

FAULTLINES AND QUANTUM LEAPS:

AN ALLIANCE HISTORIAN AND THEOLOGIAN’S CRITIQUE OF ANDREW BALLITCH’S CRITIQUE OF DR. JOHN STUMBO AND NATIONAL C&MA LEADERSHIP ON WOMEN IN MINISTRY

**A Critique of “A Radical Question for a Conservative Church”: Should The Christian and
Missionary Alliance Call Women ‘Pastors’?” By Andrew S. Ballitch**

By Paul L. King, Th.D., D.Min.

(Retired ordained Alliance pastor, theologian, historian, former LOCC member, and author of 9
books involving C&MA theology and history.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	2
Summary of the Positive and Negative Elements of the Article as a Whole.....	3
Review of Purpose 1: The State of the Question.....	4
Review of Purpose 2: Historical Awareness and Trajectory—The Direction of the Denomination.....	6
Review of Purpose 2, Part 1: The Founder of a Movement.....	6
Review of Purpose 2, Part 2: The Direction of a Denomination.....	8
Review of Purpose 3: The Lens of Scripture.....	10
Review of Ballitch’s Conclusion: “A Question of Faithfulness”—A Quantum Leap.....	12
Conclusions Regarding the Article as a Whole.....	17
Final Words: Wise Counsel from A.B. Simpson.....	18
Appendix 1: Complementarian-Egalitarian (C-E) Continuum: Where The Alliance Fits In.....	19
Appendix 2: Timeline of The Development of Simpson’s and The Alliance View and Practice of Women in Ministry.....	21
Appendix 3: Women Serving as Pastors and Elders in the C&MA 1975-2008.....	25
Appendix 4: Samples of Complementarians with Varying Interpretations.....	26
Appendix 5: Issues Not Covered in Ballitch’s Exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:9-3:1-15.....	27
Appendix 6: Problematic Issues and Timeline in the C&MA Regarding Elder Authority.....	31
Appendix 7: Alliance Sources on Women in Ministry Ballitch Could Have Consulted But Did Not.....	33
Appendix 8: A Summary of the Historic C&MA Exegesis of Biblical Passages Relating to Roles of Women in Ministry.....	35
Endnotes.....	37

INTRODUCTION

This paper is a brief summary critique (of a full 70+ page academic critique to follow) of the article “A Radical Question for a Conservative Church”: Should The Christian and Missionary Alliance Call Women ‘Pastors?’” by Andrew S. Ballitch. This article was published in the Fall 2020 issue of *Eikon: A Journal for Biblical Anthropology*, a publication of the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (CBMW), the organization founded to promote a strict complementarian interpretation of Scripture. Ballitch states, “I grew up in the C&MA and then spent almost ten years in the Southern Baptist tribe.” During that time, he earned a PhD in Church History from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, served in Baptist churches, and currently since 2018 serves as Associate Pastor of Preaching and Ministries at Westwood Alliance Church in Mansfield, Ohio, as a licensed C&MA worker.

For the purpose of brevity, I will be hitting only the highlights (highlighted in bold) and putting most of the quotes and comments in endnotes or Appendices or referring to page numbers in my book *Anointed Women*, and I will use the abbreviations “C” for complementarian and “E” for egalitarian. I suggest you read his article alongside mine and compare side-by-side, point-by-point. See the footnote for the link to his article.¹ If you are interested in the full, in-depth 70+ page academic critique, you can contact me at paulkingministries@gmail.com.

Ballitch states three purposes for his article: 1) “to summarize the question being asked in the C&MA regarding roles of women in ministry, in particular the use of the title ‘pastor’ for women, along with the reasons it is being asked.” 2) “to describe the historical trajectory of the denomination up to this point as it relates to women in ministry.” 3) “to both evaluate current C&MA practice according to Scripture and answer the question, ‘should the C&MA call women pastors?’ from Scripture.” He organizes the article accordingly under the headings of Purpose 1: “The State of the Question”; two headings for Purpose 2: “The Founder of a Movement” and “The Direction of the Denomination”; Purpose 3: “The Lens of Scripture”; and “Conclusion: A Question of Faithfulness.”

To briefly summarize Ballitch’s article as a whole, it is basically a strong critique of C&MA President Dr. John Stumbo’s “conversations” and direction of national and district leadership regarding the roles of women in ministry in the C&MA. Ballitch writes of the motivation for his article. “When I returned to the C&MA, I was made aware that national leadership had opened up a discussion about the appropriateness of applying the label of “pastor” to women serving in official roles in local churches.” According to Ballitch, Dr. Stumbo and national and district leadership are claimed to be:

- “questioning the C&MA’s historic, biblical understanding of the title ‘pastor.’”
- seeking “to normalize women preaching in the corporate worship of local churches.”
- “revisiting the C&MA’s original and long-standing conviction that the title ‘pastor’ is reserved for men and synonymous with ‘elder’ and ‘overseer’ in the New Testament.”
- “reconsidering the C&MA’s consistent application of the title ‘pastor’.”

The implication, which he asserts repeatedly, is that the historic stance of The Alliance has always been strongly complementarian, opposing women preaching or serving as pastors, and that Dr. Stumbo and national and district leadership are eroding or compromising that stance through these new conversations and resulting proposals.² Ballitch does not seem to be aware that while Dr. Stumbo has indeed opened up the conversations at a national level, the fact is that

the conversations have been stirring at all levels for the past 30 years, and Dr. Stumbo, with the support of the Board of Directors, has brought it to the surface. Further, in his conclusion, Ballitch warns that if the trajectory of Dr. Stumbo and national and district leadership is followed:

- It is “a question of faithfulness”
- It is “questionable biblical interpretation”.
- “it would assuredly cause division in local churches”
- It would develop “reputations of progressivism” as opposed to conservatism. (“progressivism” is the new euphemistic terminology for liberalism).
- “That trajectory has already moved beyond exegetical warrant.”
- “It not only must be stopped, but ground needs to be regained. The issue is not the opening of the door to egalitarianism, it is the survival of complementarianism. The line should be drawn where Scripture is clear.”
- “Better to have people leave over what the C&MA has always been, than to drive people out by changing it into what it has never been.”

Ballitch has a right to express opposing views and to present arguments for the merits of his view and the strengths and weaknesses of other views, but since his views are expressed as accusations, those accusations are serious; questioning the faithfulness of Dr. Stumbo and Alliance leadership to Scripture. If he is right, and Dr. Stumbo and national and district leadership are taking us down an unbiblical path, his warnings should be heeded. However, if Ballitch is wrong, his article causes deception, damage, and division to our beloved Alliance. And thus as an Alliance theologian and historian, although I do not write this critique with pleasure, I have felt the need for this brief response, and the necessity of a full 70+ page academic response to this article to soon follow with much more, to respond to what I call Ballitch’s shaky fault lines and “quantum leaps” in logic, assumptions, gaping gaps of vital information missing, historicity, unwarranted conclusions, and some downright falsehoods.³

Further, many of my responses to Ballitch’s article come from my book *Anointed Women: The Rich Heritage of Women in Ministry in the Christian and Missionary Alliance*, which it appears he has not read. Since most of that information can be found in my book, I will not duplicate large portions of it here. I would recommend that you (and Ballitch) read it for yourselves and see the real full documented history of The Alliance as it relates to women in ministry, as opposed to this article’s extremely limited and malformed history.

SUMMARY OF THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ELEMENTS OF THE ARTICLE AS A WHOLE

I note these positive features of Ballitch’s article: Ballitch has done some significant fresh research in the 1970s and 1980s, particularly regarding the shift to a more complementarian point of view from the leadership coinciding with the C&MA’s transition from a movement to a denomination. He has thus contributed information of value to the pool of research on the issue of women in ministry in the C&MA.

I must also share many disagreements, in which I believe Ballitch’s arguments rest on shaky fault lines:

- **Ballitch is both uninformed and misinformed about Alliance theology and history as it relates to women in ministry, as this review will demonstrate.**
- **Ballitch speaks authoritatively of his knowledge of the C&MA, yet he has limited experience in The Alliance.**
- **Ballitch does not understand, and thus mischaracterizes, Alliance polity.**
- **Ballitch speaks authoritatively of Alliance history and theology, but he has not done his homework—gaping gaps.**
- **Ballitch has not researched relevant materials crucial to his article, citing virtually nothing from 1898 to 1975, a period of 77 years, and missing huge amounts of other research, resulting in many false and misleading statements: *See Appendix 7 for a bibliography: “C&MA Sources on Women in Ministry Ballitch Could Have Consulted But Did Not.”***
- **Ballitch has no awareness of C&MA history as it relates to the historical 3-tier theological hermeneutic behind the “big tent” philosophy of The Alliance.** Simpson and The Alliance historically operated by an informal 3-tier theological hermeneutic with three levels of doctrinal importance:
 - 1st Tier—Essentials of the Faith (believed by all evangelical Christians)⁴
 - 2nd Tier—Alliance Distinctives—what makes The Alliance “The Alliance”⁵
 - 3rd Tier—Non-Essentials (Open Questions, Side Issues—which include roles of women in ministry, Calvinism and Arminianism, etc.).⁶

Note: Roles of women in ministry were declared an open question by the C&MA Board of Managers in 1906, reaffirmed in 1922, and in effect until 1999. More on this later. Ballitch has thus elevated his strict C interpretation of Scripture to 1st tier, rather than 3rd tier.

REVIEW OF PURPOSE 1: THE STATE OF THE QUESTION

Ballitch’s First Purpose Statement: “To summarize the question being asked in the C&MA regarding roles of women in ministry, in particular the use of the title “pastor” for women, along with the reasons it is being asked.”

- **Ballitch makes inaccurate, exaggerated, false statements, and logical fallacies in fleshing out his first purpose, which this paper will demonstrate.**
- **Ballitch himself is confused about Alliance history regarding women in ministry, due to his lack of knowledge of Alliance history and where the C&MA stands today.**
- **Ballitch makes assumptions without documentation and jumps to conclusions.** Without documentation, Ballitch assumptively states, “the C&MA’s original and long-standing conviction that the title ‘pastor’ is reserved for men and synonymous with

‘elder’ and ‘overseer’ in the New Testament.” This is also his conclusion, so that he ends up assuming his conclusion, which is the-logical fallacy of circular reasoning.⁷

- **Ballitch falsely claims that Dr. Stumbo and national and district leadership are “revisiting” this supposed “long-standing conviction,”** implying that they are trying to change something that has been fundamentally essential to The Alliance. In fact, in his conclusion, he overtly but falsely declares that they are “changing it into what it has never been.” More on these misleading statements next and later.
- **Ballitch thus makes broad, sweeping generalizations** with slanted and inaccurate terminology, **resulting in false statements** based on his lack of knowledge of Alliance history and theology. These false statements include:
 - “The C&MA’s original and *long-standing conviction* that the title ‘pastor’ is reserved for men and synonymous with ‘elder’ and ‘overseer’ in the New Testament.”
 - “the C&MA’s *historic, biblical understanding of the title “pastor”* is men only.
 - “the C&MA’s *consistent application of the title ‘pastor’*” has been men only.

Facts:

- Original conviction?—yes, for perhaps about the first 10 years of the C&MA, as Ballitch correctly documents.
 - Long standing conviction? — No. It is a short-standing conviction since 1999 that is by no means shared by all Alliance leaders.
 - The C&MA’s historic biblical understanding and consistent application of the title “pastor” has *not* been men only.
 - *Anointed Women* (pp 221-230) has fully documented 367 women from 1904 to 2008 who have been called “pastor” in Alliance documents.
 - **See Appendix 2: “Timeline of The Development of Simpson’s and The Alliance View and Practice of Women in Ministry.”**
- **Ballitch leaps to the false conclusion that women preaching is abnormal in the C&MA.** Perhaps it is abnormal in his limited experience and knowledge of The Alliance, but he does not seem to be aware that women preaching has been normalized in Alliance churches almost from its inception, as *Anointed Women* thoroughly documents with hundreds of examples. Women missionaries typically speak from the pulpit in most Alliance churches, but perhaps not in Ballitch’s experience.⁸ Women preaching is less common than men, but by no means abnormal.⁹
 - **Ballitch tries to make us think that the C&MA’s historic biblical understanding has always and unequivocally been that only men can be pastors.** This is not the truth. This is not the historic understanding and practice of the C&MA regarding the title of pastor, as shown throughout the book *Anointed Women*. In fact, just the opposite is true for the vast majority of C&MA history beginning in 1905.

- **Fact:** Extensive research reveals that apart from the first decade of The Alliance, no Alliance documents before 1981 state elders or pastors are only and always men.
- **Fact:** This is not the “long-standing conviction” of The Alliance throughout its history. Whether it is biblical or not continues to be debated in The Alliance; not settled, but upfront, Ballitch lays out his presuppositions as though they are facts. While there are some in the C&MA who have held and do currently hold this position, it became official only recently in 1999.

REVIEW OF PURPOSE 2: HISTORICAL AWARENESS AND TRAJECTORY— THE DIRECTION OF THE DENOMINATION.

On his last point under Purpose 1, “The State of the Question,” Ballitch claims, “A final reason proposed for reconsidering the C&MA’s consistent application of the title “pastor” is that the denomination is more restrictive of women than A.B. Simpson was. Also, current Alliance polity allows women to exercise the function of shepherding or pastoring in official capacities, serving as pastors in all but name.” He uses this as a segue into his second purpose.

Ballitch’s Second Purpose Statement: “This brings us to one of the key components of our endeavor, namely, to gain an historical awareness of where the C&MA has been on these issues as crucial context for understanding where it is today,” as well as “to describe the historical trajectory of the denomination up to this point as it relates to women in ministry.”

This is the meat of his article, along with his limited exegetical study that follows. He has two headings for Purpose 2: “The Founder of a Movement” and “The Direction of the Denomination.” Thus, he spends most of his time focusing on two areas: 1) Simpson’s beliefs regarding women in ministry in the first decade of the C&MA (1887-1898), and 2) The Alliance position and developments 1975 to the current time.

REVIEW OF PURPOSE 2, PART 1: THE FOUNDER OF A MOVEMENT

In this first part, Ballitch’s intent is to show that the denomination is not more restrictive than Simpson was (as he implies that national and district leadership suggest), but rather less restrictive. He does so by documenting Simpson’s statements between 1891 and 1897 in opposition to women serving in official ecclesiastical authority positions as pastors, elders, and overseers.

- **Ballitch’s presentation of Simpson’s early beliefs regarding ministry of women are for the most part accurate.**
- **By repeating earlier studies, Ballitch clearly demonstrates that in the very earliest days of The Alliance Simpson was strongly complementarian.**
- **Ballitch thus validates a portion of his assumption** that states, “The C&MA’s *original* . . . conviction that the title ‘pastor’ is reserved for men and synonymous with ‘elder’ and ‘overseer’ in the New Testament.”

- **Ballitch did concede that Simpson allowed for women to speak in what he called “non-ecclesiastical” settings**, even in his earlier days, but not in the official ecclesiastical offices of the church.

As the wisdom of Solomon advises us, “The first to plead his case *seems* right, until another comes and examines him” (Proverbs 18:17). No one disputes that these were Simpson’s early views and many, including Ballitch, have cited them. However, Ballitch’s argument leaps to conclusions about Simpson’s ongoing stances regarding the roles of women in ministry. Documentation of the facts shows that Simpson and The Alliance changed their views in the second decade of the C&MA and following for nearly 100 years until 1999 in the US C&MA. The Canadian C&MA, on the other hand, as well as many other Alliance fields worldwide have continued to maintain the historic Alliance position of openness to women as pastors and elders.

