true typology of the sanctuary can save the Seventh-day Adventist Church from several administrative church dilemmas that plague other churches. By reestablishing the typological correlation between the Aaronic priesthood and that of Christ, and between the earthly temple and that of heaven, the connection between the priesthood of all Israel in the old and new dispensations becomes clear—man remains as head of the family and leader of the community, and Christ remains as the “supreme head of the church” (Eph 1:22).

Man's leadership does not deprive women of accomplishing the role assigned to them by God. Witnessing, intercessory prayer, care of the sick, dedication to the upbringing of family and to the church, as well as countless other branches of service that are needing help, is this not a marvelous thing in their service to God? (1 Tim 5:10). The priesthood of the whole church, as was the case in ancient Israel, continues to include both men and women as mediators between God and the world, seeking to share the gospel of the sanctuary that today is being fulfilled in heaven with Jesus as head of the church.

Unfortunately, many churches have stopped preaching about the ministry of Christ in heaven, and thus fail to realize how they have slowly begun to adopt theological models from the apostate Christian world that are destined to break the church structure God gave us. Bringing back the correct typological correspondence between the two dispensations can deliver us from this chaos.

Let us highlight another point here. The fact that the Aaronic priesthood is fulfilled only in the priesthood of Jesus does not mean that that old priesthood cannot be an example for us, in many ways, when it comes to our New Israel priesthood. In fact, the Aaronic priesthood was not free from the patriarchal structure which was based on the family unit, with the father as head of the home and spiritual leader of the community. Consequently, it is legitimate to use that divine institution to emphasize that God called only men to be such spiritual leaders of His people.

Social and ecclesiastical structure of the New Israel according to the Bible

Discussing all the gifts and ministries mentioned in the Bible in detail would be impossible in this paper. However, let us point out that the nomination of elders, pastors, and bishops does not come from the Levitical priesthood, nor does it come from a presumable higher culture. Rather, it comes from the social structure designed by God at creation itself. In that social fabric Adam was made the head of Eve and of his family.

In the early church, not everyone was appointed to be the pastor, bishop, elder, or deacon. Nevertheless, everyone was a priest in a spiritual dimension. Another key element is that the divine call to be a prophet did not necessarily imply that that person could then become a pastor or prince of the nation or of the church. Prophets were called from among all levels of the people of God, without the implication that because they were chosen for a message they would become heads or leaders of others. They were simply the Lord's messengers, and felt no need to seek out other positions. Besides the many biblical testimonies we can refer to, there is the most recent testimony of E. G. White that we will mention at the end of this paper.

Equality? Complementarity? Opposition or aversion?

While modern feminism seeks for equality between men and women, the Bible brings out the

complementarity of the sexes. God made our first parents different. Woman was made the “suitable help” of man (Gen 2:18), and God determined that man would be her head. He was called ‘*ish*, “man”, and she ‘*isha*, “wo-man” (Gen 2:23). Their relationship was designed to please each of them. But after the introduction of sin and selfishness, this social design was stained. In spite of the pain that submission to the other would now cause this couple, this social structure had to be maintained by the grace of God (Gen 3:16). In coming to this world to die, the Son of God gave us an example of submission by following the plan designed by His Father, in spite of the suffering he would endure by taking on our human nature (Heb 2:10; 5:8-9).

God also required that a man and a woman dress differently. “A woman must not wear men’s clothing, nor a man wear women’s clothing, for the Lord your God detests anyone who does this” (Deut 22:5). Again, the differentiation of sex is not a cultural matter; it is constitutional to the way God made us. In the days of the apostle Paul, the symbol of authority of a man over a woman was symbolized by the woman’s head covering (1 Cor 11:10). In those days, wearing a covering on the head was a sign of womanhood while an uncovered head was a sign of manhood (1 Cor 11:4-5). In more recent times, that symbol of authority of a man over a woman came to be symbolized by the use of pants in men. Another demarcation between a man and a woman, until recent times, was hairstyle - long hair was for the woman, and a beard for the man.

No matter what symbol of manly authority is chosen for different times and regions, a distinct differentiation of the sexes is to be maintained. God made man head of his wife. Though in different times the symbol of manly authority could change, it is clear that in certain contexts of confrontation not dealing with matters of conscience, a woman was not to impose upon the family unit or the church an authority or dominion that was above that of man (1 Tim 2:11-14). This is a well established principle in the New Testament (Eph 5:22-24,33; Col 3:18; Tit 2:4-5; 1 Tim 2:9-12; 1 Pet 3:1-6).

As they have been a major source of controversy for some, let us pause for a moment to explain the texts of 1 Tim 2:11-14 and 1 Cor 14:34-35. In these texts, the apostle Paul does not deny women the right to testify or teach in the church. To do so would contradict what he said in 1 Cor 11:4-5, where he states that both men and women pray and prophesy (see also Joel 2:28; Acts 2:17). What the apostle rejects is teaching by a woman that refused to wear a head covering, because this could be misinterpreted in his days and would go against the divine command of having a man and a woman dress differently. In the words of the apostle, prophesying implied speaking “for edification and exhortation and consolation,” something that every woman can and should do (1 Cor 14:3).

