

Prove All Things: A Response to Women In Ministry

Chapter 14 *Great Flying Leaps (Part 2):*

The Use of Ellen G. White's Writings in Women in Ministry

Larry Kirkpatrick

Equality, Headship, and Submission in the Writings of Ellen G. White

Turning our attention to another chapter, we now consider "Equality, Headship, and Submission in the Writings of Ellen G. White." The contributors to Women in Ministry offer sometimes contradictory solutions in their attempt to solve the considerable problem of getting Ellen White to "fit" their theology of women's ordination. One example of this is the issue of headship before the Fall. In one solution, the book proposes that Adam and Eve "fully shared" in headship before the Fall.³² This novel position could be called "initial co-headship." Other contributors to the book suggest that Ellen White understood that before the Fall there was no explicit headship.³³ But do either of these solutions mesh with the writings of Mrs. White?

The evidence presented in support of the initial co-headship view is that Adam and Eve were created equal, of the same nature, and that they were to "have no interest independent of each other," and were made so that "in all things she should be his equal."³⁴ Another evidence suggested is that God initially gave dominion to Adam and Eve together, and that this dominion was shared.³⁵ But this solution is too clever. The author has introduced a substantial distortion of the new human social structure, before sin had even entered into the world.

This strange proposal leaves the first human family with two heads and no body. If both were heads, then who or what were they head over? The animals? No, the Bible says they were to exercise dominion over the animals. To exercise headship over the animals would logically include animals in the body; yet animals are not made in God's image, only people are. The author does not discuss animals in relation to headship. But a head that is connected to no body has no headship. This theory leaves the reader in a logical trap. Paul would ask, "And if they were all one member, where were the body?" (1 Cor 12:19).

Eve was made "of the same nature"³⁶ as Adam. She was made to be Adam's equal "in all things." Yet sameness of nature and equality in all things does not require uniformity in roles. The very fact of their complementary individuality is strong evidence that heaven designed that they fill specialized roles. Indeed, the same document from which the author draws the quotation that "in all things she should be his equal" repeatedly points the reader back to Eve's misguided aspirations from before the Fall, in order to warn modern Eves against receiving the same temptation!³⁷ If God wanted absolute sameness He could have simply photocopied Adam on the spot.

As we already noted, another contributor to the book holds that there simply was no headship before the Fall. One of the main Ellen White statements applying directly to the results of the Fall is presented as if proving that headship only came at the point of the Fall.³⁸ Using this quotation, the author affirms that the husband's rule over his wife "grows out of the results of sin."³⁹ But this is incorrect. As we will note below, the pre-Fall gender-differentiated role of "protector" assigned uniquely to the male of that holy pair has been ignored. In contrast to the mutually exclusive theories presented in Women in Ministry, Ellen White holds a third view that cannot be harmonized with either.

That the divine plan from before the Fall included unique roles for each one of the Edenic pair is clear in the writings of Ellen G. White. She wrote plainly that Eve was to be loved by Adam "and protected by him."⁴⁰ The husbandly role of "protector" repeatedly recurs when Mrs. White writes regarding marital relations.⁴¹ James White saw himself in this role.⁴² Adam is presented not only as "protector," but also as "the father and representative of the whole human family"⁴³ Had Ellen White meant that this applied to Eve as well, she could easily have said so. We needn't force the idea of role interchangeability into the statement that Eve "was his second self."⁴⁴ The "second self" statement occurs when Ellen White points out that Eve was "a part of man, bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh,"⁴⁵ a truth both before and after the Fall. Adam's role as "protector," emanating from the period before the Fall, is echoed in similar statements.

Not only was Adam to function as Eve's protector, but he was "to maintain the principles of the heavenly family."⁴⁶ The maintenance of God's arrangement as it was before the Fall "would have brought peace and happiness. But the law that none `liveth to himself' (Romans 14:7) Satan was determined to oppose. He desired to live for self. He sought to make himself a center of influence. It was this that had incited rebellion in heaven, and it was man's acceptance of this principle that brought sin on earth."⁴⁷

It was while Eve was operating independently from her husband that disaster entered. Ellen White points out that Eve was at fault in not staying with her husband.⁴⁸ She also points out that when Eve approached Adam, he immediately understood that the situation was a ploy of the enemy about whom they had been warned.⁴⁹ Adam was saddened because he had not adequately maintained his protective headship role.⁵⁰ Had they been together, the ensuing 6000 years likely would have been altogether different for humankind.