- **Ballitch fails to discern between early Simpson and later Simpson.** He fails to detect the nuances in Simpson’s change of thinking and wrongly assumes A.B. Simpson’s initial stricter C beliefs on roles of women in ministry remained the same throughout his life.¹⁰ (See *Anointed Women*, pp 20-27).
- **Ballitch wrongly assumes initial beliefs of Simpson and the earliest Alliance on roles of women in ministry remained the same throughout Alliance history.** The facts are that Simpson and The Alliance did not continue to hold to these stricter views after the first decade of the founding of The Alliance. (See *Anointed Women*, pp. 19-43; Barbara Howe, *Forgotten Voices*).
- **Ballitch fails to understand how radically open Simpson’s view of women in ministry was for traditional churches of his day.**¹¹
- **Ballitch fails to understand the C&MA’s historic growing flexibility in church government, including roles of women in ministry, as “open questions.”** As Simpson’s “Alliance” embraced a variety of church traditions and expressions, his church polity became much more flexible—as former Canadian C&MA president Dr. Franklin Pyles put it, The Alliance was “a group that had created a warm governance amalgam from both Methodist and Presbyterian sources.”¹² Issues of church polity, including women in ministry, would become “open questions” in the C&MA.¹³
- **Ballitch fails to understand Simpson’s view of prophecy and preaching by women.** Ballitch does not seem to know that Simpson equated prophecy with preaching. He falsely concludes, “Simpson left open the door for the prophetic ministry of women in the corporate worship of local churches, but the more such a ministry felt like preaching, the more uncomfortable he became.”¹⁴ If Ballitch had studied through the rest of Simpson’s life or had read *Anointed Women*, he would find that women had freedom to preach in Simpson’s pulpit, and throughout The Alliance.
- **Ballitch misinterprets Simpson as being “conflicted” and “equivocal,” rather than recognizing and accepting Simpson’s views as changing and growing in flexibility.** Ballitch acknowledged, “one will find conflicting statements and practices from

Simpson,” but he wrongly insisted Simpson maintained his strong stance against women preaching and pastoring.¹⁵

- **Ballitch has mistakenly assumed Simpson’s use of the term “man” always meant “male,” thus he erroneously concluded Simpson was against women preaching and leading.**¹⁶ Not understanding 19th century use of “man” as generic language for human beings, Ballitch has misinterpreted Simpson. Because Simpson used the term “man of God” and the male pronoun, Ballitch erroneously assumed Simpson was talking only about men, when it was actually common in the 19th and much of the 20th century to use the term “man” generically of people whether male or female.

REVIEW OF PART 2, PURPOSE 2: THE DIRECTION OF A DENOMINATION

Ballitch reviewed the discussions, debates and reports from the 1980s to 2020, lauding decisions that would restrict women in ministry and expressing disappointment for those that did not. To him, Alliance leadership has been too soft, too accommodating, not consistently strict enough. However, it is worth noting that **Ballitch does acknowledge, “The ‘elder authority’ language was added to the manual illegitimately,** as it was not the terminology in the recommendation approved by General Council.”

- **Ballitch leaves a gaping gap of 77 years:** “Fast forward to 1974 [from the 1890s], the year the C&MA transitioned from being a movement, a coalition of churches, to a denomination.”¹⁷
- **Ballitch thus shows no “historical awareness” and provides no accurate “historical trajectory”** of women in ministry in The Alliance from 1898 to 1975.
 - Ballitch further has no “historical awareness” or “trajectory” of women in ministry in the Canadian C&MA, which has always allowed for women in pastoral ministry. (See Barbara Howe, *Forgotten Voices*).
 - Thus, Ballitch’s overall “historical awareness” of Alliance history is extremely limited and his overall presentation of the “historical trajectory” of roles of women in ministry in The Alliance and is seriously flawed and deficient—piecemeal, inaccurate, and one-sided.¹⁸
- **Ballitch makes a misleading half-truth, half-false statement: “The formal licensing and ordination process, which the C&MA carried over from its existence as a movement, was reserved exclusively for men.”** Ballitch refers to the 1975 Licensing and Ordination Manual in which he claims limits pastoral ministry to men.
 - **Half-truth:** It is true that ordination of men only was carried over from The Alliance as a movement to a denomination.
 - **Half-false:** However, it is false that men only were licensed. Women were licensed from the early days of The Alliance and have continued to be licensed.

- **Historical Fact: C&MA President Nathan Bailey affirmed to the IRS in 1964:** “Never in the history of the church has a distinction been made between licensed men ministers and licensed women ministers. . . . *women ministers are as fully qualified to perform sacerdotal functions as any male minister. . . . This is the historic position of the church for over seventy-five years.*”¹⁹ This fact has often been ignored or even suppressed.
- **Ballitch jumps to conclusions based a small, narrow, incomplete set of data,** missing a huge black hole of 77 years of documented vital data, and much other research. Thus, among many other things, Ballitch wrongly jumps to the conclusion that it has always been the C&MA’s “long-standing conviction” that the title ‘pastor’ is reserved for men and synonymous with ‘elder’ and ‘overseer’ in the New Testament.”
- **Ballitch does not tell the whole story of the events and actions of the 1990s regarding women in ministry.** He does tell *some* of the story extensively, and it sounds pretty convincing, but he leaves out much of the background and alternative perspectives. While what he presents is detailed, thereby seemingly substantial and conclusive, he leaves out significant and crucial details.²⁰ While Ballitch may have had good intentions to provide a historical trajectory for The Alliance, he became fixated on his assumptions and failed to investigate 77 years of C&MA history.
- **Just as he did with Simpson, again Ballitch misinterprets the use of the generic term “men” as “male” in Alliance documents in the 1970s, falsely claiming only men can be credentialed in the C&MA:** “The formal licensing and ordination process, which the C&MA carried over from its existence as a movement, was reserved exclusively for men.”²¹ For examples showing Ballitch’s claim to be false, see **Appendix 3, “Women Serving as Pastors and Elders in the C&MA 1975-2008.”** The issue of women’s roles in ministry was officially an open question from 1906, until 1999 when it became a closed question. Some may claim it became closed with the 1975 manual, but women were not barred from serving as pastors until 1999 when it was voted on by General Council. Had it been official in 1975, a vote in 1999 would have been redundant and out of order.
- **Ballitch criticizes the efforts of Alliance leadership as “several lurches in the egalitarian direction.”**²² In reality, Dr. Stumbo and Alliance leadership are endeavoring to curb historical drift and to restore the historic E-C balance. (See “The Problem of Wineskins: Cracks of Historical Drift,” *Anointed Women*, 43-48). Since Ballitch is a hard-core C, he disparagingly mischaracterizes such course corrections as “egalitarian lurches.”
- **Ballitch falsely concludes of the 2011 *Licensing and Ordination Manual*, “For the first time, C&MA official policy explicitly authorized women to preach during the gathered worship of local churches.”**²³
 - **Historical Fact:** The 2011 Manual was *not* the first time. *Women had been explicitly authorized to preach in the C&MA since 1910* when New York State Supt. E.J. Richards officially appointed the first woman pastor (tacitly approved by Simpson in his own backyard). As documentation will show again and again in this paper and

throughout the book *Anointed Women*, women have been authorized to preach regular worship services of The Alliance almost from its inception.

- **Thus, Ballitch has failed to achieve his purpose** “to gain an historical awareness of where the C&MA has been on these issues as crucial context for understanding where it is today,” and “to describe the historical trajectory of the denomination up to this point as it relates to women in ministry.”²⁴

REVIEW OF PURPOSE 3: THE LENS OF SCRIPTURE

Under the heading “The Lens of Scripture,” Ballitch’s third purpose was “to both evaluate current C&MA practice according to Scripture and answer the question, should the C&MA call women pastors?” Ballitch provides a caveat to limit his purpose in an endnote (62): “The purpose of this section is not to provide a thoroughly defended, definitive interpretation, but rather to offer a position that points readers to some solid resources and historic CMA exegesis.”

The focus of this section is presenting a 3-page, standard strict C interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9-15, focusing on Paul’s argument of creation order in verse 13 and on exegetical details of Greek grammar and syntax in verse 12, especially regarding Paul’s use of *authenteo* for exercising authority. He contrasts his exegetical interpretation with recent and current Alliance moderate C interpretation, allowing for women to teach and exercise authority under elder authority so long as not usurping authority which he considers “dubious,” “questionable,” and “beyond exegetical warrant.” He says that Alliance exegesis allowing women to be called pastors should be “debated and repudiated.”

The heading for Ballitch’s third purpose would be more accurately titled “The Strict Complementarian CBMW Lens of Scripture.” By “the lens of Scripture” he really means *his interpretation* of Scripture, not accepting or even considering the possibility of other viewpoints—not even other C viewpoints. Thus, Ballitch’s supposed “biblical evaluation of the current C&MA position” is *not* purely through “the lens of Scripture,” but according to his strict C-colored lens of interpretation of Scripture, in accord with the CBMW, for whom he is writing.²⁵

- **In reality, Ballitch makes little attempt to deal with the debatable issues**, not even to consider alternative viewpoints by fellow Cs who may not share all of his interpretations of the texts. Ballitch exegetes a narrow slice of a slice—some limited exegesis. Ballitch does do some extended exegesis of a couple of the many issues surrounding 1 Timothy 2:12, but he does not engage the research of other viewpoints. *See Appendix 4, “Samples of Complementarians with Varying Interpretations” and Appendix 5, “Issues Not Covered in Ballitch’s Exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:9-3:1-15.”*
- **Ballitch cites scholarship that agrees with his assumption but does not grapple with scholarship (including from complementarians) who come to other conclusions.** Ballitch defends a typical strict C view, which is legitimate, but he does so without wrestling significantly with the issues and counterarguments Es and even some moderate Cs present.²⁶ Ballitch launches into an exegetical interpretation of tenses, and positive and negative uses, but he makes no attempt to answer or honestly wrestle with the many possible exegetical interpretations of the words, syntax, and context of the verses, and he

fails to acknowledge that even some fellow Cs would disagree with his interpretations in some matters. He presents his view as THE biblical view. *See Appendix 5 for “Issues Not Covered in Ballitch’s Exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:9-3:1-15.”*

- **Ballitch appears uninformed of historically documented roles of women as leaders during biblical times, as well as in church history.** The endnote that follows gives a brief survey of some of those documented examples.²⁷
- **Ballitch skirts the vital question of why did Paul use an obscure word like *authenteo* instead of *exousias*, if he meant the usual understanding of authority?** For the moderate or soft C, it is not as much of a problem if it is translated “usurp authority,” which Ballitch finds unacceptable. *See Appendix 5* for more on this.
- **Likewise, Ballitch ignores the vital hermeneutical principle of not building a doctrine on around an isolated verse with a dogmatic interpretation of a widely debated rare Greek term used nowhere else in Scripture.** The Greek term *authenteo* (variously translated as exercise authority, usurp authority, domineer, etc.) is a *hapax legomen*, a word used nowhere else in the Bible.²⁸ As Oscar Cullman warned years ago, “the fountainhead of all false biblical interpretation and all heresy is invariably the isolation and absolutizing of one single passage.” *See Appendix 5* for more on this.
- **Ballitch uses strongly authoritative but exaggerated language to exert his exegetical prowess** with phrases like:
 - “... impeccable exercise in biblical theology...”
 - “This exegesis ought to be debated and repudiated...”
 - “That trajectory has already moved beyond exegetical warrant...”
 - “The grammar demands. . .”
 - “We may safely conclude. . .”
 - “only when an ingressive aorist is used”

Not many biblical exegetes will use such firm and confident language or “safely conclude” many grammatical issues, especially about this passage. Most will speak in terms of probability or likelihood.

- **Ballitch does not address the problematic issues with the term “elder authority.”** Ballitch lauds the more recent terminology of “elder authority” invented in the C&MA 1981, formalized in 1999, in limiting women’s roles in ministry, but he does not deal with the meaning of “elder authority” exegetically in Scripture or in the C&MA.²⁹ *See Appendix 6: “Problematic Issues and Timeline in the C&MA Regarding Elder Authority.”*
- **Ballitch finds fault with even a moderate C interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:12 and related Scriptures upon which Alliance bases its current policies and practices.** Ballitch calls the current and past C&MA soft and moderate C interpretations “dubious,” “unlikely,” “questionable,” and “beyond exegetical warrant,” adamantly asserting, “This exegesis ought to be debated and repudiated.” In his view, The Alliance is inconsistent in

its C stance and is not strongly C enough. He would impose an even stricter complementarianism upon the C&MA.

- **Ballitch fails in his claim to point readers to “solid resources and historic CMA exegesis.”**³⁰ Not knowing Alliance history and theology, he appears unaware of most of those resources and exegesis. *See Appendix 7 for “C&MA Sources on Women in Ministry Ballitch Could Have Consulted But Did Not.”*
- **Ballitch scorned the moderating view of the 1995 Report to General Council, which, in reality, was historically The Alliance “open question” view:** “While we seek consensus as much as is within us, we view the issue of women in ministry as peripheral to those things which are essential in matters of faith and doctrine and, therefore, require unity.” With this premise, the committee recommended, “that there be no restrictions on the ministry of un-ordained men and women in ministry,” and “that local churches of The Christian and Missionary Alliance be authorized to adjust their bylaws to reflect their local convictions and practice with respect to the role of women in ministry.”³¹
- **Ballitch failed to do what he said he would do.** He began well by digging into exegesis, but then skirted the complex issues of exegesis of the texts. He focused on limited C-biased exegesis without adequately answering other significant views, some even by fellow Cs. *See Appendix 5, for “Issues Not Covered in Ballitch’s Exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:9-3:1-15.”*
- **Ballitch fails to acknowledge the reality of Alliance history,** that there have always been people on both sides of the issue, that The Alliance historically has been “soft” C, affirming that male leadership was God’s usual plan, but God made “exceptions” and so should we. There have been times of debate at General Council, such as in the 1950s when it was decided, as Tozer had opined, that this was a side issue.

REVIEW OF BALLITCH’S CONCLUSION: “A QUESTION OF FAITHFULNESS”—A QUANTUM LEAP

Ballitch’s conclusion is summed up in his opening statement, “The local option for deciding whether women may be called “pastors” is the wrong way forward.” The rest of his conclusion is comprised of compelling reasons why. He ends his article by saying:

And what has the C&MA always been? Committed to the authority of Scripture and its application, over and above pragmatic, emotive, convenient, or cultural temptations. The C&MA is a Bible people. We bring our emotions, experience, traditions, and reason itself under the authority of God’s Word. I believe that with all my heart. And I intend to devote my life to the larger cause of Christ from within the C&MA as long as I believe that to be true.

- **Even Ballitch’s positive statement has a negative caveat, for *implicit in his statement are jabs at Dr. Stumbo and national and district leadership*,** implying that because of their “trajectory” of change they are not committed to the authority of Scripture over and

above pragmatic, emotive, convenient, or cultural temptations, and that they are not bringing their emotions, experience, traditions, and reason itself under the authority of God's Word.

- **If anyone has any doubts this what he means, Ballitch reinforces it upfront, beginning his conclusion by explicitly titling the heading “A Question of Faithfulness.”** Ballitch frankly questions the faithfulness of Dr. Stumbo and national and district leadership and warns with bold, demanding, and even defiant statements that if the trajectory is followed to allow women to be called pastors:
 - It is “questionable biblical interpretation.”
 - “it would assuredly cause division in local churches”
 - It would develop “reputations of progressivism” as opposed to conservatism, “spurring exoduses likely both ways.”³²
 - “That trajectory has already moved beyond exegetical warrant.”
 - “It not only must be stopped, but ground needs to be regained. The issue is not the opening of the door to egalitarianism, it is the survival of complementarianism. The line should be drawn where Scripture is clear.”
 - “Better to have people leave over what the C&MA has always been, than to drive people out by changing it into what it has never been.”

I stated at the beginning of this article:

The accusations Ballitch makes are serious. He questions the faithfulness of Dr. Stumbo and Alliance leadership. He implies they are moving to what is pejoratively called ‘progressive Christianity’ (the new terminology for “liberal”). If he is right, and Dr. Stumbo and national and district leadership are taking us down an unbiblical path, his warnings should be heeded. However, if Ballitch is wrong, his article causes deception, damage, and division to our beloved Alliance.

I believe this paper demonstrates clearly that Ballitch’s implied and blatant accusations against Dr. Stumbo and national and district leadership are unfounded and undeserved—they are quantum leaps into the unknown and unreal.

