

Untold Story of the Bible Commentary
"The Baptism"—A Short Story
Historical Case for Ordaining Women

SPECTRUM

Journal of the Association of Adventist Forums

Volume 16, Number 3

NEW VIEWS OF ELLEN WHITE

The Scope of Ellen White's Authority
Against Canonization
A Defense of Compilations
Apology for Ellen White as Historian

SPECTRUM

Editor

Roy Branson

Associate Editor

Charles Scriven

Senior Editor

Tom Dybdahl

News Editor

Bonnie Dwyer

Manuscript Editor

Gene Daffern

Book Review Editors

Peggy Corbett

Rennie Schoepflin

Editorial Associate

Diane Gainer

Editorial Board

Roy Branson
Ethics, Kennedy Institute
Georgetown University

Molleurus Couperus
Physician
Angwin, California

Gene Daffern
Physician
Washington, D.C.

Bonnie Dwyer
Journalism
Loma Linda, California

Tom Dybdahl
Editor
Allentown, Pennsylvania

Richard Emmerson
English
Walla Walla College

Alvin L. Kwiram
Chairman, Chemistry Department
University of Washington

Gary Land
History
Andrews University

Rennie Schoepflin
History
Loma Linda University

Charles Scriven
Theology
Walla Walla College

Ottile Stafford
English
Atlantic Union College

Consulting Editors

Earl W. Amundson
President
Atlantic Union Conference

Eric Anderson
History
Pacific Union College

Roy Benton
Chairman, Mathematics Department
Columbia Union College

Bonnie Casey
Writer/Editor
Washington, D.C.

George Colvin
Government
Claremont Graduate School

Raymond Cottrell
Theology
Loma Linda, California

Geri Fuller
Public Relations
Washington, D.C.

Lawrence Geraty
President
Atlantic Union College

Fritz Guy
Theology
Loma Linda University

F.E.J. Harder
Educational Administration
College Place, Washington

Jorgen Henriksen
Artist
Boston, Massachusetts

Edward Lugenbeal
Anthropology
Kettering, Ohio

Margaret McFarland
Attorney
Washington, D.C.

LaVonne Neff
Publishing
Downers Grove, Illinois

Ronald Numbers
History of Medicine
University of Wisconsin

Gary Patterson
President
Georgia-Cumberland Conference

Edward E. Robinson
Attorney
Chicago, Illinois

Gerhard Svrcek-Seiler
Psychiatrist
Vienna, Austria

Carolyn Stevens Shultz
English
Walla Walla College

Helen Ward Thompson
Vice-President
Loma Linda University

L.E. Trader
Education
Marienhoehe Gymnasium
West Germany

Louis Venden
Pastor
Loma Linda University Church

Association of Adventist Forums

Officers

President
Lyndrey A. Niles
Communications
Howard University

Vice President
Edward Lugenbeal
Health Care Administration
Kettering, Ohio

Executive Secretary
Claire Hosten
Attorney
Washington, D.C.

Treasurer
Richard C. Osborn
Principal
Takoma Academy

Editor
Roy Branson
Ethics, Kennedy Institute
Georgetown University

Directors

Of Chapter Development
Walter Douglas
Church History
Andrews University

Of International Relations
Molleurus Couperus
Physician
Angwin, California

Of Membership
Ronald D. Cople
Business
Silver Spring, Maryland

Of Promotion
Richard B. Lewis, Jr.
Advertising
Weston, Massachusetts

Of Special Projects
Glenn E. Coe
Attorney
West Hartford, Connecticut

Regional Representatives

Atlantic
John Hamer
Business
Hudson, Massachusetts

Central
Darrell J. Huenergardt
Attorney
Kimball, Nebraska

Central Pacific
Norman D. Sossong
Physician
St. Helena, California

Columbia
E. Theodore Agard
Radiation Physicist
Kettering, Ohio

Lake
Donald Gillespie
Health Care Administration
Stevensville, Michigan

Northern Pacific
John Brunt
Chairman, School of Theology
Walla Walla College

Southern
T. Grace Emori
Center for Disease Control
Atlanta, Georgia

Southern Pacific
Mike Scofield
Business
Anaheim, California

Staff

Legal Consultant
Bradley Litchfield
Attorney
Washington, D.C.