The biblical statement that women should not prophesy is always placed in the context of exerting dominion over men and over the leaders of the church. Something similar we find in the second commandment. God requires that we do not make for ourselves images of what is in heaven, on earth, or under earth (Exod 20:4). This does not imply that we cannot take pictures of beloved members of our family or friends. The context shows that it has to do with images raised with the purpose of bowing down before them, to worship or venerate them (v. 5).

The same thing can occur with women when they prophesy or teach with dominion over men. Thus the Lord commanded its avoidance not only for the church of Corinth, but also as a principle for all the churches (1 Cor 14:33-34). Paul also cautions widows against the habit of gossip and of being idle, “busybodies, saying things they ought not to” (1 Tim 5:12-13). The term “prophesying” was used by Paul as “teaching,” and did not implicate those who would be directly called by God to speak a prophetic message.

In addition, we find in 1 Cor 14 a certain confusion within the church that required the intervention of men to put things in order (as is usually the case when significant problems arise). This is one of the reasons why women are not suited for that kind of ministry. There are always frequent problems within churches that require someone to wear the pants or show who is the boss. Even in a family, especially when boys become adolescents and mothers cannot do anything, it is sometimes necessary for the father to intervene as head of the household.

In the case of 1 Cor 15, we find discussions involving some proceeding principles such as preventing everyone from speaking at the same time, choosing the appropriate language to speak in, requesting that women abstain from participating in these conversations and instead save it for discussion at home (v. 27, 29, etc). There were confrontations and debates in meetings that dealt with church matters probably similar to those leading up to the Jerusalem church meeting in Acts 15.

Regardless of the background problem, the issue for Paul was that usurping man's authority in church would lead to confusion in certain situations when, by nature, a woman would be more prone to allow her feelings to take control and like Eve in Eden be deceived when separated from Adam, her head (1 Tim 2:9-15). In speaking of woman's submission to the headship of man, it is important to realize that Paul is not basing his argument on cultural grounds, but rather on the history of creation. This is not something that may please egalitarian feminists, but it has to do with facts. God made us different, and requires us to complement each other according to our own nature.

[Concerning the prophetic ministry of E. G. White, it is interesting to point out that God first called a man, called Hazen Foss. But when he rejected the call for his own perdition, God decided to call "the weakest of the weak." In special occasions, God may even speak through a donkey (Num 22:28-30). Would you ordain a donkey to pastoral ministry?

We have to take into account that E. G. White was called by God to speak directly from Him. In any case, when she went to church meetings, her husband would speak to the audience before her, and then introduced his wife to the assembly. After his death, she was usually accompanied by her son.

She never officiated in baptism or in marriage ceremonies. She never tried to usurp the leadership of the church, or coveted or required an administrative position, thought she defended her call as God's messenger. She submitted to their directives even when the leaders in Battle Creek asked her to go to Australia, against her will. She gave her testimony directly from God, and left the matters with God and those who received her testimony. Even in her marriage, she never tried to occupy the place of her husband as the head of his home. See her own testimony towards the end of this paper].

As we read the Bible, we see God calling Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (not Sarah, Rebecca, Rachel or Lea), to be the fathers of all believers, the patriarchs of the people of God (Gen 12:1-3; Rom 4:11). Patriarchs were the "firstborn," in reference to the first male born in the house. In this social structure established by God, man is the priest and head of the family, of the clan, and of the tribe. In a wider dimension, we may also see the tribes united under the king or pastor of Israel (Num 17; Eze 34).

We live in a sick culture

Unfortunately, we have no choice but to live in a time where everything seems to be upside down. People no longer love sweet or salty things, they instead want something in between. Men prefer to wear long hair like women, and women like wearing pants like men (note: I am not saying that these two characteristics must necessarily be a distinguishing factor between men and women. I am simply giving an example of the trend towards transforming the social structure designed in the creation of this world into something more vague, confusing, and indeterminate).

Why? Our current social scene is typical of a time where no one wants to be tied down to anything or anyone else. Modern art dislikes symmetric forms. Dissonance abounds in music, like the noise of nails on a chalkboard. In sexual matters, transsexuality is brought out more and more. No one seems satisfied with the way God made them, which leads to coveting someone else's position or condition. Women want to be men, and men women. Instead of happily fulfilling the purpose of our creation, everyone goes for more, even for occupying the place of God (to be his own god). Who can deny that God's creation is headed towards its final decline?

Feminism and machismo are two symptoms of the degradation of our species. They are the two extremes that lead to breaking that which God united. Instead of seeking ways to complement each other, many are wanting to impose equality, which results in an *opposition* or *repulsion* of sexes.

From a negative perspective, we may also perceive a natural difference between men and women. Social facts cannot deny the different nature we have. Polygamy belongs to men (it is unheard of for a woman to have lived with several men depending on her: see Mark 12:20-23). Abusive behavior also is from man towards his wife about 95%. Statistics from Mexico have revealed that more than 1,000 women are murdered by their husbands every year. The opposite seems irrelevant. Also, only men go to war (with some few exceptions today), and the greatest billionaires in the world are men (all within the same free competitive market where no one can arbitrarily determine who will be the next billionaire).

Will we men accuse God for discriminating against us because He made us unable to give birth? Since the garden of Eden, woman has been a part of man because she was taken from him. Therefore she belongs to him, and “they become one flesh” (Gen 2:22-24).