When had the male been designated head of the human family structure? "In the beginning, the head of each family was considered ruler and priest of his own household. Afterward, as the race multiplied upon the earth, men of divine appointment performed this solemn worship of sacrifice for the people."⁵¹ What was Ellen White's understanding? Not that Adam and Eve shared initial co-headship, nor that neither was head before the Fall, but simply that Adam was the head of his family.

It seems apparent that the authors of Women in Ministry are driven to solutions that require great flying leaps of logic that leave them scattered all over the board. It is no cutting-edge hermeneutical system that takes them to their conclusions but instead a subset of fragmentary and sometimes mutually exclusive notions.

Ellen White and Women's Rights

In "Ellen White and Women's Rights," another writer addresses herself to a significant statement by Ellen White in which she wrote that "those who feel called out to join the movement in favor of woman's rights and the so-called dress reform might as well sever all connection with the third angel's message."⁵² The author's conclusion?

In the end, the woman's movement was secular, driven by political activities, and continually searching for ways to capture the support of public opinion. The focus of Ellen White was spiritual, driven by holy living and reform that advanced personal and corporate holiness. She wanted a religious, not political, reform movement.⁵³

With this we agree. But the author's conclusion that "it seems likely she [Mrs. White] would support women's ordination"⁵⁴ appears strained. How does she get there? On the basis of a great flying leap.⁵⁵

The author takes up the passage and works through it phrase by phrase in an endeavor to derive "principles" from her study. But has she blended in any biases of her own? Although Ellen White insisted that "the spirit which attends the one [women's rights movement] cannot be in harmony with the other [the third angel's message],"⁵⁶ the author contends that "because today's ordination issue is not associated with secular, political, religious, or social reform movements such as those in the nineteenth century, this principle does not relate as it did when Ellen White wrote."⁵⁷ Instead, she has turned Mrs. White's statement around to its opposite meaning, to the point that she can assert "it seems likely she would support women's ordination."⁵⁸ How could Mrs. White support women's ordination unless the spirit which attends the one were indeed in harmony with the other?

Today's ordination issue is very much associated with secular, political, religious, and social reform agendas. Its first field of battle was the secular and the political turmoil of the nineteen seventies. It entered Christendom through denominations and religious structures that, a century and a half earlier, had willfully rejected the third angel's message. These bodies have continued to experience biblical disorientation. A certain element within contemporary Christendom has now absorbed these old issues and taken them up as their own cause. Where have we gotten the bug as a church? Not even from the world, but as an echo from the interest in women's ordination that is current in the fallen churches.

Another plank in the author's discussion is Ellen White's statement that "the Scriptures are plain upon the relations and rights of men and women."⁵⁹ The author follows with a detailed search of the Ellen G. White CD-ROM for the word "rights." While the results are interesting, she has inadvertently sidestepped a number of significant statements by Ellen White showing instances of Mrs. White's actual understanding of what she considered to be the plain teaching of Scripture. Let's consider some of Ellen White's own applications of the fact that "the Scriptures are plain upon the relations and rights of men and women":

In early times the father was the ruler and priest of his own family, and he exercised authority over his children, even after they had families of their own. His descendants were taught to look up to him as their head, in both religious and secular matters. This patriarchal system of government Abraham endeavored to perpetuate, as it tended to preserve the knowledge of God.⁶⁰

This reference makes plain the headship function of the male. This headship was not restricted merely to the immediate family, or just to the secular sphere, but encompassed also the religious sphere. Furthermore, this "patriarchal system of government" tended to preserve the knowledge of God.

The Lord has constituted the husband the head of the wife to be her protector; he is the house-band of the family, binding the members together, even as Christ is the head of the church and the Saviour of the mystical body. Let every husband who claims to love God carefully study the requirements of God in his position.⁶¹

Here headship is again linked with protection. When the male fulfills the headship role, he acts as a family binder. He is carefully to study the requirements of God in his position. Immediately after this statement, Mrs. White observed that "Christ's authority is exercised in wisdom, in all kindness and gentleness; so let the husband exercise his power and imitate the great Head of the church."⁶²

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.⁶³

Here once more we find the husband in the headship role, the partner uniquely foremost in filling the "protector" role. A careful balancing act is evident here between the wife's duty to yield and a husband's filling his role with meekness yet decision. A relationship is indicated in which "both should be yielding," and there is a beautiful sharing between the married couple. No indignity is incurred by a wife who yields to the one whom she has chosen to fill the husbandly role.