- **In his conclusion, first, Ballitch falsely claims: “Both C&MA exegesis and history preclude women from being given the label ‘pastor.’”³³** On the contrary, historic C&MA exegesis has allowed for differing points of view and considered this an open question from 1906 to 1999, or as Tozer put it, “a side issue.” Only recent C&MA exegesis from 1999 preclude women from being called pastors (but not agreed by all C&MA scholars). See **Appendix 8: “A Summary of the Historic C&MA Exegesis of Biblical Passages Relating to Roles of Women in Ministry.”**
- **Ballitch needlessly stirs up fear of division, falsely prophesying:** “Departure from this position to a local option . . . would assuredly cause division in local churches.”³⁴ With his limited experience in The Alliance, Ballitch apparently is not aware that divisions have already occurred as a result of the 1999 decision and at least one Alliance

megachurch left The Alliance over it. That decision actually broke the historic 90 year “harmonized diversity” of E-C policy of “live and let live” and “agree to disagree agreeably,” and set in motion the ongoing and current conversations.

Further, he is not aware of Alliance leadership making heart-felt endeavors to reverse the effects of that division, as well as of many others in the Alliance. One historic moment, among others, took place in 2006, when then-President Dr. Gary Benedict gave the keynote address for the launch of an Alliance renewal movement called “Rekindle the Flame Gathering,” and called The Alliance to repentance regarding several issues, including attitudes toward women in ministry, leading us by example. In his servant spirit, shown to us at his election at General Council, Dr. Benedict proceeded to confess specifically and intentionally the sins of the Alliance, repenting in behalf of the C&MA of denominationalism, hierarchicalism and top-down leadership, Anglo-elitism, attitudes of competition, a spirit of privilege and entitlement, an attitude that policy and methods are key to success, losing the wonder of God, being too familiar with the sacred, dwindled faith and lack of risk, *attitudes of devaluing women, ministry elitism*, neglect of holistic ministry, superficial spirituality and accountability, content with counting conversions rather than mature disciples, and attitudes of robbing God of His glory, saying, “Look what we have done” (*italics mine*). This spirit of humble confession set the stage for all that was to follow and put us all on our faces repenting before the Lord. He specifically emphasized attitudes of devaluing women and ministry elitism. I am not sure if that act was the first catalyst to try to restore harmony between Es and Cs in the Alliance, but it was a most significant one.³⁵

- **Ballitch’s fears are unfounded and baseless, not based on historical evidence, which shows otherwise.** When we examine the real and full history of women in ministry in The Alliance, it shows that Ballitch’s fears that allowing local churches to set their own policies on women in ministry would be divisive are unfounded. He is not aware that for 90 years in The Alliance the issue of roles of women in ministry was an open question and while disagreements rose from time to time, The Alliance did just fine overall allowing local churches to decide if they wanted a female pastor or elder. Division did not occur. There were not continual conflicts at the local level.

A woman in leadership was never forced on any congregation, but where a church desired, whether as an elder or pastor, a woman leader who demonstrated the anointing of God in her life and was properly under authority, not usurping authority, it was permitted and welcomed. In some churches “lady preachers” were not accepted, so they just went where they were accepted. Ballitch can disagree with the interpretation, but this was the historic interpretation of The Alliance.

There is no need for division if both strong Cs and strong Es would put down their arms. It would cause division if strict Cs or strict Es make it divisive. ***A middle ground that has been The Alliance position and has historically worked can work again if the extremes on both sides will truly practice Alliance “harmonized diversity”—love and liberty in unity.***

- **Ballitch’s rhetoric becomes hard-core, almost warlike:**

- “The narrow ‘should the C&MA call women pastors’ question is part of a larger historical discussion, indeed, a trajectory. That trajectory has already moved beyond exegetical warrant. It not only must be stopped, but ground needs to be regained.”
- Ballitch bullishly maintains, “Better to have people leave over what the C&MA has always been, than to drive people out by changing it into what it has never been.”
- Ballitch adamantly insists, “The line should be drawn where Scripture is clear. A pastor is an elder is an overseer. Pastors-elders-overseers are biblically qualified men. And only those qualified to be pastors-elders-overseers preach during corporate worship of local churches.” (Even when other fellow Cs like Craig Blomberg disagree with Ballitch: “But because ‘pastor’ can also be a spiritual gift in Paul’s lists of gifts, and because many people today are even given the official title or office of pastor without functioning as a biblical elder or overseer, I am reluctant to throw in ‘pastor’ along with elder and overseer.”³⁶)

This rhetoric is contrary to the historic Alliance spirit. the early Alliance admonition that such issues as women in ministry should “not be pressed aggressively in a controversial spirit” without “antagonism and strife toward those who may hold different opinions.” This wisdom has been ignored and abandoned by Ballitch.

- **Ballitch falsely implies that Dr. Stumbo and Alliance leadership are moving The Alliance away from the authority of Scripture toward “progressive Christianity.”** Contrary to Ballitch’s fears, they are endeavoring to restore and move The Alliance back toward where it had been before, advancing the gospel in unity, not uniformity, advocating a middle ground where the roles of women and ministry are more open questions, non-essentials once again as they were for 90 years of our history.³⁷
- **Ballitch falsely accuses Dr. Stumbo and Alliance leadership of going “beyond exegetical warrant.”** It is one thing to disagree with an interpretation, but he casts judgment on godly leaders who believe in the authority of Scripture just as he does, but prayerfully are led to different conclusions. Self-assuredly believing he is an expert on Greek exegesis, Ballitch violates The Alliance big tent spirit of agreeing to disagree agreeably.
- **Ballitch rigidly insists, “The line should be drawn where Scripture is clear.** A pastor is an elder is an overseer. Pastors-elders-overseers are biblically qualified men. And only those qualified to be pastors-elders-overseers preach during corporate worship of local churches.” Ballitch is bullish and very un-Alliance in his position. Alliance leaders may have crossed his line, but not the biblical exegetical line. He is drawing a line where The Alliance and many other Bible-believing evangelicals do not. Historically, The Alliance has maintained flexibility and harmony even while disagreeing. To many in The Alliance today, as well as to Simpson, early Alliance leaders, and Alliance leaders throughout our history, (and even to many complementarians today) the Scripture is not clear on this matter, any more than it is about Calvinism and Arminianism.

Leadership as a pastor or elder or overseer is *usually* male, but not absolutely, without exception.³⁸ What Ballitch is really saying is that line should be drawn where his interpretation of Scripture is clear to him. The Scripture may be clear to hard core Cs. Another interpretation of Scripture is clear to hard-core Es. The scripture is clear to hard-core Calvinists and the Scripture is equally clear to hard-core Arminians.

- **Ballitch inflexibly and insensitively maintains, “Better to have people leave over what the C&MA has always been, than to drive people out by changing it into what it has never been.”** I might agree with that statement, except Ballitch has no idea what The Alliance has always been. From his little experience in The Alliance, he has painted a woefully inaccurate, deficient, distorted, false picture of what The Alliance has always been.³⁹ For a newcomer to being licensed in The Alliance, irrespective of his views, I would conclude that Ballitch is quite audacious in prescribing and dictating what The Alliance should be. If a strong E used such rhetoric, I would say the same.
- **Ballitch wrongly implies that Dr. Stumbo and national C&MA leadership are “yielding to pragmatic, emotive, convenient, or cultural temptations.”** Ballitch asserts: “And what has the C&MA always been? Committed to the authority of Scripture and its application, over and above pragmatic, emotive, convenient, or cultural temptations.” I agree with the that statement too, except that what Ballitch means by that statement is a far cry of what The Alliance has always been. He believes his interpretation of Scripture is the only right one. That is not the way The Alliance operates. Some people are just as convinced about Calvinism or Arminianism as they are about C and E views on roles of women in ministry. It is one of the open question non-essentials of The Alliance ecumenical hermeneutic.

Dr. Stumbo and district leadership are committed to the authority of Scripture and its application, over and above pragmatic, emotive, convenient, or cultural temptations They are trying to get us back on track to being a big tent once again, to make the main thing the main thing, by distinguishing the open questions/non-essentials/side issues from the essentials and distinctives of the C&MA.
- **Ballitch presents a false either-or dichotomy.** Because he perceives everything as only black or white, he cannot conceive of in-between views or options. For Ballitch, there is no middle ground, no third or fourth option. It is all or none. Moderate or soft C views are unacceptable to him. If he had his way, women would never preach in The Alliance even if they did not have the title of pastor. If he had his way, many Consecrated Women in Ministry would never be able to do what they do now. His solution is to make The Alliance strict C, something The Alliance has never been, even stricter than the earliest days of The Alliance.
- **Ballitch does not understand C&MA polity.** Ballitch, in in conclusion, falsely claims, “The C&MA is not congregational in its polity. It has a denominational hierarchy.” This statement is a half-truth—partially true, partially false, so Ballitch seems a bit confused. Since he has just recently been licensed in the C&MA, perhaps he has not taken the Alliance polity course yet. In reality, the C&MA is a blend of all three types of church polity: episcopal, presbyterial, and congregational, or as mentioned earlier, former

Canadian C&MA president Dr. Franklin Pyles put it, “a group that had created a warm governance amalgam from both Methodist and Presbyterian sources.”⁴⁰ As with so many issues in the big tent Alliance, we find elements of truth in various viewpoints.

The Alliance does have a little denominational hierarchy, but it is minimal compared to traditional churches like Methodist, Episcopal, Lutheran, etc. It is mostly a blend of presbyterial *and congregational* with just a little bit of hierarchy. Plurality of leadership working together as a team blends in the presbyterial aspect. The local church has a lot of autonomy within constituted authority, so is somewhat congregational in polity, but less so than the Baptist tribe from which he most recently came. Perhaps his Baptist view of congregational polity has confused him about the congregational aspect of The Alliance.

What Dr. Stumbo and national and district leadership are proposing is to lessen top-down decisions from the national office and increase congregational autonomy for women in ministry decisions as it was for 90 years of Alliance history, allowing the local church to decide if they want a woman pastor or elder.

- **Ballitch adamantly advocates turning the C&MA into a strict C only denomination, not the flexible, welcoming Alliance big tent.** Ballitch has made up his mind and wants to make up the C&MA mind to adopt his strict C views. Rather than the historic Alliance big tent stance that this is an open question like Calvinism and Arminianism. He asserts: “The issue is not the opening of the door to egalitarianism, it is the survival of complementarianism.” What he really means is the survival of hard-core complementarianism, not Alliance policy. He falsely contends that The Alliance has always taught and practiced this. **In Ballitch’s Alliance, there is no room for even soft and moderate Cs, let alone Es. In Simpson’s Alliance, there was room for both,** so long as neither side got too adamant.
- **Ballitch makes the false judgment that holding to egalitarianism or some middle ground moderating position such as a moderate or soft C must involve a low view of Scripture.** This kind of rhetoric is judgmental and not helpful to the discussions in The Alliance. I hold to a very high view of Scripture, but as a former strong C like Ballitch, I came to the conclusion that a high view of Scripture cannot be dogmatic about portions of Scripture that are very debatable, whether about women in ministry, Calvinism and Arminianism, various views of the end times, etc.

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE ARTICLE AS A WHOLE

- **Ballitch’s article has been found to have numerous shaky fault lines, creating great cracks in Ballitch’s assumptions, and thus making quantum leaps over those giant gaps.** He is missing critical historical and theological data and facts for the bulk of Alliance history (77 years) of women in ministry.
- **Ballitch is dogmatic and rigid about what he himself considers clear in Scripture.** This issue is complex; Ballitch tries to make it simplistic, when even fellow Cs disagree with him on certain points. It involves the exegesis of several more passages of Scripture from all sides, looking as objectively as possible at the whole of Scripture--"the whole

counsel" of God, looking at God's ways which are higher than our ways, and maintaining a high view of Scripture. Where Scripture is clear, we can make clear conclusions; where interpretations can be debated then those things are 3rd tier. Scripture is clear only about the essentials that all evangelical Bible-believing Christians can agree upon. The E-C debate is not a 1st-tier essential issue. Nor, for that matter, was it a 2nd-tier Alliance distinctive for 90 years of Alliance history. It was officially a 3rd tier open question until 1999. It should return and remain where it was for 90 years in The Alliance—a 3rd-tier non-essential, open question—a side issue as Simpson and Tozer considered it. (See endnotes 4-6 and my e-book PDF of *Essentials, Distinctives, Open Questions: The 3-Tier Alliance Theological Hermeneutic*).

- **Ballitch does not understand that historically The Alliance is neither solely C, nor solely E.** Like Ballitch, there are others in The Alliance who insist that the C&MA be strongly C. There are those who insist that The Alliance be strongly E. There are some in the middle. In reality, The Alliance is neither and is both at the same time. The Alliance is not and should not be solely C. That is not our history and not our hermeneutic. The Alliance is not and should not be solely E. That is not our history and not our hermeneutic.
- **Ballitch does not understand that historically Alliance leaders have endeavored to maintain a charitable spirit** of toleration, love, and liberty along the line of the dictum attributed to Augustine: “Unity in things essential, liberty in things non-essential, and charity in all things.” Differing views and practices regarding women in ministry were regarded in the realm of the non-essential in which liberty was encouraged. Tozer likewise regarded the debate as a secondary issue.

FINAL WORDS: WISE COUNSEL FROM A.B. SIMPSON

A.B. Simpson gives some wise counsel which Ballitch and we all would do well to heed:

There is nothing that so rends the body of Christ and destroys all unity in Christian life as religious controversy, especially about non-essential matters. There is room for an infinite variety of opinion of minor points, but there is no need to flaunt our opinions in the face of our brethren and provoke them to criticism and controversy. Things which if allowed to rest would never be serious difficulties, when agitated, grow into an exaggerated importance, and Christian love becomes suspended on a lot of side issues, and separated from its true centre. There are, it is true, great essential principles that we cannot compromise, respecting the person and work of Christ, the simplicity of the great salvation, the fullness of redemption, and the future life, but the platform is broad enough to hold the great body of evangelical Christians, and bridge over the hundred little differences that need never have been publicly emphasized.... This principle, then, of respecting the conscience of our brethren in things non-essential, is the true secret of toleration and Christian unity.⁴¹

APPENDIX 1

COMPLEMENTARIAN-EGALITARIAN (C-E) CONTINUUM AND WHERE THE ALLIANCE FITS IN

These are generalizations, not hard-and-fast characteristics, subject to adjustment and revision with more specific information. I have placed the advocates and denominations of each position or level as best as I know from what I have researched, but I can adjust as warranted with new information.

	Characteristics	Beliefs	Advocates	Denominations
Hard-C	Dogmatic & insistent. Other viewpoints are unacceptable.	Women are to be silent in church Women cannot teach	Piper, Grudem, Sproul, MacArthur, Bruce Ware, George Knight	Wisconsin & Missouri Synod Lutherans, Baptists Roman Catholic Some Presbyterians Church of Christ Calvary Chapel
Moderate-C	Strong or moderate belief, but tolerant	Women may minister under authority with some restrictions.	Tom Schreiner Susan Foh ⁴² J.I. Packer	C&MA-1999ff Some Baptists Some Presbyterians
Soft-C/ E-C	Mild to moderate belief but liberty of conscience	Women may minister freely under authority with few restrictions	A.B. Simpson, Tozer, C&MA leaders (1906-1975/99)	C&MA 1906-1975/99 Anglican, Church of God in Christ Evangelical Free
Neither or embrace both	Neutral, embraces both, or seeks to find truth in both	Both equality of ministry and complementarity recognized	Catherine Booth Amy Carmichael Lee-Barnewall, "Neither Complementarian nor Egalitarian"	Christian Reformed Vineyard Salvation Army (husbands & wives pastor together) Church of the Brethren
Soft-E	Mild to Moderate belief but liberty of conscience	Women may minister freely under authority with few restrictions	Phoebe Palmer Craig Keener	Brethren in Christ Some Mennonites Some Quakers Some Pentecostals
Moderate-E	Strong or moderate belief, but tolerant	Women may minister freely under authority	Hannah Whitall Smith Gordon Fee Ruth Tucker Walter Liefeld	Some Quakers, Free Methodist, Church of the Nazarene, AME, Pentecostal, Evangelical Presbyterian, Evangelical Covenant
Hard-E	Dogmatic & insistent Other viewpoints are unacceptable	Women may minister freely. Hierarchialism is unbiblical patriarchialism.	Kroegers; Eddie & Susan Hyatt; Berkley & Alvera Mickelson Scanzoni, Hardesty	United Methodist, United Church of Christ, some Presbyterians

Within each of these positions there may be several sub-positions or variations. Some may overlap with another category. They could be subdivided as Ultra Hard, Hard, Moderately Hard; Strong Moderate, Moderate, Mildly Moderate; Moderately Soft, Soft, Ultra Soft. Basically, both Cs and Es are all over the map.