Some liberal theologians today are blaming Peter and the other apostles for presumably denigrating Mary. They have elaborated quite a conspiracy theory that claims the apostles invented the story of Mary as a prostitute. They have based their theories on an apocryphal writing and deduce that Mary would have been appointed an apostle of Christ had it not been for the other apostles and their presumed discomfort with this. These theologians are “liberal” because they don’t believe in the divine inspiration of the gospels and of the epistles of the New Testament. Their conspiracy theories reflect a modern problem that has nothing to do with the time of the apostles. In this way they distort the gospel.

Our culture criticized by Jesus and the apostles

Whenever we compare and contrast cultures, we often focus on the negative aspects of the previous culture, in order to highlight what seems to be better in our modern society. For instance, we cannot deny the fact that the human rights principles adopted by modern societies have brought with them a much better quality of life compared to the Middle Ages. However, when we consider the divine law and its application to biblical times, many are too quick to undervalue those old cultures and thus are prone to misinterpret divine principles. This is often the case when certain abusive behaviors depicted in the Bible are strongly emphasized. But in doing so many forget to notice the fact that the Bible condemns those old abuses, and at the same time conveys an advanced criticism of our modern society.

Let us not hurry to boast about our corrupted and skeptical culture, because we will not be able to go too far with it (Isa 24:1; 2 Tim 3:1, etc). God’s men have always been in clear conflict with the culture of their days. The command of God is: “Do not conform to the pattern of this world” (Rom 12:2). But many Christians are today becoming less and less critical of our culture, and more and more critical of the clear testimony of the Word of God.

In Gen 18 (see 2 Pe 2:7-9), we see that the corrupt culture of Sodom and Gomorrah was destroyed. Again and again we find other societies assuming the same kind of culture that was likewise condemned (Isa 1:10; 3:9, Jer 23:14; Zeph 2:9). Jesus and the apostles also branded certain cities of their days with the names of Sodom and Gomorrah (Matt 10:1-15; 11:20-24; Luke 1:1-12). Instead of eulogizing our modern culture, they compared it in advance to the culture of those haughty cities of the plain that God destroyed (Luke 17:18-20; 2 Pe 2:4-10; Jud 7). The same thing happened with the antediluvian social culture that was destroyed by God (Gen 6). Jesus and the apostles did not positively portray that ancient culture, and projected it likewise to our modern culture (Matt 24:38-39, etc).

Today's mad society breaks the biblical model designed by God, in which there is submission of the woman and the sons to the husband and father, of the members of a congregation to their elders and leaders established by God to represent His divine authority in the church, and of men in general to their head that is Christ. The problem is that no one wants to be tied to anyone else, much less under pain and suffering. In this way many are rejecting the Son of God who gave us an example of submission by submitting to the will of His Father even under severe suffering, in order to save us all. We live in a corrupt and ungovernable culture comparable to the disastrous picture of the antediluvian world, especially when it comes to marriage, and this fact is what Jesus warned us would be a symbol of the last days.

I urge you to pray that Satan does not succeed in introducing into our church a structure at odds with what God determined for our human societies, because we may not see the consequences until it is too late. The current plea put forth that women no longer be discriminated against for pastoral headship is, in some ways, similar to the claim made by Korah, Dathan and Abiram who also felt discriminated by Moses and Aaron. Where did that complaint of a presumed discrimination end up? We all know the story (see Num 16).

Therapies of liberation and insubordination versus therapies of subjection and subordination?

Mental health professionals know that as the stresses of life become more and more intense, the psychological health of the public suffers. For this reason, many of them offer therapies of liberation.

However, because many of them lack the gospel, most of the time their attempts to help their clients find a way out of a crisis is temporary, if not unattainable. The good news is that the spiritual therapies of the gospels are different. The peace of Jesus is not external like that of the world (John 14:27), as stated by a text that portrays the spirit of unbelievers: “let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die” (1 Cor 15:31-32).

The liberation offered by the Bible leads to freedom from sin, remorse, and anguish (John 8:32-36; Rom 6:14; 2 Cor 3:17; Rev 1:5-6). It does not have to do with a liberation from social, communal, familiar, or conjugal responsibilities. On the contrary, it has to do with an inner liberation that allows one to exert self-control and bear the burdens of life (Matt 11:28-30). Instead of promoting an irresponsible escapism or insubordination to duty, the true spiritual therapy of subjection offered by the Bible helps us prevail in the midst of the battles of life. It helps us avoid falling apart and succumbing, and instead gives us the tools to keep ourselves stable no matter what the circumstance.

The problem of the world today is its inability to distinguish between a therapy of liberation from sin and another one of presumable liberation from responsibilities. Women do not seem to want to accept the divine design that made them depend on man and their families (see 1 Pet 3:6: women “were submissive to their husband, like Sarah, who obeyed Abraham and called him her master”). It is unfortunate that many women are no longer wanting to happily and faithfully fulfill their divinely designed social roles. This is why feminism tends to reject the notion of any “head” or means of subjection, including the divine one revealed in God’s word and projected to our modern society. When such criteria that are foreign to the gospel are used, the result is usually one of chaos as has been the case in many modern societies.