How can husband and wife divide the interests of their home life and still keep a loving, firm hold upon each other? They should have a united interest in all that concerns their homemaking, and the wife, if a Christian, will have her interest with her husband as his companion; for the husband is to stand as the head of the household.⁶⁴

When Mrs. White mentions that "the wife, if a Christian, will have her interest with her husband," she reminds us that being a wedded couple is not about each party's seeking their rights. Instead, each party will have his or her interest with the spouse. There is to be a "united interest" in all that concerns "their" homemaking. Homemaking is not an exclusively feminine task. The male, in filling his headship role, also contributes to homemaking. After all, "he is the house-band of the family, binding the members together."⁶⁵

The husband and father is the head of the household.⁶⁶

In the above and many of the other citations that we have considered, Ellen White frequently links fatherhood with headship. An examination shows that often Ellen White has mentioned the children of the household in connection with the father's role. It seems that Mrs. White had no problem applying her understanding that "the Scriptures are plain upon the relations and rights of men and women."

Two letters to a pastor's wife over the space of some years further demonstrate Ellen White's specific application of the scriptural principles we have been considering. John and Mary Loughborough worked steadily to advance the third angel's message through the years. Even so, the household was occasionally the scene of domestic imperfections. Unfortunately, the manner in which Mary related to her husband was becoming a matter of comment, and Mrs. White wrote to her to suggest a personal adjustment:

You have sought to please your friends altogether too much, and if you would have eternal life you must cut loose from relatives and acquaintances and not seek to please them, but have your eye single to the glory of God, and serve Him with your whole heart. This will not wean you from your husband at all, but will draw you closer to him, and cause you to leave father, mother, sisters and brothers and friends and cleave to your husband, and love him better than anyone on earth, and make his wishes your wishes. And you can live in harmony and happiness. . . . God has given the man the preference, he is the head, and the wife is to obey the husband, and the husband is not to be bitter against the wife, but love her as his own body. Dear sister, I saw that you were not half given up to God, not half consecrated to Him. Your will was not swallowed up in the will of God. And you must get ready, fitted and prepared for Christ's coming, or you will come short, be weighed in the balance and found wanting. You must be more devoted to God, more in earnest about your soul's salvation and eternal interest. I saw that if you would labor with your husband for God, you would not lose your reward. That is, labor to have him free and not lay a feather in his way, but cheer, encourage, and hold him up by your prayers.⁶⁷

Seven years later, we again find counsel in this vein offered to Mary:

Dear Mary, let your influence tell for God. You must take a position to exert an influence over others to bring them up in spirituality. You must guard yourself against following the influence of those around you. If others are light and trifling, be grave yourself. And, Mary, suffer me a little upon this point.

I wish in all sisterly and motherly kindness to kindly warn you upon another point. I have often noticed before others a manner you have in speaking to John in rather a dictating manner, the tone of your voice sounding impatient. Mary, others notice this and have spoken of it to me. It hurts your influence.

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. I have said more perhaps upon this point than necessary. Please watch this point.

I am not reproofing you, remember, but merely cautioning you. Never talk to John as though he were a little boy. You reverence him and others will take an elevated position, Mary, and you will elevate others.

Seek to be spiritually minded. We are doing work for eternity. Mary, be an example. We love you as one of our children and I wish so much that you and John may prosper. Be of good courage. Trust in the Lord at all times. He will be your stronghold and your deliverer.⁶⁸

These personal letters give clear insight into Ellen White's perception of how the "rights and relations" between men and women, presented so plainly to her in Scripture, were to be applied. One senses here no preoccupation with rights but with the simple translation of Scriptural principles into practical godliness.