ALLIANCE LEADER QUOTES OF THE ALLIANCE OPEN QUESTION, NON-ESSENTIAL SIDE ISSUES—THE E-C MIDDLE GROUND

Matters of church government, including roles of women in ministry are non-essentials. Simpson wrote, “There is nothing that so rends the body of Christ and destroys all unity in Christian life as religious controversy, especially about non-essential matters. There is room for an infinite variety of opinion of minor points, but there is no need to flaunt our opinions in the face of our brethren and provoke them to criticism and controversy. Things which if allowed to rest would never be serious difficulties, when agitated, grow into an exaggerated importance, and Christian love becomes suspended on a lot of side issues, and separated from its true centre. There are, it is true, great essential principles that we cannot compromise, respecting the person and work of Christ, the simplicity of the great salvation, the fullness of redemption, and the future life, but the platform is broad enough to hold the great body of evangelical Christians, and bridge over the hundred little differences that need never have been publicly emphasized.... This principle, then, of respecting the conscience of our brethren in things non-essential, is the true secret of toleration and Christian unity.”

Liberty of Opinion without Pressure, Aggressiveness, Antagonism. The Alliance gave liberty to teachers in presenting various opinions, so long as they “shall not be pressured in an aggressive or controversial spirit toward those who differ,” and “with the understanding that any spirit of antagonism and strife toward those who may hold different opinions is discountenanced.” Alliance leaders agreed to disagree peacefully on those things in an attitude of love, charity, and acceptance.

There is to be no controversy—agree to differ. “It was distinctly understood when The Alliance was organized that there was to be no controversy on the questions of church government, baptism, feet washing, Calvinism, Arminianism, etc., on which the various evangelical bodies are divided, but we were simply to agree to differ.”⁴³

Substantial oneness of spirit amid an infinite diversity of expression. Simpson wrote: “There is often needless controversy about phrases of truth and phrases in which it is expressed...’ and simple hearts become perplexed while dogmatic people become warlike over these various lines of battle. Perhaps after all we shall find when we reach the land of perfect light that these various parties were nearer together than they dreamed, and that amid an infinite diversity of expression there was substantial oneness of spirit. After all the great thing is not so much what we say but what we are and what Christ is to us. The finest theories and the most Scriptural phrases do not constitute the divine life. Let us learn to recognize the Christ life behind every variety of temperament and theological expression. At the same time we shall find it very safe to keep close to Bible terms. If we meet God on His own very Word we shall find that He will meet us in blessing.”⁴⁴

Christ-Centeredness. Board of Managers member John MacMillan called it “harmonized diversity,” saying, “Where there is this Christo-centric attitude, differences of doctrine and variations in forms of worship are recognized as non-essentials of faith.”³³

APPENDIX 2

TIMELINE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF SIMPSON'S AND THE C&MA VIEW AND PRACTICE OF WOMEN IN MINISTRY

Strong Complementarian Simpson 1891-1893

- 1891: “The New Testament prohibits women from the formal and official ministry of the Christian church in the strictly ecclesiastical sense. She is not called to be a pastor, an elder, a bishop.”
- 1891: “The less formal her testimony is, the better. The more it takes the form of a simple story of love, the less like a sermon and the more like a conversation, the more effective it will be.”^[25]
- 1893: women can serve “in all but the pastoral office and the official ministry of the Christian church.”

Less Strict Complementarian Simpson—Women Preaching in Public Is a Side Issue

- **1893: Simpson begins to describe women preaching in public as “*a little side issue* of purely speculative character, which God has already settled, not only in His Word but in His providence, by the seal which he is placing in this very day, in every part of the world, upon the public work of consecrated Christian women.”** Ballitch comments, “It is important to note that at issue is not preaching in the local church, but rather women speaking in public in an extra-ecclesiastical setting.” And yet, he misses that Simpson directs his statement to “ecclesiastical convictions”:

The dear brother seems to have quite forgotten all the glorious results of that great convention, in the single fact that it had run across one of his *ecclesiastical convictions* and the opportunity of proving that the convention and the women were wrong in that one particular seems to have almost obliterated all the other effects of the convention and kept him and his brethren from reaping the glorious harvest of spiritual blessing that ought to have been gathered out of such a meeting.”

Ballitch does not catch the fact that Simpson (and the brother he speaks of) considered the convention an ecclesiastical setting, not an “extra-ecclesiastical setting,” as Ballitch claims.

Influence from Mild/Moderate Complementarian A.J. Gordon—1894ff. Baptist pastor A.J. Gordon, founder of Gordon-Conwell Seminary, speaker at Alliance conventions, and friend of A.B. Simpson, published an article on “Ministry of Women.” Citing the exegesis of Canon Garrett, Gordon interprets 1 Timothy 2 as referring to “a married woman’s domestic relations, and not to her public relations.” Even if prohibition against public teaching were admitted as the appropriate interpretation, Gordon says, he still insists that it is only circumstantial to the situation and does not command a universal prohibition for all times. Rather, it indicates that lacking an example of a woman teaching or exercising authority, it would only “lead us to refrain from *ordaining* a woman as pastor of a Christian congregation.”⁴⁵

1897-1899--Softening of Hard Stance Against Women as Pastors

- **1897**—Simpson approved: “It is true that the Apostle Paul did not at that time suffer a woman to teach, or to usurp authority over the man. Doubtless at that time there were no women competent to act as teachers.”⁴⁶ Andrews summarizes, “The Pauline prohibition to teach is seen as cultural and not binding, therefore, today. This particular position seems consistent with Simpson’s views in general.”⁴⁷
- **1897**—Simpson: “the passage *might mean* that women were not to take an official place in the ecclesiastical organization, was not to be one of its elders, its rulers, its ecclesiastical leaders.” (softening his interpretation from 1891 and 1893)
- **1898**—Mattie Perry served as evangelist and was appointed in an official ecclesiastical position as District Supt of the entire C&MA Southern District

1900—Exceptions Can Be Made—Women Can Act as Elders If No Elder Available

- **1900**—Simpson: “*God’s methods in matters of outward form are flexible enough to allow for exceptions and adjustments.*”⁴⁸ (in reference to a woman anointing with oil in place of an elder). When qualified elders were not available, Simpson allowed that *women could fulfill the role of an elder* according to James 5, and be permitted to anoint with oil for healing.⁴⁹
- **1902**: *A.B. Simpson assured* Canadian mission pastor Mary Gainforth of “*the right of women to act as elders,*” especially for anointing sick people with oil for healing.⁵⁰ He even asked her to anoint and pray for people right alongside him.

1903/1904—Ordained Woman Serves as C&MA Missionary—C&MA missionary Mary Mullen, ordained with the United Brethren church, is called “Rev. Mary Mullen” in list of C&MA missionaries.⁵¹

1905ff—Women Begin to Be Recognized as Pastors in C&MA

- **1905**--Miss Mary Inglis, *mentioned as pastor* of an independent church in Stockton, California, “in full sympathy with” the C&MA,” *praised by future C&MA president Frederick Senft*, recorded in *C&MA Weekly*.⁵²
- **1906**—Women in Ministry Is an Open Question: *The issue of roles of women in ministry is officially an open question* (along with Calvinism & Arminianism, various end time views, etc.), reaffirmed by Board of Managers in 1922⁵³

1910-1999—Women Officially Appointed & Approved as Pastors Throughout 20th century

- **1910**: Alice Raynor, first woman officially appointed as a C&MA pastor in NY (Simpson’s backyard & approval)⁵⁴
- **1911**—**Dr. J. Hudson Ballard (Board of Managers Secretary/Asst Alliance Weekly Editor)** records in *Alliance Weekly* that women can pastor:

God’s highest plan is for men to be the leaders and for men to be the teachers in His work....*When God cannot find the right kind of men He does not hesitate to lay hold of a willing woman. If a woman has been seemingly divinely appointed as a pastor over a church we know no reason why she should not perform all the duties associated with her office, such as baptism and officiating at the Lord’s Supper, weddings and funerals.*⁵⁵

This became the position of The Alliance for 70-90 years. The Alliance policy as delineated by Ballard is clearly C, affirming the headship of men, but unlike most contemporary complementarianism, it is also clearly a very “moderate” or “soft” position, that nonetheless allows for women to serve as pastors under the authority of the district superintendent or other male spiritual authority, along with full authority to perform all the functions of the clergy.

- **1922: Board of Mgrs reaffirms the 1906 policy that the issue of roles of women in ministry is officially an open question.**
- **1926: Dist. Supt. R.A. Forrest (founder of Toccoa Falls College) w/approval of C&MA president Frederick Senft appointed a woman to pastor a failing church, assisted by her husband as Asst Pastor/Bible teacher. The church grew from 50 to 500 in 10 months.**⁵⁶

1927, 1928, 1948—3 warnings from Alliance sources against stifling ministry of women:

- **1927: Warning Against Condemning Women Pastors**—Dr. T. J. McCrossan, Alliance pastor, Simpson Bible Institute professor/ president, respected Greek scholar, in a book published by the C&MA and **approved by C&MA President H.M. Shuman**, affirmed, “God is now again pouring out His Spirit upon both His male and female servants, and when He says His female servants in the last days shall preach and expound Scripture publicly, *let some of us beware how we condemn ‘women pastors,’ who are Spirit-filled.*”⁵⁷ He and The Alliance interpreted the prophecy of Joel fulfilled through Pentecost as sanctioning women in pastoral leadership positions.
- **1928, 1948: Warning Against Repressing Women Preaching—Alliance Weekly, citing Dr. A.J. Gordon:** “How little authority there is in the Word for repressing the witness of women in the public assembly, or for forbidding her to herald the Gospel to the unsaved. . . . *Beware, lest, in silencing the voice of consecrated women, they may be resisting the Holy Ghost*” (italics mine).⁵⁸

1957: women in ministry was debated at General Council. Tozer said it was a side issue that did not belong in General Council. *No action was taken.*

1964—C&MA President Tells IRS women are fully qualified to fulfill all clergy functions.⁵⁹

1975-1999—E-C position maintained while scales tip toward more C leadership control

- **1974**—The C&MA officially becomes a denomination
- **1975**—new denominational Licensing/Ordination Manual seems to be more C-slanted, but without official General Council approval.
- **1981**—first use of term “elder authority,” but not officially approved by General Council
- **1987—Anita Bailey, Managing Editor of *The Alliance Witness* from 1944 to 1977, affirmed in *Heritage Cameos*, her centennial booklet on women in ministry, “*Other women pastored churches, especially in smaller towns or where the church could not support a pastor and family.*”⁶⁰ Anita herself had been one of those women pastors in the 1930s.**

- **1987**—*Women in Ministry* by L.E. Maxwell published by the C&MA, presents the historic C&MA E-C position.
- **1987**—**The Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (CBMW) is created**, asserting through “The Danvers Statement” a strict C view. This may have been the catalyst for the C&MA E and C debates in the 1990s, as strong Cs became more assertive in the C&MA and strong Es pushed back.
- **1993-1999**—women in ministry papers, reports, discussion, and debate
- **1995**—controversy over women serving Communion at Pittsburgh General Council (even though historically women pastors from 1911ff were permitted to do so)

1999-present—US C&MA tilts stronger C; Canadian C&MA maintains historic E-C stance

- **1999**—US C&MA reverses its 1906 “open question” policy for women in ministry to a closed question, forbidding women from being elders and pastors; Canadian C&MA and many countries of the Alliance World Fellowship continue to maintain the historic open question stance, allowing women pastors and elders, some countries of AWF ordain women
- **1999-present**—discussion and debate continue on all levels
- **200?**—Canadian C&MA General Assembly votes to allow ordination of women

APPENDIX 3

WOMEN SERVING AS PASTORS AND ELDERS IN THE C&MA 1975-2008

Ballitch has misinterpreted Simpson and the early Alliance by assuming that when the word “man” was used in official documents, it always only referred to males. On the contrary, with adequate knowledge of Alliance history and practice during that period of time, we find out it did not. Rather, as was common in the 1970s, the term was used generally of all people, male and female, not just males. With Ballitch’s limited experience in the C&MA, he does not have a clue that his interpretation was not factual in real life in The Alliance. These positions and licenses were not given only to men, but to women also, and women occasionally served as elders, both before and after 1975. See the attached endnote for just a few examples. Even though the scales were beginning to tip away from the balance of an E-C toward a stricter C position, women continued to be permitted to pastor in the C&MA. The policy that women could not serve as a pastor did not become official until 1999 in the US and never in the Canadian C&MA. Most of this is documented in *Anointed Women*.

- **Western Pennsylvania, 1970s.** A church in Western Pennsylvania where I served as youth pastor in the early 1970s had a woman elder.
- **Western District, 1979.** In my first Alliance pastorate in 1979, a woman preached at our annual mission conference as a “home missionary” in Kentucky. She was also called pastor by her congregation.
- **Kentucky and West Virginia—Beefhide Gospel Mission, 1970s-2008.** At one time nearly two dozen churches, pastored mostly by women, were planted under the auspices of Beefhide Gospel Mission in Kentucky and West Virginia, headed by Margaret Wheatley. Some of those who continued to pastor through the 1980s included Rachel Davison (asst. pastor, Essie, KY, 1973-1977; pastor, 1977-2008)⁶¹ and Florence Wilting, home missions pastor, Beefhide Gospel Mission, Ashcamp, KY, 1954-1965; pastor, Cucumber, WV, 1965-1987. (I talked personally with both of these women).
- **Arkansas—Ozark Mountain Ministries, 1950s-2000.** At one time there were 16 churches in Arkansas, most of them pastored by women as home missionaries. Those who continued to pastor up until 2000 included: Miss Arbutus Barr and Miss Letitia Waite, Cowell, AR, 1955-1983,⁶² Mrs. Margaret Hauser Sinclair, Cowell, AR, 1992-2000.⁶³

It was reported that in the early 1990s in actual practice some Alliance churches did have women as associate or assistant pastors, up to 18% of churches had women as local church elders, and 11% of churches had women as the senior or sole pastor.⁶⁴ Although these percentages were lower than in the past in The Alliance, it nonetheless negates Ballitch’s claim. How then this discrepancy? As noted in *Anointed Women*:

Through the 1960s into the 1970s women continued to serve as pastors and evangelists in The Alliance, although their numbers seemed to be dwindling. By the late 1970s Alliance leaders who did not believe in the validity of women in pastoral ministry began to gain the ascendancy in influence and policy, a tipping of the scales of balance away from maintaining the “open question” policy held for more than seventy years. Once again the cracks of

historical drift began to deepen and widen until the “open question” bridge over the gulf of the two sides collapsed in the late 1990s, and it became a closed question. A hardening of the categories, becoming rigid in defining elder authority as only and always male.