There is much to say about this topic. We only mention this here to highlight how certain points are often neglected when considering the liberation of women. There is one true liberation that all of us can and must have for our mental health, one that will enable us to bear even the most disagreeable burdens of life: we are to be subjects in the spirit of the gospel (for more about the old and new biblical liberations, see A. R. Treiyer, *Jubilee and Globalization. The hidden intention*).

Religious and social leadership in ancient Israel

Since the apostle Paul spoke of men as “heads,” “elders,” “pastors,” and “bishops,” we will now have to consider the biblical background of that representation. In using these words, he borrowed from the similar terminology seen in the OT in connection with the leadership of the people. Thus, *rosh* (head), is employed in the OT in relation to *tsaqen* (elder), *nashi’* (chief), *sar* (prince), *qasir* (ruler), and even with *qohen* (priest).

In this scenario, God is the principal head or head per excellence over His people. He is also seen as an “Elder of days [years]” (Dan 7), who presides upon a court of elders to judge His people. The judges of Israel were elders that seconded the work of the king (Ps 122:4-5; 1 Kgs 12:6-8; Rev 4-5). On the other hand, the priests and heads of their homes and tribes were heads under their Head (see 2 Chr 13:12: “He [God] is our *rosh*, Head”). This social and ecclesiastical leadership of ancient Israel is applied by the apostles Peter and Paul to the leadership of the church, which counts on “elders” and “shepherds” of the flock, all of them under the chief pastor or head of the church, Jesus Christ (1 Pe 5:2-4; Eph 1:22).

Let us now quote a couple of texts from among the many examples of this seen in Scripture.

Head of a family, clan, tribe, or kingdom

“These are the heads [*rosh*] of their fathers’ households. The sons of Reuben, Israel’s firstborn: Hanoch and Pallu, Hezron and Carmi; these are the families of Reuben” (Exod 6:14)

“Then the leaders [*nasi’*] of Israel, the heads [*rosh*] of their fathers’ households, made an offering. They were the leaders of the tribes; they were the ones who were over the numbered men” (Num 7:2).

“One chief [*nasi’*] for each father’s household from each of the tribes of Israel; and each one of them was the head [*rosh*] of his father’s household among the thousands of Israel” (Jos 22:14; see 1 Chro 5:24).

“Joshua summoned all Israel, its elders [*tsaqen*] and heads [*rosh*], its judges and officers” (Jos 23:2).

“Solomon assembled the elders [*tsaqen*] of Israel and all the heads [*rosh*] of the tribes, the leaders of the fathers’ houses of the people of Israel, in Jerusalem, to bring up the ark of the covenant of the LORD” (2 Chr 5:2).

“These are the heads of their fathers’ households and the genealogical enrollment of those who went up with me from Babylon in the reign of King Artaxerxes” (Ezra 8:1; Neh 11:13, after the exile).

“The sons of David were priests (*qohen*)”, that is, “heads [*rosh*] at the king’s side” (2 Sam 8:8; 2 Chr 18:17).

Head of some people

“He shall become head [*rosh*] over all the inhabitants of Gilead” (Judg 10:18; 11:8-9,11).

“Moses chose able men out of all Israel and made them heads [*rosh*] over the people, leaders [*sar*] of thousands, [*sar*] of hundreds, [*sar*] of fifties and [*sar*] of tens” (Exod 18:25)

“These are they who were called of the congregation, the leaders [*nasi*] of their fathers’ tribes; they were the heads [*rosh*] of divisions of Israel” (Num 1:16).

“So I took the heads of your tribes, wise and experienced men, and appointed them heads [*rosh*] over you, leaders [*sar*] of thousands and of hundreds, of fifties and of tens, and officers for your tribes” (Deut 1:15).

“Hear now, heads [*rosh*] of Jacob and rulers [*qasin*] of the house of Israel “ (Micah 3:1).

Apparently combined with the idea of first in a series

“Ezer was the first [*rosh*]” (1 Chr 12:9-10).

“Now behold, God is with us at our head [*rosh*] and His priests with the signal trumpets to sound the alarm against you” (2 Chr 13:12).

The position of a man over other people

“A place at the head [*rosh*] of those who were invited” (1 Sam 9:22)

“Seat Naboth at the head of the people” (1 Kgs 21:9).

Heads of an army (Deut 20:9; 1 Chr 4:42).

Some few exceptions?

Although the term “head” does not appear in the Bible in reference to a woman, there were a few exceptions when it came to female leadership in ancient Israel. Within the kingdom the only two exceptions were tyrannical usurpers, despotic idolaters, and murderers - the infamous Athaliah and Jezebel.

A third relative exception was seen in the time of the judges, which was characterized by a certain anarchy among the tribes (see Judg 17:6). In these circumstances, God called various individuals to judge His people. One such person was Deborah, a married woman, whom the people came to for advice. This is a relative exception, because she does not seem to have performed a leadership over man. The terms mentioned above were not applied to her to define her ministry. In fact, we see her calling Barak to ask him, as directed by God, to gather the people to defeat Sisera and Jabin (Judg 4).

Even so, we must remember that an exception does not make a rule. David and his companions ate the sacred bread when they were hungry and there was no other bread to eat (1 Sam 21:6; Mar 2:23-26). Would this however give room for anyone to eat that sacred bread and do so on a regular basis?