In contrast to Ellen White, the author devotes fully a third of her chapter to the issue of "rights."⁶⁹ Could it be that her intense focus upon this aspect has led to a misguided analysis? Ellen White seems more concerned about humility than rights:

A study of women's work in connection with the cause of God in Old Testament times will teach us lessons that will enable us to meet emergencies in the work today. We may not be brought into such a critical and prominent place as were the people of God in the time of Esther; but often converted women can act an important part in more humble positions.⁷⁰

Clearly, the end-time emphasis of God's people will not be upon women's rights, but upon the third angel's message.

The author later adds that "the women's rights movement as a movement, not the favoring of women's rights, was the problem."⁷¹ Of course, Ellen White was not against the legitimate rights of women, but she was focused upon giving the last message of mercy to the world. The very idea of Mrs. White's following in the wake of a disoriented secular movement seems far-fetched. A Mrs. Graves once approached Ellen White, insisting that she enter into the issue of woman's suffrage.⁷² But in a letter to her husband James, Mrs. White wrote that her work "was of another character."⁷³ Indeed it was.

The conclusions⁷⁴ presented in "Ellen White and Women's Rights" are, unfortunately, an example of the logical leaps made in Women in Ministry. Although much of the information in the author's article is accurate and helpful, her theories appear to be overly imaginative.

Is women's ordination truly, as it has been painted in this book and in "Ellen White and Women's Rights," a matter of "rights" and "hierarchy?"⁷⁵ No. It is a matter of what God says is right in a divinely ordered system of perpetual equality between men and women with pre-Fall role differentiation.

Will failure to ordain women in our contemporary western culture reduce our influence in soul-winning as the author contends?⁷⁶ No. Rather, a failure to adhere to heaven's plan as revealed in Scripture would reduce our influence. It would make evident that we had effectively discarded the emphasis on the authority of the Bible that has characterized the Advent movement since its inception.

Would women's ordination somehow cause us to reach more people than we are reaching now?⁷⁷ No. Instead, when women take advantage of their innately heightened effectiveness in certain specialized ministries, we will see this potentiality realized.

Would the ordination of women provide more workers for the field?⁷⁸ No. Ordination neither adds nor subtracts workers from the field.

The relentless push for women's ordination only brings increased polarization within the church. It would be well to ponder how deep this polarization caused by forcing women's ordination upon the

church can become before the pain becomes unbearable for some members. The "thinking" of Adventism is much more than the sum of its institutional centers, or of a certain class of "theological elites" to whom we are persistently being encouraged to turn for guidance. Too often, it is they who are out of touch with the thinking of Adventism as a whole.

The pro-women's-ordination subculture within the church says that, not they, but we need to be reeducated in Bible interpretation. In this they are simply wrong; wrong in making women's ordination a litmus test of Adventist political correctness; wrong in using the reputation of the Seminary or the Adventist Review for propaganda purposes; wrong for making a bold attempt to replace the sound hermeneutic that this church is founded upon. Fortunately, we can turn to the Bible and to the writings of Ellen G. White and find very sound inspired guidance. Let us draw close to the documents that heaven has provided and step back from revisionism and imaginative speculation.

Reading through the reasoning presented by many of the contributors to *Women in Ministry* is like watching a theological train wreck occur in slow motion. As inevitably as night follows day, surrendering to the subjective reorientation of Scripture presented in *Women in Ministry* would leave us without any substantial foundation for presenting the third angel's message to a world already awash in its own philosophical emptiness.

The New Hermeneutic

Before closing this chapter, it may be helpful to take a moment to distill the methods of interpretation used in *Women in Ministry* into the readily graspable core of its hermeneutical system. For although the hermeneutical method of the book is really more of a subjective quagmire than a minutely defined system, there is a shape that can be seen moving under the dark waters.

There seems to be a consistent pattern of:

- A. Using inspired writings selectively.
- B. Building interpretive constructs above plain Scripture.
- C. Introducing subjective systems of interpretation, which tend toward enshrining a subset of the scholarly elite as the final arbiters of truth.
- D. Using interpretations of selected passages as canon-within-a-canon controls (similar to but different from A).
- E. Permitting the current wave of group-think to act as a correcting override.