APPENDIX 4

SAMPLES OF COMPLEMENTARIANS WITH VARYING INTERPRETATIONS

- **Some Cs say a woman can preach, contrary to Ballitch who says, women cannot preach in a worship service.** This is in contrast to moderate C Craig Blomberg, who says, “many complementarians, having decided that the office of pastor-elder is limited to men, often jump to the conclusion that therefore women should never preach in a worship service. But what biblical text ever limits preaching to pastors or elders?”⁶⁵
 - **Some C’s recognize a woman’s gift of teaching can be used more broadly, contrary to other Cs.** Moderate C Thomas Schreiner: “In many respects I agree with egalitarians here.”⁶⁶
 - **Some Cs define prophecy as preaching, contrary to Ballitch:** See J. I. Packer (*Keep in Step with the Spirit*) and Thomas Schreiner, who essentially defines prophecy as “preaching.”⁶⁷
 - **Some Cs say women should wear veils.** Thomas Shreiner: “Should women wear veils or shawls today? A minority of complementarians think they should.”⁶⁸
 - **A moderate/soft complementarian like Blomberg leaves room for a woman in some pastoral settings:** “But because ‘pastor’ can also be a spiritual gift in Paul’s lists of gifts, and because many people today are even given the official title or office of pastor without functioning as a biblical elder or overseer, I am reluctant to throw in ‘pastor’ along with elder and overseer.”⁶⁹
 - **Some C’s do not totally forbid women from teaching or exercising authority.** Blomberg: “I do not find the Bible also forbidding women from regularly teaching men or exercising authority over them, once 1 Timothy 2:12 is understood properly.”⁷⁰
 - **Complementarian scholars like Douglas Moo and Craig Blomberg** have modified and softened some of their beliefs and interpretations.
 - **Some moderate Cs say women can minister under male headship--**Susan Foh, Thomas Schreiner.
 - **Some complementarians acknowledge Junia as a female apostle:**
 - 4th century Church father Chrysostom commends Junia as an apostle
 - Dr. Henry Wilson, Simpson associate, quotes Chrysostom⁷¹
 - A.J. Gordon cites Chrysostom; C&MA leaders, in turn, cite Gordon
- **Complementarians disagree on interpretation of 1 Corinthians 14:33-35 and Ephesian 5:21, submitting to one another** e.g., Thomas Schreiner and Wayne Grudem.

APPENDIX 5

ISSUES NOT COVERED IN BALLITCH'S EXEGESIS OF 1 TIMOTHY 2:9-3:1-15

These are samples of some of the issues not discussed or even mentioned by Ballitch, who was supposedly applying “the lens of Scripture.” These are not exhaustive. Ballitch has taken something complex and tried to make it simplistic and not done justice to the complexity of the issues.

Issues Relating to 1 Timothy 2:12

- **The scholarly grammatical debate over *oude***, especially of *ouk...oude authentein*, Is the prohibition of two acts or one? It is teaching and authority? Teaching or authority? Authoritative teaching? Some scholars view this as two prohibitions, other scholars view it as a single prohibition—authoritative or domineering teaching. C scholars are divided.
- **The nature, type, degree, and setting of the teaching?** Even C scholars are divided.
 - Hard C view: Women cannot teach or exercise authority at all.
 - Moderate C: Women can teach but not authoritatively. Schreiner’s view prohibits only the teaching of men (plural) in groups while permitting teaching of individual men. Schreiner and Grudem (hard C) disagree on some interpretations. Baldwin and Schreiner disagree on some interpretations
 - Moderate to Soft C: Women can teach under authority of men. (Current C&MA position—opposed by Ballitch, yet moderate Cs Susah Foh and Thomas Schreiner state that women can minister under authority)
 - Soft C: Women can teach/preach/pastor under authority (historic Alliance position—which Ballitch opposes.)
 - Various interpretations of Colossians 3:16—“teaching and admonishing others with psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs”—Is this for men only? Should only men be worship leaders?
- **The scholarly grammatical debate over the meaning of *authenteo*.**
 - Ballitch dealt with only a minor portion of the debate—use of *authenteo* as positive or negative, and even then did not engage other scholarly research coming to alternate conclusions. For instance, Ballitch references Baldwin and Wolters, who emphasize uses of *authenteo* are most likely positive, but he does not engage Westfall, who documents evidence that shows uses *authenteo* as most likely negative. Scholars differ. There are good arguments and bad arguments on both sides. I am not convinced of either strict Cs or strict Es.
 - Why did Paul use an obscure word *authenteo* instead of *exousia*? Moderate or soft complementarians translate “usurp authority,” which Ballitch finds unacceptable.
 - **Most important:** One cannot make an airtight case and a doctrinal mandate out of a *hapax legomen*, an isolated word used nowhere else.
- **Use of the present tense of “I do not permit”—universal or current local situation** (does he mean “I am always not permitting” or “I am now not permitting”?)
- **Marriage and family or church assembly?**

- Moderate complementarians A.J. Gordon and early C&MA viewed as a possible interpretation that 1 Timothy 2 is referring to “a married woman’s domestic relations, and not to her public relations.”
- Even if prohibition against public teaching were admitted as the appropriate interpretation, Gordon says, he still insists that it is only circumstantial to the situation and does not command a universal prohibition for all times.
- **Dealing with seemingly contradictory texts to 1 Timothy 2:12 and 1 Timothy 3:1**
 - In Acts 18 where *Priscilla leads in teaching Apollos*, C&MA leaders cited the counsel of Dr. A.J. Gordon (a moderate C) on “The Ministry of Women” (*Alliance Weekly*, 1928),⁷² concluding 1 Timothy 2:12 must not be absolute.
 - *Junia is viewed as a female apostle by some complementarians*, most notably Chrysostom. Other C&MA related Cs do as well: A.J. Gordon, C&MA leaders citing Gordon as Alliance policy. Dr. Henry Wilson, Simpson’s associate, quotes Chrysostom’s commendation of Junia as an apostle.⁷³
 - *Dealing with exceptions*-- If God makes exceptions (such as *Deborah and Priscilla*) how can we make a rigid rule?
- **Various Interpretations of cultural and specific or transcultural and universal?**
Schreiner—universal; Gordon and C&MA—not universal

Issues Relating to 1 Timothy 2:13-14—Paul’s Comments Regarding Creation and the Fall

- **Regarding Paul’s so-called “creation defense”** for women not teaching or exercising authority, as a soft complementarian, I agree in principle with Ballitch’s statement, “Man and woman are ontologically equal, yet given complementary roles in the home and the church. This complementarianism was woven into the fabric of human nature expressed in maleness and femaleness; it is not the result of the fall.” Yet the creation issue is much more complex than he makes it out to be. Complementary roles do not necessitate forbidding women to teach or to exercise authority. If this were a hard and fast rule, God Himself violated it by ordaining (*qum*, Hebrew for ordain, appoint) Deborah to be a judge—both a leader with authority and a shepherd/pastor (Heb. ra’ah—1 Chronicles 17:6).
- **Genesis 1 and 2**—Relationship and authority before Fall and after Fall. What does Gen 1:27 mean? Does complementary necessitate hierarchy? What does it mean for both husband and wife to have dominion and rule over the earth?
- **Christology and Trinity**—Is Christ eternally subordinate or temporarily subordinate on earth during the Incarnation? How does that relate to kenosis theory (Philippians 2:7)? How does that affect men and women in the image of God?
- **Genesis 3**—What does redemption from the curse after the Fall cover? Are women not released from the curse of subordination if they are redeemed from all else?
- **What does Paul mean by woman being deceived?** Are all women thus deceived? How can women teach women and children if they are deceived? If they are not to be teaching men, then should they not be teaching male children? Or any children for that matter, if they are so deceived and can lead men into deception?

Issues Relating to 1 Timothy 2:15

- **The fallacy of selective literalism—Interpreting 2:15 metaphorically, but 2:12 literally.** How literal is literal?—If 2:15 is not and 3:1-7 is considered literal (sort of),

how literally? How consistently? Ballitch tries to make a point supporting C from 2:15: “according to verse 15, women are saved from usurping the role of men by embracing the role of women, embracing it with the Christian virtues of faith, love, holiness, and self-control.” Yet he makes no attempt to wrestle with whether a woman being saved in childbirth is metaphorical or literal. He wants to take verse 12 very literally and strictly, but not verse 15. In order to interpret the text consistently, the moderate C can be a bit more adaptable. Susan Foh, a moderate C, says verse 15 “is difficult to understand” and does not interpret it literally.⁷⁴

Issues Relating to 1 Timothy 3:1ff

- **Are *episkopos* (overseer/bishop), *poimen* (pastor/shepherd), and *presbyteros* (elder) always synonymous?** This is a major assumption and emphasis of Ballitch, but he does not deal with the many historical and cultural issues surrounding the use of these terms, which discount his assumption. See Endnote 29 for a summary of these issues.
- **Various Interpretations of 1 Timothy 3:1-7—even among complementarians**
 - Women cannot be elders or deacons
 - Women cannot be elders, but can be deaconesses
 - How literal, consistent, and strict are the qualifications? Is there selective literalism of elders and overseers? Qualifications stipulate: 1) married; 2) with children; 3) who obey. Are exceptions made for men who are single, married without children, and children who don’t obey? If exceptions are made for them, why not for women?
- **Issues Relating to 1 Timothy 3:15—Are the instructions of the prior chapter ~~and~~ verses for the church assembly, ~~or~~ the church as a whole or something else?**
 - Ballitch calls the current C&MA moderate C interpretation “dubious.”
 - A.J. Gordon and earlier Alliance leaders held to several possible interpretations, or domestic relations, not church assembly.
 - Ballitch claims Paul’s use of “the household of God” 1 Timothy 3:15 means “behavioral instructions to the local church, providing guidance to the congregation for conduct during worship.” He references only one complementarian, as if that should settle the matter.
 - What he fails to disclose, however, is that most complementarian commentators do not even mention this interpretation of 1 Timothy 3:15 in their arguments, for the truth is that even some complementarians, both older and more recent, do not come to that conclusion. Most scholars (including most Cs) do not interpret *oikos* (“household”) as a worship service, but as it is used throughout the New Testament as an image of the church as the family of God.

OTHER RELATED ISSUES—Various Interpretations of *Kephale*—“head.” Is head “authority” or “source” or both?

- The C argument that *kephale* means only “authority” is weak.
- The E argument that *kephale* means only “source” is weak.
- *kephale* can mean and does mean both source and head.
 - Medical doctor Paul Brand’s fascinating book on the spiritual analogies in Scripture to the human body, entitled *In His Image*, explained how the head in the body is both source and authority, and how that relates to Church, the body of Christ. He did not have in mind the C-E debates; he was approaching the symbolic image of Christ as

the head of the Church, His body. A light came on in my mind when I realized it is not either-or, but both-and. Christ is both authority and source. When we realize this there is no need for debate between E and C, between source and authority.

APPENDIX 6

PROBLEMATIC ISSUES AND TIMELINE IN THE C&MA REGARDING ELDER AUTHORITY

1964—President Nathan Bailey’s letter to IRS that women can fulfill all clergy functions.

1974—C&MA officially becomes a denomination

1977—Wendell Price dissertation on women in C&MA ministry—cites Nathan Bailey legal letter to the IRS and cites women serving as pastors in the 1920s-1940s.⁷⁵

1980—term “elder authority” first considered at Council, but not approved as part of the Manual-- a very recent interpretation—not found anywhere in Alliance literature before this.

1981—first use of the term “elder authority” in the C&MA licensing manual—but not Council approved.

1995—Report of the Committee to Study the Role of Women in Ministry: Elder Authority,” p. 41, C&MA General Council 1995, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. At the 1995 General Council in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, the following recommendation was adopted: “That other independent biblical studies presenting the traditional/ historical position on gender-based distinction with application to elder authority/leadership roles in the church be commissioned by and submitted to the Board of Managers for review and distribution to official workers and preregistered lay delegates one month prior to Council 1996.”

1996—Traditional/Historical Papers on Gender-Based Distinction. in its September 1995 meeting the Board of Managers commissioned the following people to write papers: Dr. Elio Cuccaro. Dr. Kenneth Liu, Rev. Richard Collier, Rev. L. James Tieszen

1997--Council 1996 established a “Committee to Define the Concept of "Elder Authority" and its Consistent Application; and to Define the Privileges and Responsibilities of Ordination.” Minutes of C&MA General Council 1997. Members of the committee included Dr. David Schroeder, Rev. John Casey, Rev. David Klinsing, Mrs. Kay Kong, Rev. David Philips, Mr. Donald Swanson. This committee investigated and discovered that there was no General Council authorization for the inclusion of the term “elder authority.”⁷⁶

1998—The Attempt at Defining Elder Authority. While a definition was put forth, nowhere in the C&MA Manual was “elder authority” defined according to Scripture. The definition that was given, though well-meaning, has no scriptural support, thus **is** inadequate and both a man-made term and a man-made definition. Nowhere in Scripture is the term “elder authority” found. Nowhere in Scripture are the Greek terms for “elder” (*presbyteros*) and authority (*exousia*) found together or in proximity or context with each other. As an argument from silence, it is a weak argument without other clear support. That support comes from the words of Jesus Himself. The phrase contradicts and violates Jesus’ view of servant leadership:

Calling them to Himself, Jesus said to them, “You know that those who are recognized as rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great men exercise authority over

them. But it is not this way among you, but whoever wishes to become great among you shall be your servant; and whoever wishes to be first among you shall be slave of all. For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many” (Mark 10:42-45).

The Board of Managers and the 1997 “Taskforce to Study the Organizational Functions and Design of the Christian and Missionary Alliance” recognized this contradiction and tried to correct it, reporting to General Council in 1997:

1996—Several Board of Managers members expressed reservations about the terminology “elder authority”: “The committee agrees that the two words may be easily understood to imply a dynamic which seems to be quite far from the biblical teaching on leadership. Indeed, the two words ‘elder authority’ do not appear in Scripture together. The sense of several members of the Board of Managers was that these words may communicate a top-down style of leadership, which is exactly what Scripture prohibits (Luke 22:24-30; 1 Peter 5;1-4, et al.) Our understanding, therefore, of the intent of the assignment is to study the role of elder *leadership* in the governance of local churches.”⁷⁷

No adequate definition or biblical support has been provided since then either. The two terms *presbuteros* and *exousias* are never used together or in proximity to each other in Scripture. An argument from silence is insufficient in itself, but as we examine the whole of Scripture, The emphasis on the authority of elders seems inimical and contradictory to Jesus’ model and teaching on service and leadership. We are to be servant leaders, not authority leaders. Certainly, authority is a part of leadership, but should not be the major part of church leadership and not that for what church leaders are known. This hyper-emphasis on authority is one of the biggest weaknesses and dangers of strict complementarianism. Abuses come not from servant leadership, but from authoritarian, controlling leadership, from elders and pastors exercising too much authority over both men and women, but especially over women.

Note: There was apparently no attempt to reconcile or harmonize the two viewpoints in the C&MA General Council as had been done in the past.

APPENDIX 7

C&MA SOURCES ON WOMEN IN MINISTRY BALLITCH COULD HAVE CONSULTED BUT DID NOT

Older Late 19th-Early 20th Century Sources

- *Alliance Weekly*—alternative moderate or soft C views of A.B. Simpson and other writers from the 1890s and following, as well as records of women pastors 1905 and following
- Dr. J. Hudson Ballard, Ph.D., Secretary of the C&MA Board of Managers in 1911—statement in *Alliance Weekly* approving women as pastors
- C&MA Board of Managers Minutes, Sept. 20-23, 1922.
- 1894, 1928, 1948—Dr. A.J. Gordon, friend of Simpson and the C&MA, and founder of Gordon-Conwell Seminary, who says that women have freedom in every way except that there is no biblical example of a woman being ordained as a pastor and his statement became the C&MA policy, his article republished in *Alliance Weekly* in 1928 and 1948.⁷⁸
- 1927—Dr. T.J. McCrossan, C&MA pastor, professor, and interim president of Simpson Bible Institute (now Simpson University)—warning against condemning women pastors.