Church and social leadership in the New Israel

Theologians, in general, recognize that the ecclesiastical structure of the early church was borrowed from the synagogue, with a body of leading elders. In the vision of Rev 4, the 24 elders of the heavenly court are depicted as sitting down around the throne of God, like the courts of elders in the synagogues in every city. We find in the Christian community the same terminology of the OT in reference to the appointment of pastors and elders. The term elder is given in both testaments to all the principal authorities of the people of God.

Man as head of his wife and his family, and leader of the church

Let us state here that the Word *kephale* is found in over fifty contexts where it refers to people who have authority over others of whom they are the ‘head.’ But it never once takes a meaning ‘source without authority,’ as egalitarians would like to make it mean” (Grudem, 194).

“Wives, *submit to your husbands* as to the Lord. For *the husband is the head* of the wife as *Christ is the head* of the church, his body, of which he is the Savior. Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit to their husbands in everything” (Eph 5:22-23; see Gen 3:16: “Your desire will be toward your husband, but he will rule over you”).

“Now I want you to realize that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is man, and the head of Christ is God” (1 Cor 11:3).

“They [the older women] can train the younger women to love their husbands and children, to be self-controlled and pure, to be busy at home, to be kind, and *to be subject to their husbands*, so that no one will malign the word of God” (Tit 2:4-5).

Pastors take care of the flock as the shepherds of Israel did in old times (see Eze 34). They are heads of their families and act under another head, the supreme one, that is Christ (1 Pet 5:2-4). A woman's submission may be more easily accomplished if her head is subjected to the head of Christ. Nevertheless, in the event an unbeliever is willing to live with and respect the religion of his wife, it is the duty of the woman to remain at his side in all humility (1 Cor 7:13-15; 1 Pet 3:1). In the same vein, the apostle Peter also requires submission to the elders of the church, “for God resists the proud, but gives grace to the humble” (1 Pet 5:5-6).

In other words, in both OT and NT times gender was not an option for leading the church. This fact does not deny that women may do a wonderful and marvelous work in many areas. The apostle Paul mentions some of the good works women can do, and the wise king Solomon likewise praised women for the wonderful works they may do, wherein all acknowledge them as being “blessed” (Prov 31).

She is to be “well known for her good deeds, such as bringing up children, showing hospitality, washing the feet of the saints, helping those in trouble and *devoting herself to all kinds of good deeds*” (1 Tim 5:10).

Ordination of the authorities of the church: elders, pastors, and bishops

There is not a clear distinction in the NT between elders, pastors, and bishops. The New Testament clearly distinguishes bishops from deacons (1 Tim 3). But there is no clear distinction between elders and bishops (“overseers”), and pastors. Elders lead the church (1 Tim 5:17; Tit 1:7; 1 Pe 5:1-2), teach and preach the Word (1 Tim 3:2; 2 Tim 4:2; Tit 1:9), protect the church from false teachers (Acts 20:17,28-31), exhort and admonish the saints in sound doctrine (1 Tim 4:13; 2 Tim 3:13-17; Tit 1:9), visit the sick and pray (Jam 5:14; Acts 20:35), and judge doctrinal issues (Acts 15:16). In other words, the role assigned by the NT to the elders is one of overseeing, leading, and caring for the local church.

We have to keep in mind that congregations in the early church were small, and usually met in houses. The mention of bishops in addition to elders might suggest that bishops had larger responsibilities over local elders. This was probably the case because it was evident that as time went by, some leaders would have to supervise wider territories.

The word ordination is a Latin term introduced by Tertullian in the third century, a conservative leader who also introduced the term Trinity. Both terms are not found in the Bible, but help us refer to a biblical truth with only one word. We can say the same thing about other terms that are not in the Bible, like “millennium” and “incarnation.” Although not in the Bible, these single words have proved helpful as definitions of what the Scriptures teach about the topic. Similarly, Tertullian wanted to be able to define the laying of hands on the leaders of the church with a single Latin term. We should point out that discussing the origins of the word ordination does not change anything, nor can it deny the fact that the church appointed certain people for the pastoral work, and that all of them were men.

In the Old Testament, the laying of hands is related to many things (transference of sin from the sinner to an animal, nomination for a position or responsibility, healing, spiritual gifts, etc). In the context of the nomination of bishops and elders in the NT, the imposition of hands is also related to authority. We may see the same thing in the Old Testament, when God required Moses to ordain Joshua as leader of Israel with an imposition of hands.

“The LORD said to Moses, ‘Take Joshua son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay your hand on him. Have him stand before Eleazar the priest and the entire assembly and commission him in their presence. Give him some of your *authority* so the whole Israelite community will obey him’” (Num 27:18-20).

This is the same purpose, among others, that the laying on of hands has in the New Testament. For instance, Paul reminds Timothy not to allow anyone to despise his age when he was to receive the laying on of hands for the position of “elder.” “Let no one despise you for your youth” (1 Tim 4:12,14). Let us notice that Joshua received authority as leader of the people without coming from the tribe of Levi. He was not a son of Aaron, nor was he an officiating priest in the Tabernacle. Joshua, like us, formed part of the priesthood of all the people.