If we accept the principles of interpretation that are showcased in *Women in Ministry*, we may not be quoting either Scripture or Ellen White thirty years from now. Instead, we will have turned our attention "to bishops, to pastors, to professors of theology"⁷⁹ as our guides. What this book, which some hope will function "determinatively" in the future of this discussion,⁸⁰ effectively does is to provide an

implicit system by which the authoritative use of Scripture is replaced with an amorphous machine. This machine is actually a subjective philosophical black-box designed to generate whatever outcome is desired by its user, while characterizing the results as being conservative and biblical. It works as follows:

Consider various texts one by one, often providing reasonably sound explanations. Here, one can create the illusion of being "conservative," "scriptural," "biblical," etc. Texts are introduced and may provide the appearance of authoritative biblical justification for the teaching to be presented.

When these texts are compiled, and the impression is given that the outcome is "biblical," they may then be used to construct an overarching idea that is one step removed from Scripture and is outside of it. Several of these ideas may be layered together. This is the "black box." Its legs are not the Scriptures that have been considered, but the "principles" represented as having been "derived" from them. In the end, Scripture need not be used authoritatively and reason can be the truly determinative element.

Next, an assertion may be made, based upon the "principles" or "ideas" previously derived. This is the arbitrary output of the system. Yet what comes out needn't sound arbitrary if a very reasonable or scriptural-sounding representation can be made. If presented well, the outcome can shift the foundation from Scripture to what human reason has said about Scripture. In this way, the system can affirm whatever is desired. Surround the discussion with Scriptures, leap the ideological chasm from A to B, and if no one catches on, the mental transaction has been made.

Finish by reemphasizing Scripture, thus solidifying the impression that the whole production has been the product of a diligent and scholarly study of the Bible.

This system can be reused at will. It may be made to support an almost infinite number of ideas either scriptural or unscriptural, because by means of "interpretation," it makes an end-run around the authority of Scripture. It is a shortcut on a long road that leads to places where the Seventh-day Adventist movement must not go.

It may be asked, just how does this differ from the use of Scripture among our pioneer Adventists? This indeed is the right question to ask. The documents of our history are still available for all to study for themselves. The answer is not hard to come by. The Adventist pioneers interpreted Scripture by Scripture. They saw nothing to gain by lingering in this world and proceeding from a stance of hearing God's Word only selectively. They treated the Bible as it was and is in reality: the voice of God to the soul.⁸¹ Perhaps this is why we are told that "The most humble and devoted in the churches were usually the first to receive the message. Those who studied the Bible for themselves could not but see the unscriptural character of the popular views of prophecy; and wherever the people were not controlled by the influence of the clergy, wherever they would search the word of God for themselves, the advent doctrine needed only to be compared with the Scriptures to establish its divine authority."⁸²

But what about us? What if we permit the meaning of our faith to be reworked in an unduly imaginative manner by theological experts?⁸³ Will our Bible-based Adventist heritage of Seventh-day Adventism be placed in jeopardy? Do we realize that the Bible could effectively be removed from the common member in the pew? that there could come a time when little meaningful difference exists between a theologian and a magician? Instead of casting a spell, the theologian may invoke an arcane,

private knowledge as his final appeal. This is where reliance upon theological finesse and academic panache risks taking us. It means the use of a philosophical system effectively (a) to negate the need to respond in conformity to God's will through real life change, and (b) to negate the past experience of God's people. If present trends continue to prevail, we could become such a different people from the early Adventists that our real links to that past are severed, and we could flounder as every other movement eventually has. It must not happen.

Conclusion

The manner in which the contributors in Women in Ministry generally have used the writings of Ellen G. White is hermeneutically unsound. Quotations and references have been gathered up and "principles" supposedly consistent with them have been constructed which in some cases exactly contradict Mrs. White. Unfortunately, all of the good intentions of the authors cannot change the misguided nature of their conclusions.

This brings us back to the attitudes expressed by my fellow ministers at the beginning of this chapter. Are great flying leaps the theological solution that the church has really been waiting for? Is Women in Ministry a triumph for God's people, providing at long last "help from the seminary?" Or is it more a case of self-disclosure to the church? Have a group of well-meaning but misguided scholars disclosed much more than they had intended? Is it safe to adopt their methods of interpretation? Finally, can we hear the concern of our brothers and sisters around the world who tremble to see how far we in North America have departed from the spirit and interpretive methods of the original Advent movement?