Late 20th Century Sources

- 1964: C&MA President Nathan Bailey tells the IRS women can fulfill all clergy functions.⁷⁹
- 1977—Dr. Wendell Price's D.Min. doctoral dissertation "The Role of Women in the Ministry of the Christian and Missionary Alliance."⁸⁰
- 1984—Dr. Ernest Wilson, Ph.D., 1984 doctoral dissertation, credentialed C&MA minister beginning in 1938, documented modifications of women's roles in ministry⁸¹
- 1987--L.E. Maxwell *Women in Ministry*, published by the C&MA⁸²
- 1987—Anita Bailey, *Heritage Cameos*⁸³
- 1995—"Report of the Committee to Study the Role of Women in Ministry: Elder Authority," C&MA General Council 1995, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- 1997—"Taskforce to Study the Organizational Functions and Design of the Christian and Missionary Alliance"

21st Century Sources

- John Sawin, *John Sawin File Project: The Life and Times of A.B. Simpson*, 2000.
- James Enns, "Every Christian a Missionary: Fundamentalism Education at Prairie Bible Institute 1922-1947," Masters thesis, University of Calgary, 2000. Cites C&MA women pastors in Canada and through Prairie Bible Institute
- Paul L. King, "Women as Pastors in the Christian and Missionary Alliance," *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, Fall 2008
- Paul L. King, Th.D., D.Min., *Anointed Women: The Rich Heritage of Women in Ministry in the Christian and Missionary Alliance*

- Barbara L. Howe, *Forgotten Voices: Women in Ministry in The Christian and Missionary Alliance in Canada* (2010)

APPENDIX 8

A SUMMARY OF THE HISTORIC C&MA EXEGESIS OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES RELATING TO ROLES OF WOMEN IN MINISTRY

The following are principles established after Simpson began to adjust his own theology of women in ministry. See *Anointed Women*, Chapter 3, pages 49-68, for more detailed information on Alliance exegesis. See *Essentials, Distinctives, Open Questions: The 3-Tier Alliance Theological Hermeneutic* for more details on what Simpson and the C&MA considered to be open questions, side issues, and non-essentials, and how those levels were determined.

Oftentimes Simpson's early interpretations of key passages reflect a strict C belief, not permitting women to minister officially in the church as a pastor, elder, overseer, teacher, or preacher. That is what strict Cs like Ballitch typically cite, either unaware that Simpson's views softened over time or ignoring his later views. After the first decade of The Alliance, Simpson and Alliance leaders came to recognize that a variety of interpretations regarding the roles of women in ministry was possible, just as with Calvinism and Arminianism. So the ministry of women became considered as a "side issue," a "non-essential" or "open question" by 1906, and women pastors were first appointed in The Alliance by 1910. Alliance leaders cited the modified interpretations of Simpson, based primarily on the position of C&MA friend Dr. A.J. Gordon. Dr. J. Hudson Ballard, Secretary of the C&MA Board of Managers and Associate Editor of *The Alliance Weekly* under Simpson, became a spokesman in 1911.

The Alliance continued to maintain that the role of pastor, elder, or overseer was *usually* male, but not rigidly and not always, leaving room for God's sovereignty to call women to leadership as He did Deborah. Remember, these are not Es interpreting the Scriptures this way. These are Cs who believe in the headship of men. Here are some of the historic C&MA hermeneutical principles:

C&MA LEADERS ON JOEL 2:27-28 AND ACTS 2:17-18

Alliance leaders interpreted Joel 2:27-28 and Acts 2:17-18 as freedom for women to preach and pastor:

- **1927—Dr. T. J. McCrossan, an Alliance pastor, Simpson Bible Institute professor and interim president, and respected Greek scholar**, wrote in a book approved and published by the C&MA, "God is now again pouring out His Spirit upon both His male and female servants, and when He says His female servants in the last days shall preach and expound Scripture publicly, *let some of us beware how we condemn 'women pastors,' who are Spirit-filled*" (italics mine).⁸⁴
- **1894, A.J. Gordon, published in *Alliance Weekly*, 1948:** "This prophecy of Joel, realized at Pentecost, is the *Magna Charta* of the Christian Church. It gives to woman a status in the Spirit hitherto unknown. And, as in civil legislation, no law can be enacted which conflicts with the constitution, so in Scripture we shall expect to find no text which denies to woman her divinely appointed rights in the New Dispensation. "*Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy.*" Here is woman's equal warrant with man's for telling out the Gospel of the grace of God."

C&MA LEADERS ON GALATIANS 3:28

Women are lifted and enfranchised by the Gospel as one in Christ. “The Gospel of Christ lifts the yoke of burden from womanhood, rescues her from ignorance and degradation and introduces her to a new and better condition, where there is neither Jew nor Gentile, male nor female, but all are one in Jesus Christ. And woman thus enfranchised by the Gospel of Christ, has been a most successful worker in the cause and service of the Lord.”⁸⁵—Referring to Galatians 3:28, *Alliance Weekly*, 1897.

C&MA LEADERS ON 1 TIMOTHY 2:12 AND 3:1-8

Early Alliance leaders recognized this as a pivotal passage, making this the primary text for interpretation by C&MA leaders. At the same time, they also recognized that its interpretation was thorny and not a sure thing.

- **God Allows Flexibility for Exceptions and Adjustments.** “God’s methods in matters of outward form are flexible enough to allow for exceptions and adjustments.”—A.B. Simpson, 1900⁸⁶
- **A Variety of Interpretations of 1 Timothy 2:12 Are Possible, Including Referring to Marriage Relationships.**—A.J. Gordon, cited by *Alliance Weekly*⁸⁷
- **Seemingly contradictory texts should be balanced and harmonized, not pitting one against another.** On harmonizing 1 Timothy 2:12 with the seeming contradictory text in Acts 18 where Priscilla leads in teaching Apollos, C&MA leaders cited the counsel of Dr. A.J. Gordon (a moderate C) on “The Ministry of Women.”⁸⁸
- **The passage is cultural, not universally binding for all times.**—*Alliance Weekly*, 1897⁸⁹
- **Women can teach when they are competent and are not usurping authority.**—Dr. J. Hudson Ballard, Ph.D., C&MA Board of Managers, *CMAW*,⁹⁰ Ballard was clearly a C, but not a strict, rigid C.
- **The prohibition of women teaching or exercising authority is not absolute, but only in certain circumstances or situations.** This became the official Alliance Board of Managers policy regarding woman in ministry, as stated by Dr. J. Hudson Ballard in 1911,⁹¹ and reaffirmed by *The Alliance Weekly* citing Dr. A.J. Gordon in 1928.⁹²
- **Normally the man is the leader, but not absolutely or exclusively.** Simpson and Alliance leaders taught and practiced that it is normally God’s divine intention is for men to lead the church. In God’s economy, normally the man is the leader. However—and this is key—not absolutely or exclusively.

- **When a qualified man is not available, God uses anointed women to teach and pastor.**⁹³—J. Hudson Ballard, Ph.D., Secretary, C&MA Board of Managers, Asst Editor *Alliance Weekly*. Ballard was clearly a C, but not a strict, rigid C.
- **Women have freedom to teach under authority in the New Covenant.**—*Alliance Weekly*, 1897⁹⁴
- **Warnings against condemning women pastors and preachers.**
 - Dr. T.J. McCrossan, an Alliance and Presbyterian pastor, Simpson Bible Institute professor, and respected Greek scholar, wrote in a book approved and published by the C&MA in 1927 affirming, **“Let some of us beware how we condemn ‘women pastors,’ who are Spirit-filled.”**⁹⁵
 - “How little authority there is in the Word for repressing the witness of women in the public assembly, or for forbidding her to herald the Gospel to the unsaved. . . . **Beware, lest, in silencing the voice of consecrated women, they may be resisting the Holy Ghost**”⁹⁶ (A.J. Gordon, 1894—reprinted in *The Alliance Weekly* 1928.

ENDNOTES

¹ Ballitch’s article can be found online at <https://cbmw.org/2020/11/20/a-radical-question-for-a-conservative-church-should-the-christian-and-missionary-alliance-call-women-pastors/>.

² Elsewhere Ballitch writes pejoratively of this discussion, “I am committed to biblical complementarianism in a denomination currently plagued by a vocal minority of powerful egalitarians on the issue of women pastors.” Andrew Ballitch’s Review of *The Making of Biblical Womanhood: How The Subjugation of Women Became Gospel Truth*, by Beth Allison Barr. Published on April 28, 2021 by Eugene Ho. <https://www.booksataglance.com/book-reviews/andrew-ballitchs-review-of-the-making-of-biblical-womanhood-how-the-subjugation-of-women-became-gospel-truth-by-beth-allison-barr/>. He mislabels anyone who disagrees with his interpretation as an “egalitarian” even if they are not (like myself, an E-C, not an E.)

³ By his own acknowledgement Ballitch engages in “fast forwarding from the beginning of the 20th century to 1974,” with a huge 77-year piece of Alliance history of women in ministry totally omitted, resulting in half-truths, misleading and false statements. He also makes quantum leaps in making misleading and false implications that Dr. John Stumbo and national Alliance leadership are leading The Alliance down a wrong path, falsely accusing leadership of “changing it (the C&MA) into what it has never been.”

⁴ These are the Trinity, deity and humanity of Christ, Incarnation, death and resurrection of Christ, the Atonement, salvation by grace through faith alone, the second coming of Christ, and the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture.

⁵ These are Christo-centrism, the Fourfold Gospel, continuism, and believer’s baptism by immersion.

⁶ See my e-book PDF, *Essentials, Distinctives, Open Questions: The 3-Tier Alliance Theological Hermeneutic*, available on my website at www.paulkingministries.com.

⁷ Early in his article under his first purpose he asserts that the C&MA’s “long-standing conviction that the title ‘pastor’ is reserved for men and synonymous with ‘elder’ and ‘overseer’ in the New Testament.” This is his conclusion, but it is also his assumption. He assumes his conclusion. Through his article he does this repeatedly six more times in various phrases. The problem is that his assumptions are flawed and faulty—many of them half-truths or totally false—and thus his conclusions are flawed and faulty as well.

⁸ Ballitch will repeat his assumption that women are not to preach four more times in parts 2 and 3 of his article, citing examples, but by using half-truths. He tries to prove his point by quoting Simpson’s earliest writings, again leaping to the conclusion that Simpson always maintained his earliest stance. He concludes his article with his

assumption: “And only those qualified to be pastors-elders-overseers preach during corporate worship of local churches.” This has never been The Alliance position.

⁹ As I wrote in *Anointed Women*, “Throughout Alliance history, because The Alliance has been a ‘big tent’ regarding various secondary doctrinal issues, there would always be some who frowned upon ‘lady preachers,’ or women as pastors, and perhaps even some who opposed the ‘open question’ view of The Alliance, but freedom of conscience was always maintained in the spirit of agreeing to disagree. Churches who did not want women as pastors or elders were not required to accept them. However, women were universally allowed and encouraged to preach and teach in Alliance churches as evangelists, Bible teachers and itinerating missionaries on deputation.” (p. 27).

¹⁰ As a church historian, Ballitch should be aware that Christian leaders and theologians through the millennia have been known for changing views dramatically, one of the most notable being Augustine, who wrote his *Retractions*. Even though Simpson never wrote formal retractions, a comparison of his writings shows that Simpson changed his views on several theological issues, including his views on baptism, healing, eschatology, church government, and roles of women in ministry, among others.

¹¹ Simpson’s allowance and encouragement of women speaking even outside of official “ecclesiastical authority” was actually quite radical for traditional churches of his day. However, holiness churches who believed that the Spirit was poured out on both men and women (Joel 2; Acts 2:17-18) joined the ranks of the fledging Alliance. Women preached and pastored in the holiness churches like the Free Methodist, Church of the Nazarene, Brethren, Salvation Army, and Pentecostal churches, and women from these churches participated in The Alliance. Women like Catherine Booth and Frances Willard preached in Simpson’s pulpit.

¹² Facebook C&MA Workers page, May 19, 2021.

¹³ “Conference for Prayer and Counsel Regarding Uniformity in the Testimony and Teaching of The Alliance,” May 25-28, 1906.

¹⁴ Perhaps that was true of Simpson in 1891, but hardly so as time went on. In 1895, even before Simpson fully changed his view on women as pastors, he had no doubt that a woman can preach, teach, and testify: “Woman has, according to the Scriptures, perfect liberty to speak and testify or preach the Gospel whenever the Holy Spirit qualifies her and sends her to do so.” A.B. Simpson, *The Christian Alliance and Foreign Missionary Weekly (CAMW)*, XIV (January 29, 1895), 79. See J. I. Packer, *Keep in Step with the Spirit* [Old Tappan, N.J.: Revell, 1984], 215, for a complementarian who essentially defines prophecy as “preaching.” Also Thomas Schreiner, in *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, Craig Blomberg, ed. (Counterpoints: Bible and Theology) (p. 322). Zondervan Academic. Kindle Edition.

¹⁵ Ballitch asserts: “A.B. Simpson was clear in his principles, but at times can seem equivocal in practice” and “Again, Simpson appears conflicted at times, but was nonetheless clear.” Rather than acknowledge that Simpson’s views were gradually changing, he maintained that Simpson was conflicted and equivocal. He suggests this was because Simpson was singularly focused on world evangelism. That is true, but there is more to it than that. Ballitch is so focused on trying to prove his point that he cannot see the reality. Simpson was a practical theologian, asserting in 1902 that there are “living truths and dead theologies.” A.B. Simpson, Editorial, *Living Truths*, July 1902, 1. Thus, for Simpson, theology is not rigid and abstract, but the importance of sound, orthodox doctrine is to be joined with dynamic application of biblical principles. This was applied to the theology and practice of roles for women in ministry. “Simpson’s irregulars” actually became more regular. We see some clear modifications both of Simpson’s beliefs and his practice.

¹⁶ He has anachronistically conveyed his 21st century understanding into 19th century literary and cultural patterns. Ballitch writes of Simpson’s commentary on 1 and 2 Timothy, “It is worth noting that the fact that this role is reserved for a man is simply assumed in almost every paragraph. He says the minister is a ‘man of God.’ He uses the male singular pronoun throughout.” First of all, certainly, we acknowledge that at this early point in Simpson’s career and theological thinking he is a stronger C and his writing would reflect that. Second, Ballitch unwittingly acknowledges that he is assuming—the logical fallacy of assumption. As an academic, he should know that in academic studies (as well as in all of life), we should never assume.

First of all, Simpson uses the term “man of God.” While he could mean male, it is not necessarily so. In the Bible, the term “man of God” does not necessarily mean male. “Man” can generically mean humans, people. When we say “mankind” we mean humankind. For example, let’s look at familiar passage: “All Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness; so that the *man of God* may be adequate, equipped for every good work” (2 Tim 3:16-17). Does Paul mean that the “male of God” may be adequate and equipped? No. The Greek word here used for “man” is *anthropos*, the generic word for humankind that can be applied to both men and women, hence the field of anthropology, studying humankind. When Paul

means “male,” he uses the Greek term *aner* or *andros*. So when Simpson uses the term “man of God.” it must not be assumed that he signifies men. Many contemporary translations clarify that for modern readers.

But what about Ballitch’s second observation? He notes, “He uses the male singular pronoun throughout.” Well, of course he does. Everyone did in the late 1800s even when speaking of women, and for that matter the Bible does too, especially in the King James Version. As a historian, he should know that words are used differently in different times. For instance, like “man of God” above, because Simpson uses the male pronoun he erroneously assumes Simpson is talking only about men. This is known in historical studies as “presentism”: “In literary and historical analysis, presentism is the anachronistic introduction of present-day ideas and perspectives into depictions or interpretations of the past. Some modern historians consider it a form of cultural bias, and believe it creates a distorted understanding of their subject matter.” Lynn Hunt, *Against Presentism | AHA.* (May 2002 *Historians.org*. Accessed at <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/may-2002/against-presentism>. Twice in this quote, Ballitch employs this logical fallacy of presentism and it has distorted his understanding of his subject matter, anachronistically conveying his 21st century understanding into 19th century literary and cultural patterns. Later in his article, Ballitch employs this logical fallacy of presentism a third time in Part 3.

¹⁷ Apart from a brief mention of women field evangelists praised by Simpson, Mattie Perry (1898) and Mary Davies (1909), saying that their “office and role were outside of the ecclesiastical structure,” he makes no mention of Simpson’s changes in thinking toward women in ministry after 1897, no mention of a women pastor mentioned in 1905, no mention of the ministry of women as an open question in 1906, no mention of the first C&MA appointed pastor in 1910, no mention of President Nathan Bailey’s letter to the IRS in 1964 saying that licensed women can fulfill all clergy functions, and so much more!