Once again, gender was not an option. As in the Old Testament, the nomination of elders, bishops, and pastors was granted only to men. The priests of the Old Testament were similarly organized with the elders as leaders and heads of their families and tribes (Luke 12:11; Acts 26:10,12). The fact that God nominated men for the priestly service, as well as for the nominations of elders in their families and congregations, shows us again that sex was not an option in both testaments. They followed the pattern given by God in Creation, where everyone works in submission to the authority designed by God from the beginning, with God Himself being the supreme head.

Fallacy of those who want to open the door for the ordination of women

The Bible only mentions elders in the masculine form and states that they should only be married to one woman (not the reverse of a lady being married to only one man). Hence many have inferred that this does not necessarily imply that some appointed elders could choose to be single or divorce (see Matt 5:32). However, some have gone further with this and claimed that, at some point in the future, women could then also be ordained. Here they mistake. As we mentioned earlier, it is important to note that the apostle clearly stated that he did not allow a woman to have authority over a man in the home and church. The reasoning that followed was not culturally based, but rather emphasized the constitutional design instituted by God at creation (see 1 Tim 2:11-14; 1 Cor 14:34-35).

Interestingly, Paul did not use the argument of creation when mentioning submission in regards to other cultural or social matters, such as servitude (which in old times functioned as a type of “social security,” and at times consisted of temporary economical obligations. In the parable of Jesus we may see that servants were entrusted large capitals by their masters (Matt 25:14). (I deal with this point in detail in my book *Jubilee and Globalization. The Hidden Intention*).

Under these attempts to make the text say just the opposite of what it says, let us then also ordain homosexuals and lesbians, because this text does not mention them. This is what other church leaders and churches ahead of ours have been doing, in spite of the fact that the apostle is also clear in stating that homosexuals will not inherit the kingdom of heaven (1 Cor 6:9-10). Interestingly, homosexual egalitarians have distorted the meaning and context of these statements in exactly the same way as feminist egalitarians.

To contest this, some argue that prohibiting ordination to pastoral leadership is explicit for homosexuals, while for women such a denial is implicit (if it is so really). I don’t understand that way of reasoning. Where does the Bible state that homosexuals cannot be ordained as elders, pastors, or bishops? Isn’t this inferred from the other statement that homosexuals will not inherit the kingdom of God (see 1 Cor 6:9-10)? Right! Let us then notice that prohibiting the ordination of homosexuals is, on those grounds, implicit, not explicit.

So then where does the Bible state that women cannot be ordained to pastoral ministry? As already seen above, this is implicit in the statements of the apostle Paul in what regards man’s exercise of authority in both the family unit and the church. Although for many these statements are sufficiently explicit, given such a

rigorous logic we have to recognize that denying women ordination to pastoral ministry is as implicit as denying homosexuals.

Another argument appears when some begin to bring out certain negative qualities of men, very commonly represented today, to affirm that men are also not suitable for ministry. There is truth to this. The apostle Paul admitted in 2 Cor 2:14-17: "Who is sufficient for these things? ... But thanks be to God, who in Christ always leads us in triumphal procession, and through us spreads the fragrance of the knowledge of him everywhere... For we are not, like so many, peddlers of God's word, but as men of sincerity, as commissioned by God, in the sight of God we speak in Christ."

If someone wants a list of the human degradation that is to be manifested in the latter days, especially the violent and degenerate character of men, let him read what the prophets and apostles of the Lord, even Jesus Himself, wrote about that (Rom 1:18-32; 1 Tim 4; 2 Tim 3; the Epistle of Jude, etc). We can all agree about the ineptitude of that kind of people for pastoral ministry. Those men are not worthy to be the heads of their home, and are the reason why there are so many broken and desolate homes. This evil occurs because many unrepentant hearts do not want to accept the headship of Jesus Christ. It goes without saying that just because one is a man does not mean that one is suitable for ministry. This is why the apostle Paul gave specific qualifications that a man must possess before he is to be honored with that responsibility.

Some also bring out the positive qualities of many women, and how in modern society there are women who even lead other countries. I believe that we must acknowledge the role of women in our society. But in what regards pastoral church leadership, we cannot use our feelings to decide what seems to be acceptable or not, especially when God spoke about the matter. It is our duty to respect the divine design for man and woman. There are too many examples in the history of Christianity about the introduction of standards that, while seemingly positive at the beginning, led to pernicious results. King Solomon warned: "There is a way that seems right to a man, but in the end it leads to death" (Prov 16:25).

Social and church structure in both dispensations according to the Spirit of Prophecy

An article prepared about a quarter of a century ago by William Fagal (the former director of the White Center at the University of Andrews), concluded by stating that E. G. White never spoke about the ordination of women to pastoral ministry. Though she advocated for an active participation of women in the task of proclaiming the Adventist message, as well as their involvement in several ministries of the church, she never required her ordination to pastoral ministry. Neither did she receive the laying of hands for pastoral ministry. However, in one special occasion, she did recommend the laying of hands on certain physicians and pastor's wives to support the work of the pastor, but for a different type of work. At other times, she urged that women should be paid for their work as we would now call "bible instructors."