The church today stands upon the verge of a great flying leap.

Don't jump.

[End]

Did you read [Part 1](#)?

Copyright 2000 Adventists Affirm

Endnotes (for Part 2)

32. Peter van Bemmelen, "Equality, Headship, and Submission in the Writings of Ellen G. White," Women in Ministry, p. 298.
33. Richard Davidson, "Headship, Submission, and Equality in Scripture," Women in Ministry, pp. 264, 267.
34. van Bemmelen, p. 298.
35. Ibid.

36. Ellen G. White, Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 46.
37. "She was perfectly happy in her Eden home by her husband's side; but, like restless modern Eves, she was flattered that there was a higher sphere than that which God had assigned her. But, in attempting to climb higher than her original position, she fell far below it." Ellen G. White, Testimonies for the Church, 3:483. "A neglect on the part of woman to follow God's plan in her creation, an effort to reach for important positions which He has not qualified her to fill, leaves vacant the position that she could fill to acceptance. In getting out of her sphere, she loses true womanly dignity and nobility." *Ibid.*, p. 484.
38. Davidson, pp. 267-268 quoting Patriarchs and Prophets, pp. 58-59.
39. Davidson, p. 269.
40. Ellen G. White, Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 46.
41. See Ellen G. White's Testimonies for the Church, 1:105, 307-308; Testimonies on Sexual Behavior and Divorce, p. 117; Thoughts From the Mount of Blessing, p. 64; Review and Herald, December 10, 1908; Manuscript Releases, 4:217; 13:83, etc.
42. See Arthur L. White, Ellen G. White: The Early Years, Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1981), pp. 110-111.
43. Ellen G. White, Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 48.
44. van Bemmelen, p. 298.
45. Ellen G. White, Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 46.
46. Ellen G. White, Counsels to Parents, Teachers, and students, p. 33.
47. *Ibid.*
48. "The angels had cautioned Eve to beware of separating herself from her husband while occupied in their daily labor in the garden; with him she would be in less danger from temptation than if she were alone." Ellen G. White, Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 53.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 56.
50. "He mourned that he had permitted Eve to wander from his side." *Ibid.*
51. Ellen G. White, The Spirit of Prophecy, 1:53-54.
52. Ellen G. White, Testimonies for the Church, 1:421.
53. Alicia Worley, Women in Ministry, p. 372.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 369.
55. This section discusses Alicia Worley's "Ellen White and Women's Rights," in Women in Ministry, pp. 355-376.
56. Ellen G. White, Testimonies for the Church, p. 421.
57. Worley, p. 368.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 369.
59. Ellen G. White, Testimonies for the Church, 1:421.
60. Ellen G. White, Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 141.
61. Ellen G. White, The Adventist Home, p. 215.
62. *Ibid.*
63. Ellen G. White, Testimonies for the Church, 1:307-308.
64. Ellen G. White, The Adventist Home, p. 119.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 215.
66. *Ibid.*, p. 211.
67. Ellen G. White, Letter 6, 1854. In Manuscript Releases, 10:20.
68. Ellen G. White, Letter 5, 1861. In Manuscript Releases, 6:126.
69. Worley, pp. 359-365.

70. Ellen G. White, Special testimonies, Series B, p. 2. Also in Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, 3:1140.
71. Worley, p. 371.
72. Ibid., p. 372, citing Manuscript Releases, 10:69.
73. Ellen G. White, Letter 40a, 1874. In Manuscript Releases, 10:69.
74. Worley, pp. 370-372.
75. Ibid., p. 355.
76. Ibid., p. 370.
77. Ibid.
78. Ibid.
79. Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 595.
80. Calvin Rock, "Review of Women in Ministry" in Adventist Review, April 15, 1999, p. 29.
81. "Study God's word prayerfully. That word presents before you, in the law of God and the life of Christ, the great principles of holiness, without which 'no man shall see the Lord.' Hebrews 12:14. It convicts of sin; it plainly reveals the way of salvation. Give heed to it as the voice of God speaking to your soul." Ellen G. White, Steps to Christ, p. 35.
82. Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy, p. 372.
83. Nancy Vhymeister, "Prologue," in Women in Ministry, p. 5, prepares the way for the book's "use of sanctified judgment and imagination to resolve questions and issues."