¹⁸ Ballitch’s Ph.D. was in church history. My two doctorates are not in church history (although my interdisciplinary Th.D. research through the University of South Africa included church history and historical theology), but as a historian for The Alliance, I would expect an full-orbed historical presentation of all sides regardless of his biases and preconceptions just as I tried to do in *Anointed Women*. When I started my historical study of women in ministry in the C&MA, I was a strong C, much like Ballitch himself, and I was expecting to confirm my C bias. However, through my studies of history and biblical exegesis regarding women in ministry, and looking at all sides of the issues and relevant texts, I ended up becoming, not an E as Ballitch has mischaracterized me, but as an E-C.

¹⁹ “Report of the Committee to Define the Concept of ‘Elder Authority’ and its Consistent Application; and to Define the Privileges and Responsibilities of Ordination,” paper presented to General Council 1999, The Christian and Missionary Alliance, Portland, Oregon, May 25-30, 1999, p. 44; Nathan Bailey, Correspondence to G.J. Schumaker of the IRS dated, Sept. 4, 1964, cited in Wendell W. Price, “The Role of Women in the History of the C&MA, San Francisco Theological Seminary, 1977, 66.

²⁰ What does Ballitch leave out? Well, for starters, 77 years of historical events, theological background, and facts that contradict his claims that the C&MA has always maintained that leadership is only male. Further, he omits several crucial details from his 1975-1999 timeline—1) that women continued to serve as pastors and elders, though in fewer numbers; 2) that materials continued to be published by the C&MA in the 1980s supporting the historic E-C stance; 3) that research was done and papers were written by Alliance leaders and scholars in the 1990s supporting the E-C stance, showing that The Alliance maintained both views were viable, though in tension; 4) that although the majority of General Council in 1999 voted to restrict women from being pastors and elders, a significant minority remained; 5) that the Board of Managers and original committees were uncomfortable with the language of “elder authority” vs. servant leadership; among several other issues.

²¹ Ballitch quotes the preamble of the 1975 the *Uniform Procedures on Licensing* in the C&MA manual: “Since the Christian ministry is regarded with honor and reverence, the church has insisted that *only men with the “Call of God” or a summons into the Holy ministry by the sovereign will of God shall be credentialed and commissioned by the church to proclaim the unsearchable riches of Christ*. Only a person of sound Christian experience, Godly life, a keen sense of mission and who is in genuine accord with the doctrines and teachings of The Christian and Missionary Alliance, may be approved by The Christian and Missionary Alliance as a minister of the Gospel. “

While the phrase “only men” could mean “only males,” in the 1970s, just as in Simpson’s day, the term “men” was also used generically to mean humans or persons, so sometimes people mistake 21st century use of the term “men” with 19th and 20th century usage. (See endnote 16). He has anachronistically conveyed his 21st century understanding into 20th century literary and cultural patterns of the 1970s, which were changing by the 1990s. On the basis of his logical fallacy of presentism, Ballitch thus makes false assumptions about the following statement, “Licenses were given for the positions of ‘Pastor, Assistant Pastor, Evangelist, Home Missionary, and Christian Education Director,’ and erroneously concludes, all of which were reserved exclusively for men.” Four times in this article Ballitch has fallen prey to the logical fallacy of presentism.

²² In Ballitch's supposed accounting of the C&MA's "historical awareness" and "historical trajectory" he pejoratively speaks of "several lurches in the egalitarian direction," which are really course corrections to get back on course where The Alliance has gone adrift from its historical path, the true Alliance historical trajectory of E-C, not the greatly segmented re-trajectory he postulates.

Again, Ballitch does not have a clue of real Alliance history. The Alliance has always had strong Cs and strong Es in our midst, and for the most part we have gotten along great! However, when one side starts pushing its view too much, there is push back. Cs pushed too far in the 1990s, now Es are pushing to get The Alliance back where it once was for 90 years. Strong C newcomers to The Alliance have not educated themselves on Alliance history and have falsely assumed The Alliance is historically strongly C.

²³ Ballitch ends his discussion of his "historical trajectory" of the C&MA regarding roles of women in ministry, citing the 2011 Manual regarding the similarity of requirements of Consecrated Women Workers to those of ordination. This statement is shown to be patently false by the previous documentation.

²⁴ By leaving out a huge chunk of C&MA history, Ballitch presents insufficient information. In logic, this is called the fallacy of hasty generalization (also referred to as the fallacy of insufficient statistics, fallacy of insufficient sample, leaping to a conclusion), which is basing a broad conclusion on a small sample.

²⁵ The problem is that Cs may agree on some interpretations, but not on others. For instance, Baptist pastor A.J. Gordon, founder of Gordon-Conwell Seminary, was a moderate to soft complementarian. Gordon interprets 1 Timothy 2 as referring to "a married woman's domestic relations, and not to her public relations." Even if prohibition against public teaching were admitted as the appropriate interpretation, Gordon says, he still insists that it is only circumstantial to the situation and does not command a universal prohibition for all times. Ballitch would consider this an E view, even though Gordon is a C.

²⁶ See the discussion on Deborah in Appendix 5 and endnote 27 below.

²⁷ Certainly, the titles overseer, elder, and shepherd/pastor are used synonymously in Acts 20 and 1 Peter 5, but that does not mandate that they *always must mean* the same thing. Not all overseers are necessarily pastors and elders; not all elders are necessarily pastors and overseers; not all pastors are necessarily elders and overseers. It is a generality, not an absolute. Dr. Stumbo and national and district leadership recognize this principle from historic Alliance hermeneutics.

Even though he is a church historian, Ballitch does not seem to be aware in this arena of history, as women served as elders, overseers, and pastors in extra-biblical literature during biblical times in various cultural settings and in church history. For instance, Plato says that "Women should be overseers [Gr., *episkopos*] of young married couples." Gerhard Kittel, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 2:610.

God called the Judges *ra'ah* (shepherds, pastors). Deborah was a judge appointed by God to be a shepherd/pastor and certainly also an overseer with authority and equivalent of an elder, a spiritual leader, in her day. God says that He commanded (*tsavah*) the judges "to shepherd [*ra'ah*—pastor] My people" (1 Chron. 17:6). Deborah was therefore commanded as a judge to shepherd/pastor the people of Israel. So here we have a clear command from God for Deborah as a judge to pastor the people of Israel. The notion that Deborah was God's second choice has no evidence in the text, but is eisegesis, reading into the text.

The authoritative Teacher of Wisdom in Proverbs 8 was depicted as a woman. Wisdom in Proverbs (1:20-33; 8:1-32; 9:1ff) is personified as an authoritative itinerant female teacher. If a woman was not permitted to teach authoritatively, this image would never have been used in holy canonical Scripture.

It has been documented that women served as elders at Qumran and other Jewish communities, such as synagogue rulers. It is clear from ancient documents that women did serve as synagogue rulers and elders in first century Judaism and earlier. Investigating eldership in Qumran literature, Sidnie White Crawford concluded "this council included female elders as well. It has also been documented that women also served as elders among the early church fathers. *Word Biblical Commentary* summarizes literature that demonstrates female leadership in Jewish culture before, during, and after the time of Christ: There are some nineteen inscriptions from ca. 27 BC through the sixth century AD in which women bear such titles as ἀρχισυνάγωγος and ἀρχισυναγωγίσσα, "head of the synagogue," ἱέρισσα, "priestess," μήτηρ συναγωγῆς, "mother of the synagogue," πρεσβυτέρα, "elder," and προστάτης and ἀρχήγισσα, "leader." Cohen (*Conservative Judaism* 34 [1980] 25–26) and Brooten (*Women Leaders*) argue convincingly that these are functional rather than honorific titles. One of the more relevant evidential inscriptions is from Sardis (*CIJ* 741).

It has also been documented that women also served as elders among the early church fathers: "Women are called πρεσβυτέρα in several early Christian inscriptions, in which the epithet signifies the holder of an office rather than an old woman. F. Cardman cites two Latin inscriptions: "Leta the presbyter" (Italy, 4th/5th centuries) and "the presbyter Flavia Vitalia (Yugoslavia, 425)."40 Kraemer (## 93, 94) mentions two inscriptions, one from third century c.e. Asia Minor, the other from Sicily in the 4th/5th century:41 "Diogas the bishop to Ammion (fem.) the

elder (πρεσβύτερα) in memory,” and “Here lies Kale, the elder (πρε[σ]β[υ]τις), Eisen adds two more, one for “Epikto the Presbytis (πρεσβυτιδαζ)” from era, 2nd–4th centuries c.e., and a label for the mummy of the “Presb(ytera) (πρεσβ[υ]τεραζ) Artemidora,” from 2nd/3rd century c.e. Egypt. With the title “elder,” however, would seem to be a specific inheritance from the parent Jewish community in Christianity, as is the use of this title (for both men and women) in its technical sense. As we see a continuous use of this title for women from its appearance in 4Q502 (probably a product of the Essene community), through Diaspora Jewish communities and into the early Christian movement. Sidnie White Crawford, “Mothers, Sisters, and Elders: Titles for Women in Second Temple Jewish and Early Christian Communities,” University of Nebraska - Lincoln DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska – Lincoln Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious Studies Department January 2003 Classics and Religious Studies, 189.

²⁸ I had to come to the conclusion as a strong C that some of our arguments are not so strong as we maintain they are. For me, trying to build a case on 1 Timothy 2:12 became increasingly difficult to maintain. It is a basic principle in hermeneutics that one cannot build a case on a single verse and even more important, one cannot build a doctrine on a *hapax legomen*, much less one that is rare, has many possible meanings, and is highly debated. My C pillar of 1 Timothy 2:12 had crumbled. With about eight possible meanings, narrowed down to four, and perhaps to two, the odds are still not strong. Weighing the strengths and weaknesses of each argument, at best there is a 50-50 chance of getting the right interpretation, but more like one in three or one in four. Yet Ballitch acts as if his interpretation is certain.

²⁹ Ballitch defines what that means in the C&MA as, “Presently, in the C&MA, women may hold any office and perform any function that does not involve elder authority, meaning a woman cannot hold the office of elder, but may function freely and without restriction under the collective authority of the elders through delegation.” But even that is not enough for him. What he does not reveal and probably does not know is that the term “elder authority” had never been used in The Alliance until 1981. It has no history in The Alliance—no usage, no concept, no definition, no biblical support. The committee in 1996 recognized this and questioned whether it should even be used.

³⁰ He achieves well the first part—what he will not provide, and thus he gives himself a bye. Regarding the second part of the clause, he does offer resources for his hard C position, but he does not point readers to “solid resources and historic CMA exegesis.” Not knowing Alliance history, he provides no resources for the real historic Alliance E-C middle of the road position. He provides a one-sided view of what he inaccurately calls “historic CMA exegesis.” By eliminating 77 years of C&MA history, Ballitch thus has ignored a massive amount research, resources, and exegesis.

³¹ What Ballitch does not know is that this had in effect been the position of The Alliance for 90 years. My later research, surprising to me a strong C, uncovered the full story through the decades. From 1906 on, the roles of women in ministry had been designated with other issues of church government as an “open question” (C&MA Board of Mgrs, 1906, reaffirmed in 1922), a “non-essential” (Board of Managers 1908), a “side issue” (Tozer—1950s). At the time, the 1995 Committee Report had not uncovered sufficient documentation to back up their recommendation, so General Council had inadequate, incomplete, and inaccurate information on which to make its decision. When my book *Anointed Women* was published in 2009, members of the committee asked me, “Those are the facts and documentation we knew were there but could not find them. Where were you back then?” I responded, “I was one of the strong complementarians opposing you at the time.”

The Alliance position historically has been that men should *normally* be elders, but if suitable male elders could not be found, God would use women in that role, and thus the Scripture should not be interpreted strictly as an absolute norm without exception. So while Simpson and early Alliance leaders maintained the need for male covering, they modified their position to considering elder leadership as *usually* male, but not absolutely or exclusively so. Hence, the guiding principle of The Alliance became to allow local congregations to determine a woman’s role and title in ministry. Women would not be ordained but could be licensed in various capacities and women ordained elsewhere were welcomed. Some churches called women pastors, others called them superintendents or leaders, depending on local preferences. As long as they were under delegated authority and not usurping authority, they could exercise great authority as well (Matthew 8:8-10).

Throughout Alliance history, because The Alliance has been a “big tent” regarding various secondary doctrinal issues, there would be some who frowned upon “lady preachers,” or women as pastors, and perhaps even some who opposed the “open question” view of The Alliance, but freedom of conscience was always maintained in the spirit of agreeing to disagree. Churches who did not want women as pastors or elders were not required to accept them. However, women were universally allowed and encouraged to preach and teach in Alliance churches as evangelists, Bible teachers, and itinerating missionaries on deputation.

³² “Progressivism” is the new euphemistic terminology for liberalism.

³³ The real fact is that only recent C&MA exegesis from the late 1990s, not historical C&MA exegesis, precludes women from being given the label “pastor.” Further, Ballitch selectively omits the original alternate exegetical reports from 1995 by other C&MA scholars that dispute the recent exegesis and maintain the historical C&MA exegesis. Historic C&MA exegesis has allowed for differing points of view and considered this an open question from 1906 to 1999, or as Tozer put it, “a side issue.” Second, C&MA history by no means precludes a woman being given the title of pastor. Women were first called pastors in *The Alliance Weekly* in 1905, and officially appointed as pastors by 1910.

³⁴ He may have drawn this idea from the 1996 Introductory Report to General Council by Dr. Elio Cuccaro, who summed up the committee’s feelings that if the decision was left to local churches, “We would end up exchanging one national conflict for a thousand local ones.” “Introductory Overview Submitted to the Board of Managers for the Delegates of Council 1996, by Rev. Elio Cuccaro, Ph.D.,” Summary of C&MA Background Documents—1996 Study and Report,” Attachment 5, Elder Authority, 39, “Report of the Committee to Define the Concept of ‘Elder Authority’ and Its Consistent Application; and to Define the Privileges and Responsibilities of Ordination: Report to the 1998 General Council of The Christian and Missionary Alliance, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, May 27-31, 1998.” Again, Cuccaro and the 1996 Committee did not have the information and documentation to realize that their fear of a thousand local conflicts was unfounded.

³⁵ Notes and CDs, Rekindle the Flame Gathering, Maple Ridge Community Church, Lafayette, Indiana, May 2006.

³⁶ Blomberg, *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, 333.

³⁷ I was a strong C at the time of the 1999 General Council., and though not present at that Council, I would have voted with the majority to disallow women pastors. It was only later that through extensive research and exegetical study, that my mind was changed and I shifted, not to E, but to a middle E-C position. A strong minority voted against the legislation to disallow women pastors. After the 1999 vote against women as pastors, the feelings were numb. There was much pain. Division did occur. Some churches, pastors and people left The Alliance. Yet a strong minority remained, respecting the decision of the slim majority, but working within the system to reverse or modify the decision. Some churches that had women associate pastors still continued to do so. Since women could not hold the title of pastor, some districts licensed women as evangelists. though they were in a pastoral setting and their congregation considered them as pastors. These were not viewed as rebelling against the new policy, but maintaining the spirit of Simpson’s principle of flexibility, exceptions, and adjustments.

³⁸ We might say the scripture is clear to hard-core Calvinists and to hard-core Arminians for their positions. However, in The Alliance, our hermeneutic is that Scripture is clear about the essentials of the faith in which all evangelicals believe, and almost as clear for our Alliance distinctives (Christ-centeredness, the Fourfold Gospel, continuism, believer’s baptism), but in practically most other doctrines and practices, such as Calvinism/ Arminianism and E/C, we may differ on clarity.