In reference to such ministries, E. G. White mentioned "women who are willing to consecrate *some of their time* [she is not speaking of a full time service] to the service of the Lord... to visit the sick, look after the young, and minister to the necessities of the poor." But, she warned: "In some cases they will need to counsel with the church officers or the minister... *This is another means of strengthening and building up the church. We need to branch out more in our methods of labor*" (RH July 9, 1895 italics supplied). In other words, the reference of E. G. White to a particular laying of hands for certain ministries which could include women, had to do with assisting or supporting the pastoral labor of a minister, and not with pastoral leadership itself, as evidenced by a woman's need to seek the counsel of the church officers or ministers.

The fact that E. G. White remained silent about the topic of ordaining women to pastoral ministry does not imply that she advocated for it. In fact, she did not keep silent about the role that she and other women must have in the home and in the church. Many times she stated that their role was to support and submit to the heads and leaders of the house and of the church, in perfect harmony with what the apostle Paul wrote and with God's requirement that man maintain his position as head of his house with humility.

Woman must yield to the head. She is the helpmeet or complement of her husband

"The husband is the head of the family, as Christ is the head of the church; and any course which the wife may pursue to lessen his influence and lead him to come down from that dignified, responsible position is

displeasing to God. It is the duty of the wife to yield her wishes and will to her husband. Both should be yielding, but the Word of God gives preference to the judgment of the husband. And it will not detract from the dignity of the wife to yield to him whom she has chosen to be her counselor, adviser, and protector. The husband should maintain his position in his family with all meekness, yet with decision” (1 T 307-308 (1862)).

“We women must remember that God has placed us subject to the husband. He is the head, and our judgment and views and reasonings must agree with his, if possible. If not, the preference in God’s Word is given to the husband where it is not a matter of conscience. We must yield to the head” (Letter 5, 1861).

“The work of God demands most earnest labor, and the Lord would have ministers and their wives closely united in this work. The husband and wife can so blend in labor that the wife shall be the complement of the husband... Through her unselfish interest to advance the cause of God, the wife has made her husband’s work much more complete” (6 MR 43).

“I am trying to help my husband bear his burdens... The work was not pleasant to me at first, but I have overcome my dislike for it. I no longer feel that sentimentalism must be woven through all our experience in the married life... I had for a time to study hard and pray much to overcome my weakness of character, and become, in some degree, what a woman should be, a true helpmeet. I desire not to lead into sin, as did Eve [see 1 Tim 2:14], but with a firm hold upon Jesus I would lead away from sin, and pride, and love of show, in the quiet paths of meekness and lowliness of heart” (14 MR 305.3).

The leaders are “at the head of the work”

The fact that Jesus is our supreme head does not mean that we cannot have leaders “*at the head of our various institutions*” (The E. G. White appeal in 1901 for a reorganization of the GC, 4). “Satan causes church members to engage in a spirit of criticism of denominational leadership at all levels—he excites ‘jealousy and dissatisfaction toward those *at the head of the work*” (5 T 674).

Head, priest, and legislator of his own house

Let us pay attention to the fact that in the priesthood of all the church the head and priest of the house is the father, not the mother.

“The home is an institution of God. God designed that the family circle, father, mother, and children, should exist in this world as a firm. The father is to act as priest in his own house. He is the ‘house-band’... The father is to stand at the head of his family, not as an overgrown, undisciplined boy, but as a man with a manly character and with his passions controlled” (10 MR 188). “He is the head of the family, and as priest of his household. The most powerful sermon that can be given the unbelieving world in recommendation of our faith is a well-disciplined family” (PH 123.45).

“All members of the family center in the father. He is the lawmaker... This rule of action [dealing with the morning and evening worship], zealously carried out by the father when he is present or by the mother when he is absent, will result in blessings to the family” (AH 212.1).

Every family is a church

The position that the father occupies in his home is equivalent to the position he may occupy in the church, because the family is a small church. In the light of what the apostle Paul wrote and of these statements, we may see clearly that women, in both the home and the church, occupy an important place as supporters and helpers suitable for both the smaller and the larger churches.

“The home is a school where all may learn how they are to act in the church...” (CG 549.2). “Every Christian family is a church in itself... The father... is the priest of the household, accountable to God for the influence that he exerts over every member of his family” (3 SM 209.2). “The father as a priest of the household, the mother as a home missionary” (CCh 143.1).

“The most elevated work for woman is the molding of the character of her children after the divine pattern [see 1 Tim 2:5]. She should gain their affections; she should cherish love; for with these precious traits of character she can have a transforming influence upon the family circle. If she makes a success here, she has gained the victory. Society will feel her influence in the deportment and moral worth of her children. The church will bless her because she has educated and developed talent which will be of the highest value. She gives to the church, men and women who will not flinch from duty however taxing. If Christian mothers had always done their work with fidelity, there would not now be so many church trials on account of disorderly members. Mothers are forming the characters which compose the church of God. When I see a church in trial, its members self-willed, heady, high-minded, self-sufficient, not subject to the voice of the church, I am led to fear that their mothers were unfaithful in their early training” (HR, April 1, 1880 par. 8).

“There is always a danger of taking upon ourselves a work that the Lord has not placed in our hands, and neglecting that which He has given us to do and which would better honor His name” (14 MR 309.1).

“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. 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” (PP 59).

