

it was "they" who instructed Apollos. Further, though it is perhaps not determinative, it is interesting that it is Priscilla who is mentioned first—and chivalry was not yet in fashion.

REV. J. DAVID WOOD
Zion Covenant Church
Ellsworth, Wis.

I am weary of hearing "what the apostle intended" from people whose obvious interest is not the apostle's intention, but their own preconceived conclusions. Forcing I Timothy 2:11-12 into an unbiblical chronological context is impertinent arrogance. The Bible specifically states that a woman may *not* teach or hold authority over a man. Where does it specifically state that she may? The simple answer is that it does not, and it is unbelievable that so many would take obscure and unclear passages to deny a clear and direct command. Hermeneutical gymnastics have no place in evangelical Christianity.

DANIEL V. DAVIS
Denver, Colo.

In I Timothy 2:11-14, Stouffer ["Ordination of Women: Yes"] adduces that "Adam's sin was worse [than Eve's] because he sinned with his eyes wide open," while Eve's sin was less serious because she acted in ignorance. Paul is not citing this information in order to establish the degree of culpability between them as Stouffer alleges. Rather, he is showing why women are not allowed to hold teaching positions in the assembly, that is, he is backing up his statement in I Timothy 2:11-12. Women are not allowed to hold teaching positions in the assembly because women are more susceptible to errors in understanding doctrinal truth. Paul sees the details of the Fall in the Garden as illustrating this principal, not as contentless events.

DICK FULLER
Pendleton, Oreg.

Why does the right to ordain women have to be seen in the context of the modern women's liberation movement? I would hope that objective, open-minded Christians would make their decision about "women's ordination" solely on the basis of scriptural emphasis on the equality of all people in the eyes of God.

REV. JOSEPH MORRISON
Setauket United Methodist Church
East Setauket, N.Y.

The point is made [Editorial, Feb. 20] that I Corinthians 14:34 should be understood in the light of I Corinthians 11:5. Wouldn't it be more correct to switch that around?

Paul desires that women be silent in the churches, even realizing that this may be hard for them to accept (I Cor. 14:37). However, each time he speaks of it (I Cor. 14 and I Tim. 2), he states clearly that the reason for this is God's Word. Paul is clearly not giving advice for a temporary situation when he calls on what God has spoken before to back him up.

"We must not try to draw the full doc-

trine of women in the church from a single passage." Therefore, I Corinthians 11 should be understood in the light of I Corinthians 14, I Timothy 2, and above all, Genesis 2 and 3.

I glory in the fact that the Lord has made both sexes equal in his sight. However, please recognize that he has given his equally redeemed females and males *different* (not greater or lesser) roles in his church and also the family.

REV. STEVEN BLUMER
Faith Evangelical Lutheran Church
El Paso, Tex.

As a couple preparing to enter God's service as "professional" pastors, we were greatly encouraged by CT's editorial stand for women's ordination. We feel that your handling of the issues was balanced and fair.

As committed United Presbyterians, we struggle deeply with our denomination's exclusion of candidates for ministry on the basis of their conviction that women should not be ordained to the teaching ministry. We think that at this point in time our denomination has erred in its handling of the issues, preferring legislation over education. However, the UPC has not raised this issue as a test for orthodoxy, as uncertain as tests for orthodoxy may be today. Rather, the denomination, with its own polity structure that places jurisdiction for ordination in the hands of the presbyteries, has chosen a stand which reflects the general direction of the UPC. We strongly agree with our church's affirmation of women in ministry. However, the question in legislating such a mandate always is "how" and "when."

REV. AND MRS. P. DAVID BRUMBAUGH
Beverly, Mass.

An Imposition

I appreciate Keith Green's "Making the Gospel Free" [Feb. 6]. I think he errs, though, in trying to impose his conviction on others. This is the point at which legalism begins. When it comes to an area where the Scriptures do not speak specifically, Paul writes, "Who are you to judge someone else's servant?"

STEPHEN L. RANNEY
Portland, Oreg.

Money Matters

I agree with Mr. Rumford ["What to Expect of a Seminary Graduate," Feb. 6] that the purpose is to "... lay a foundation for a lifetime of ministry." However, one minor priority got left out of his article: that of affording the schooling in the first place. Among fellow students at Talbot Seminary, I have noted that the majority are working their way through school at secular occupations of one sort or another, and some of these indeed are working nearly full-time while taking heavy course loads. The added responsibilities of continuing to work within one's own church take time, and if the

student also is married and has children, they get whatever time is left over. This situation is not the best for laying a good foundation for ministry, except perhaps in that it gives a good foretaste of the life of an overworked minister.

The problem is that many, if not most, seminary students do not have the financial backing necessary to allow them to fully apply themselves to the already difficult task of preparing for a lifetime ministry. We must realize that unless we are a lot more generous monetarily with our seminaries and seminarians, we are impeding the development of tomorrow's church leaders.

DIEHL H. MARTIN III
Fullerton, Calif.

A Wider Perspective

Thank you for your printing of the Gothard article in the February 6 issue. Perhaps it will stimulate alumni to reevaluate the degree of influence the IBYC has on their lives. It is difficult but necessary to "stand alone" as did Dr. Schultz and other former staff. As a former staff wife, I applaud you for expanding the issues beyond the primary moral focus. Those of us who left have already experienced misunderstanding from alumni, staff replacements, and the board. What they do not realize is that those who were closest knew Bill best. If alumni would examine the attitudes in the core which precipitated the disintegration, they would begin to see the wider perspective of what really happened, and why.

JOY WOOD
Vancouver, Wash.

China Strategy

Regarding Lyall's "Call for a Unified China Strategy" [Jan. 23]: The resolutions he suggests point out errors to be avoided and attitudes to be maintained. Would they not be better expressed as cautions rather than binding regulations? Is the possibility of causing embarrassment, even more, the final and compelling reason for refraining from witnessing? Since the representative body in China would have to be government approved, what would be the response to evangelicals asking permission to carry out some activity? There are still some denominational distinctives in China, without labels. Can others preserve the unity without the labels? Would the complexity of such a system and the publicity of it create greater problems?

The eight positive suggestions for "future action" are valuable. They are also very similar to the requests that are coming out of China and the UN for those outside China to help in many fields of activity. To the Chinese Christians all over the world, well equipped in academic, scientific, medical, and other areas, as well as theological, belongs the responsibility of Christian witness in China.

DOROTHY M. MACLEOD
Willowdale, Ont.