³⁹ Ballitch’s view seems to parrot a paper entitled “An Alliance Historical Perspective,” presented to the 1997 General Council. The writer of that paper falsely alleged that the C&MA’s “view of women in ministry has been unchanged since its inception. Women have always had effective ministries, but The Alliance has always maintained that the Bible reserves the ‘headship’ roles and duties (i.e., elder, pastor, bishop) for men.” It further falsely claimed, “Simpson and The Alliance have held a singular view of the biblical teaching regarding women in ministry. They have believed that women are not to hold the positions or conduct the duties reserved for men. These are the positions and duties of headship: elder, bishop, pastor.” However, the historical documentation in *Anointed Women* clearly shows that claim not to be true. Extensive search of Alliance documents shows these conclusions to be in great error, especially the claim that The Alliance has “always” maintained that women are not to be pastors or conduct duties reserved for men “since its inception.” “Report of the Committee to Define the Concept of ‘Elder Authority’ and its Consistent Application; and to Define the Privileges and Responsibilities of Ordination,” paper presented to General Council 1999, The Christian and Missionary Alliance, Portland, Oregon, May 25-30, 1999, p. 40-41.

⁴⁰ Dr. Franklin Pyles, Facebook C&MA Workers page, May 19, 2021. As with so many issues in the big tent Alliance, we find elements of truth in various viewpoints. The Alliance does have a little denominational hierarchy, but it is minimal compared to traditional churches like Methodist, Episcopal, Lutheran, etc. It is mostly a blend of presbyterial and congregational with a little bit of hierarchy. Plurality of elder leadership working together as a team adds in the presbyterial aspect, along with congregational polity in which the local church has a lot of congregational freedom within constituted authority to create its own bylaws and operate with a good degree of autonomy.

⁴¹ A.B. Simpson, “Consecration, in Relation to Our Duty to the Weak and Erring,” *CAMW*, July 6, 1894, 4, 5. Simpson’s entire article was a sermon exposition of Romans 14-15 devoted to liberty and tolerance.

⁴²Aa a moderate C who believes a women should not be a lead pastor, Foh nonetheless acknowledges, “It is debatable whether this passage specifically excludes women from the office of elder or not.” *Women in Ministry: Four Views*, 81.

⁴³ Editorial, *CMAW*, Mar 31, 1906, 185.

⁴⁴ Simpson, “The Phases and Phrases of the Higher Christian Life,” 348.

⁴⁵ It appeared in the December 1894 issue of *Missionary Review of the World*. See an edited version online at: http://www.cbeinternational.org/new/free_articles/ministry_of_women.pdf.

⁴⁶ “Women Who Helped in the Gospel,” *CMAW*, June 18, 1897, 592.

⁴⁷ Leslie A. Andrews, “Perceptions of the Role of Women in the Christian and Missionary Alliance,” D.Min. Dissertation, Columbia Theological Seminary, 1976, 61. Ballitch notes, as does Andrews, that the article does not have Simpson’s byline, so that it may not have been written by Simpson. Many articles written by Simpson do not have his byline. It is consistent with Simpson’s wording and views, so it is likely to have been written by him. My first doctoral dissertation (600+ pages) involved extensive authorship attribution and analysis of the writings of C&MA Associate John MacMillan; Editor Henry Shuman, president of the C&MA; and anonymous editorials without a byline, so I have learned to pick up certain signals, word usage, and writing styles. Even if not authored by Simpson, the article certainly had his stamp of approval. If he disagreed with some article published, he would make an editorial comment about it.

⁴⁸ *CMAW*, June 9, 1900, 385, cited in Andrews, “Restricted Freedom,” 229.

⁴⁹ Andrews, 229.

⁵⁰ Mary Gainforth, *The Life and Healing of Mrs. Mary Gainforth* (Trenton, Ontario: Jarrett Printing and Publishing Co., n.d.), 38-39.

⁵¹ “Officers of the Christian and Missionary Alliance,” *CMAW*, January 31, 1903, 69; “Officers of the Christian and Missionary Alliance,” *CMAW*, January 16, 1904, 100.

⁵² Mrs. K.C. Woodberry, “From Shanghai to San Francisco,” *CMAW*, May 6, 1905, 281; “Christian Work and Workers,” *CMAW*, June 11, 1904, 28.

⁵³ C&MA Board of Managers Minutes, Sept. 20-23, 1922. According to the official Alliance Conference respecting uniformity in testimony and teaching, held in May 1906, these open questions include the following:

1. Church Government
2. The subject and mode of Baptism. Note: Inasmuch as the almost universal practice at home and in our mission fields: has come to be baptism of believers only by immersion, those holding contrary view should for the sake of unity regard this as a practically closed question.
3. The doctrines known as Calvinism and Arminianism.
4. Various ceremonies and practices such as feet-washing, open or closed communion, the dedication of children.
5. The ministry of women.

Members present: Mssrs. Rader, Turnbull. Snead, Funk, Mauer, MacArthur, Hallman, Evans, Whiteside, Armstrong, Richards. Forrest, Shuman, Stumpf, Brown and Poling.

⁵⁴ “Notes from the Home Field,” *Christian and Missionary Alliance Weekly (CMAW)*, March 26, 1910, 418.

⁵⁵ J. Hudson Ballard, “The Spiritual Clinic,” *CMAW*, August 19, 1911, 333.

⁵⁶ “Dedication of the Great Miami Tabernacle,” *Alliance Weekly (AW)*, March 6, 1926, 159. Note: Senft was on the Board of Managers that approved women in ministry as an open question in 1906.

⁵⁷ T. J. McCrossan, *Speaking with Other Tongues: Sign or Gift—Which?* (Christian Publications, 1927), 5.

⁵⁸ A. J. Gordon, “The Ministry of Women,” *AW*, December 15, 1928, 820-821.

⁵⁹ “Report of the Committee to Define the Concept of ‘Elder Authority’ and its Consistent Application; and to Define the Privileges and Responsibilities of Ordination,” General Council 1999, 44; Bailey, Correspondence to G.J. Schumaker of the IRS dated, Sept. 4, 1964, cited in Wendell W. Price, “The Role of Women in the History of the C&MA, 66.

⁶⁰ Anita M. Bailey, *Heritage Cameos* (Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1987), 86.

⁶¹ “Rachel Davison: One of the Good Things to Come to Leslie County,” newspaper article clipping, December 1977, C&MA Archives. Interview with Rachel Davison, 2007. She ministered in the Kentucky mountains for more than 50 years. Even after women from Specialized Ministries were no longer officially called pastors in the 1980s and following, people in her church and community called her pastor. She regularly administered Communion, and occasionally baptized people when a man was not available. When the District Superintendent came, they baptized people together.

⁶² “Alliance Family,” *The Alliance Witness*, July 2, 1986, 29; Warren Bird, “Women: Crucial Workers in God’s Vineyard,” *The Alliance Witness*, April 29, 1987, 27; “The Alliance Family,” *AW*, January 2, 1952, 14. Arbutus

Barr began work in Arkansas in 1952. She was variously referred to as home missionary and pastoral personnel. She co-pastored with Letitia Waite in Cowell 28 years, then both worked with Specialized Ministries 1983-87 with Lao people in Elgin, Illinois.

⁶³ I remember Margaret Sinclair pastoring when I first came back into the Southwestern district in 1992 and I remember seeing her at district conferences. Since at the time I was opposed to women pastors, I did not know what to think of her.

⁶⁴ “Report of the Committee to Study the Role of Women in Ministry: Elder Authority,” p. 41, C&MA General Council 1995, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

⁶⁵ Blomberg, *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, 127.

⁶⁶ Thomas Schreiner in Blomberg, *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, 279.

⁶⁷ J.I. Packer, *Keep in Step with the Spirit* (Old Tappan, NJ: Revell, 1984), 215; Thomas Schreiner, Blomberg, ed., *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, 322.

⁶⁸ Blomberg, *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, 319.

⁶⁹ Blomberg, *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, 333..

⁷⁰ Blomberg, *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, 332.

⁷¹ Henry Wilson, “Dr. Wilson and the Children, CMAW, June 10, 1905, 363.

⁷² “Did not Paul say, ‘I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over a man?’” But, here a woman is actually taking the lead as theological teacher to Apollos, an eminent minister of the Gospel, and so far setting her authority as to tell him that he is not thoroughly qualified for his work! . . . It is evident that the Holy Spirit made this woman Priscilla a teacher of teachers, and that her theological chair has had many worthy incumbents through the subsequent Christian ages. . . . “How little authority there is in the Word for repressing the witness of women in the public assembly, or for forbidding her to herald the Gospel to the unsaved. If this be so, it may be well for the plaintiffs in this case to beware lest, in silencing the voice of consecrated women, they may be resisting the Holy Ghost. The conjunction of these two admonitions of the apostle is significant: “Quench not the Spirit. Despise not prophesyings” (1 Thess. v.19-20).” A.J. Gordon, “The Ministry of Women” *Alliance Weekly*, December 15, 1928.

⁷³ Henry Wilson, “Dr. Wilson and the Children, CMAW, June 10, 1905, 363

⁷⁴ *Women in Ministry: Four Views*, 82.

⁷⁵ Wendell Price concluded in his doctoral dissertation, “Women, however, served as pastors, evangelists and teachers throughout the decades of the twenties, thirties, and forties.” Price, “The Role of Women in the Ministry of the Christian and Missionary Alliance, 45.

⁷⁶ The “1997 Task Force to Study The Organizational Functions And Design Of The Christian And Missionary Alliance Report To The 1997 General Council” reported to General Council:

In September 1996 when the Board of Managers was considering Council’s request for this study, several members expressed reservations about the terminology “elder authority.” In 1980, Council called for the creation of an instructional statement on Church Government. This was presented to Council and adopted in 1981 (pages 220 and 304). This instructional statement (pages 270-288) did not contain the statement **d(5)** concerning the ministry of women. Later that same Council motion which passed (pages 228 to 229) to include the following statement in its Manual: “Women may fulfill any function in the local church which the pastor and elders may choose to delegate to them consistent with the Manual.” During the same Council action was also taken on a report of the role of women in ministry. Within this report was the statement [page 325] “We conclude that women may properly engage in any kind of ministry except that which involves elder authority.” However, this statement was not in the portion of the report adopted by Council. In the President’s Cabinet following Council (6/81) the following action was taken: “In reference to Council action that the Christian and Missionary Alliance include in its manual the following statement, “Women may fulfill any function in the local church which the pastor and elders may choose to delegate to them consistent with the manual.” Refer to secretary will be responsible to fit this into the manual at the place the division of church ministries suggests. “In the 1981 edition of the Manual the statement on the role of women in ministry was printed as follows: “Women may fulfill any function in the local church which the senior pastor and the elders may choose to delegate to them consistent with the constitution for churches and may properly engage in any kind of ministry except that which involves elder authority.” (Our emphasis).

We can find no other action on this matter and no authorization for the inclusion of the underlined words above, Since there is no authorization by council for the inclusion of the words “elder authority,” we have questioned whether the call for this study is valid we wondered what we should do with this the women so we appealed to the Board of Managers whose answer will not be given until after the deadline for submitting this report. Elder Authority page 4, green papers. Reports to the 1998 General Council, May 27 to 31 1998, Milwaukee WI.

⁷⁷ This is page 8 of the elder authority statement in the 1997 Taskforce to Study the Organizational Functions and Design of the Christian and Missionary Alliance Report to the 1997 General Council Charlotte NC June 3 to 8 1997, from Reports to General Council 1997.

⁷⁸ A. J. Gordon, "The Ministry of Women," *AW*, December 15, 1928, 820-821; A. J. Gordon, "The Ministry of Women," *AW*, May 1, 1948, 277-278, 286.

⁷⁹ "Report of the Committee to Define the Concept of 'Elder Authority' General Council 1999, The Christian and Missionary Alliance, Portland, Oregon, May 25-30, 1999, 44; Nathan Bailey, Correspondence to G.J. Schumaker of the IRS dated, Sept 4, 1964, cited in Wendell W. Price, "The Role of Women in the History of the C&MA, San Francisco Theological Seminary, 1977, 66.

⁸⁰ Price, "The Role of Women in the Ministry of the Christian and Missionary Alliance," unpublished D. Min. dissertation, San Francisco Theological Seminary, 1977.

⁸¹ Wilson concluded in his 1984 Ph.D. dissertation *The Christian and Missionary Alliance: Developments and Modifications of Its Original Objectives*: "The data indicate quite clearly that there has been a definite modification of policy concerning women's ministries between the CMA origin and the present time, due to its shift from a fraternal to an ecclesiastical organization." Ernest Gerald Wilson, "The Christian and Missionary Alliance: Developments and Modifications of Its Original Objectives," Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1984, 47, 52, 54, 360-361.

⁸² See L. E. Maxwell with Ruth C. Dearing, *Women in Ministry* (Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1987), 8, 146-147.

⁸³ Anita M. Bailey, *Heritage Cameos* (Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications, 1987).

⁸⁴ T. J. McCrossan, *Speaking with Other Tongues: Sign or Gift—Which?* (Christian Publications, 1927), 5.

⁸⁵ "Women Who Helped in the Gospel," *CMAW*, June 18, 1897, 592.

⁸⁶ *CMAW*, June 9, 1900, 385, cited in Andrews, "Restricted Freedom," 229.

⁸⁷ The Alliance historically held to the headship of man and submission of women to men but did not view that as a rigid rule. Early Alliance leaders took the exegetical interpretation of Simpson's close friend and associate A.J. Gordon and published this as The Alliance position. "Some have held that the statement in 1 Timothy 2:9, with the entire paragraph to which it belongs, refers to the married woman's domestic relations, and not to her public relations; to her subjection to the teachings of her husband as against her dogmatic lording over him. This is the view of Canon Garrett in his excellent observations on the 'Ministry of Women.'"—A. J. Gordon, "The Ministry of Women," *AW*, December 15, 1928, 820-821.

⁸⁸ See Endnote 72.

⁸⁹ An anonymous article in 1898, possibly by Simpson, but certainly having his approval, asserts that the passage was in the context of "at that time," and not binding for all times: "It is true that the Apostle Paul did not *at that time* suffer a woman to teach, or to usurp authority over the man. Doubtless *at that time* there were no women competent to act as teachers "Women Who Helped in the Gospel," *CMAW*, June 18, 1897, 592. Italics mine.

⁹⁰ "It will be noticed that this passage speaks particularly against a woman teaching or usurping authority "over the man." We may imply from this that the force of the prohibition is applicable only when there is a proper man around to do the teaching and have the authority. If there is such a man it seems unscriptural for a woman to step in and usurp his place and prerogatives." J. Hudson Ballard, "The Spiritual Clinic," *CMAW*, August 19, 1911, 333.

⁹¹ See Endnote 90. It is interesting to note that John Sawin, the leading C&MA historian of the 20th century, must have himself been a very soft C, an E-C, or an E, for in his remarks regarding Ballard's article, he viewed Ballard's position as "grudging acquiescence in female leadership." John Sawin, *The John Sawin File Project: The Life and Times of A.B. Simpson*, 2000. C&MA Archives.

⁹² "As to the question of women's teaching a difficulty arises which it is not easy to solve. If the apostle in his words to Timothy absolutely forbids a woman to teach and expound spiritual truth, then the remarkable instance of a woman's doing this very thing at once occurs to the mind, Acts 18:26 an instance of private teaching possibly, but endorsed and made conspicuously public by its insertion in the New Testament."—A.J. Gordon, "The Ministry of Women," *AW*, December 15, 1928.

⁹³ "In the absence of a man qualified for such work we do know that God has often chosen and anointed spiritual women for teaching and for leading on the work of the Lord."—J. Hudson Ballard, Ph.D., Secretary, C&MA Board of Managers, Asst Editor *Alliance Weekly*. Ballard was clearly a C, but not a strict, rigid C. J. Hudson Ballard, "The Spiritual Clinic," *CMAW*, August 19, 1911, 333.

⁹⁴ "Women Who Helped in the Gospel," *CMAW*, June 18, 1897, 592

⁹⁵ T. J. McCrossan, *Speaking with Other Tongues: Sign or Gift—Which?* (Christian Publications, 1927), 5.

⁹⁶ A. J. Gordon, "The Ministry of Women," *AW*, December 15, 1928, 820-821.