“He who is engaged in the work of the gospel ministry must be faithful in his family life... As the priest in the home, and as the ambassador of Christ in the church, he should exemplify in his life the character of Christ... God will not serve with the sins of men who have not a clear sense of the sacred responsibility involved in accepting a position as pastor of a church. He who fails to be a faithful, discerning shepherd in the home, will surely fail of being a faithful shepherd of the flock of God in the church” (6MR 49).

The forms of government developed in biblical history

“The first form of government over men was established by God himself, and acknowledged him as the only Sovereign. He made known his will by written commands and revelations, by messages to his chosen servants, by dreams, by signs, and wonders. He would have continued to be their king, had they content with his paternal care” (ST, July 13, 1882 par. 1).

In the Old Testament

“At the beginning, the father was constituted priest and magistrate of his own family. Then came the patriarchal rule, which was like that of the family, but extended over a greater number. When Israel became a distinct people, the twelve tribes, springing from the twelve sons of Jacob, had each a leader. These leaders, or elders, were assembled whenever any matter that pertained to the general interest was to be settled. The high priest was the visible representative of Christ, the Redeemer of his people. When the Hebrews settled in Canaan, judges were appointed, who resembled governors. These rulers were invested with authority to declare war and proclaim peace for the nation; but God was still the recognized king of Israel, and he continued to reveal his will to these chosen leaders, and to manifest through them his power... But increase of population, and intercourse with other nations, brought a change. The Israelites adopted many of the customs of their heathen neighbors, and thus sacrificed to a great degree, their own peculiar, holy character” (ST, July 13, 1882 par. 2-3; italics supplied).

In the New Testament

“When Jesus had ended His instruction to the disciples, He gathered the little band close about Him, and kneeling in the midst of them, and laying His hands upon their heads, He offered a prayer dedicating them to His sacred work. Thus the Lord’s disciples were ordained to the gospel ministry” (DA 296).

“The circumstances connected with the separation of Paul and Barnabas by the Holy Spirit to a definite line of service, show clearly that the Lord works through appointed agencies in His organized church” (AA 162).

The “organization of the church at Jerusalem was to serve as a model for the organization of churches in every other place where messengers of truth should win converts to the gospel... Later in the history of the early church, when in various parts of the world many groups of believers had been formed into churches, the organization of the church was further perfected, so that order and harmonious action might be maintained” (AA 91-92).

In connection with the ordination of the first deacons (Acts 6:1-6), E. G. White wrote that “there was necessity for a further distribution of the responsibilities which had been borne so faithfully by a few during the earlier days of the church. The apostles must now take an important step in the *perfecting of gospel order* in the church, by laying upon others some of the burdens thus far borne by themselves” (AA 88-89).

“I saw that in the apostles’ day the church was in danger of being deceived and imposed upon by false teachers. Therefore the brethren chose men who had given good evidence that they were capable of ruling well their own houses and preserving order in their own families, and who could enlighten those who were in darkness” (EW 100-101).

“The apostle says: ‘Lay hands suddenly on no *man*’ [1 Tim. 5:22]. In the days of the apostles the ministers of God did not dare to rely upon their own judgment in selecting or accepting *men* to take the solemn and sacred position of mouthpiece for God. They chose the *men* whom their judgment would accept, and then they placed them before the Lord to see if He would accept them to go forth as His representatives. No less than this should be done now (4T 406).

INDEX

The Roman Catholic Church

Protestant and Evangelical Churches

Seventh-day Adventist Church (biblical perspective)

Multiple Protestant Vulnerabilities

Evangelical conservative authors

The trend to avoid man's leadership leads to a rejection of any kind of authority

Protestant vulnerability to the Catholic hierarchical structure

Protestants feel the need of a head to face secularism in the world

Mutual accusations

Displacement or denial of the covenant and the sacrifice of all believers

a) The spiritual sacrifices of all believers in the New Covenant (1 Pe 2:5)

b) The spiritual sacrifices of all believers in the Old Covenant (Exod 19:5-6)

The corruption of the spiritual sacrifices

Why do some Adventists also become vulnerable?

Israel as a first born

Current confusion

Is ordination a requisite for the outpouring of the Spirit?

Does everyone have to be a pastor in order to participate in the priesthood of the New Israel?

A path to disunity and loss of mission

The outcome of failing to preach our distinctive messages

Importance of the Adventist typological approach in its ecclesiological projection

Recovering the true typological correlation of the sanctuary

Social and ecclesiastical structure of the New Israel according to the Bible

Equality? Complementarity? Opposition or aversion?

We live in a sick culture

Our culture criticized by Jesus and the apostles

Therapies of liberation and insubordination versus therapies of subjection and subordination?

Religious and social leadership in ancient Israel

Head of a family, clan, tribe, or kingdom
Head of some people
Apparently combined with the idea of first in a series
The position of a man over other people
Some few exceptions?

Church and social leadership in the New Israel

Man as head of his wife and his family, and leader of the church
Ordination of the authorities of the church: elders, pastors, and bishops
Fallacy of those who want to open the door for the ordination of women

Social and ecclesiastical structure in both dispensations according to the Spirit of Prophecy

Woman must yield to the head. She is the helpmeet or complement of her husband
The leaders are "at the head of the work"

Head, priest, and legislator of his own house

Every family is a church

The forms of government developed in biblical history

In the Old Testament

In the New Testament