SPECTRUM is a journal established to encourage Seventh-day Adventist participation in the discussion of contemporary issues from a Christian viewpoint, to look without prejudice at all sides of a subject, to evaluate the merits of diverse views, and to foster Christian intellectual and cultural growth. Although effort is made to ensure accurate scholarship and discriminating judgment, the statements of fact are the responsibility of contributors, and the views individual authors express are not necessarily those of the editorial staff as a whole or as individuals.

The Association of Adventist Forums is a nonsubsidized, nonprofit organization for which gifts are deductible in the report of income for purposes of taxation. The publishing of SPECTRUM depends on subscriptions, gifts from individuals and the voluntary efforts of the contributors and the staff.

Editorial Correspondence: SPECTRUM is published by the Association of Adventist Forums. Direct all editorial correspondence to SPECTRUM, 7710 Carroll Avenue, Takoma Park, Maryland 20912. Manuscripts should be typewritten, double spaced and in matters of style and documentation, conform to *A Manual of Style* (University of Chicago Press). Submit the original and two copies, along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Responses from readers may be shortened before publication.

Subscription Information: In order to receive SPECTRUM, send a membership fee (\$20 per 5 issues, except \$25 in Canada and in other foreign countries; \$2 less for students) to Association of Adventist Forums, Box 5330, Takoma Park, Maryland 20912. Phone: (301) 270-0423. Single copies may be purchased for \$4. Pay by check made out to the Association of Adventist Forums. For address changes, send old address label along with the new address.

In This Issue

Vol. 16, No. 3, August 1985

Special Section: New Views of Ellen White

The Scope of Ellen White's Authority	Donald R. McAdams	2
Formative Authority, Yes; Canonization, No	Herold Weiss	8
In Defense of Compilations	Arthur L. White	14
A Vindication of Ellen White as Historian	Jean Zurcher	21

Short Story

The Baptism	Bonnie L. Casey	32
-------------	-----------------	----

Articles

The Untold Story of the Bible Commentary	Raymond F. Cottrell	35
The Adventist Heritage Calls for Ordination of Women	Bert Haloviak	52

Responses

About This Issue

For 15 years studies have appeared in this journal and elsewhere examining the sources of Ellen White's writings and her methods of composition. (For an overview see Donald McAdams' "Shifting Views of Inspiration: Ellen G. White Studies in the 1970s," *Spectrum*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 27-41, and notes to his article in this issue.) Although we have not published materials on Ellen White for some time, we are pleased to present in this issue diverse views of Ellen White and her role in the church by a group of distinguished Adventist authors.

Two of the four essays are by trustees of the Ellen G. White Estate: Arthur White explains that the White Estate's publication of compilations was a continuation of Ellen White's own practice, and Jean Zurcher defends the accuracy of historical passages

in *Great Controversy* describing the Waldenses and Albigenses.

Donald McAdams and Herold Weiss have written on Ellen White before. Here they break new ground, going beyond the details of Ellen White's sources and methods of composition to explore her role in the future of the Adventist Church. Both essays conclude that she will continue to have authority in the church, but in a new way.

Elsewhere in this issue, Bert Haloviak reveals that women have served as licensed ministers since the early days of the Adventist denomination. Ray Cottrell, from his uniquely well-informed position as associate editor, reveals for the first time the authors of the articles in the *SDA Bible Commentary*. Bonnie Casey reminds us of those times when symbols, such as baptism, have shocked us with an encounter with the divine. Finally, our readers continue cogent conversations about important challenges facing the church.

—The Editors

The Scope of Ellen White's Authority

by Donald R. McAdams

The Adventist dilemma in 1985 over the authority of Ellen White is not new. It also confronted those in her day who accepted her spiritual gift. The 1919 Bible Conference transcripts make that clear. The college Bible teachers, editors and General Conference administrators present at the 1919 meetings had personal knowledge of Ellen White's unique spiritual gift. They also knew that Ellen White copied from other sources and made statements that were not correct—in short, that her works were not entirely original and that they were not infallible. An inspired, yet fallible, prophet was—and still is—the dilemma for Adventists.¹

But the debate about Ellen White's authority in the 1980s is not a private discussion confined to church leaders; it is open to the entire church. The publicity given to the allegations of Walter Rea, the basic nondenial of his charges by the church's official publications and spokesmen,² and the publication of his book, *The White Lie*, in April 1982 have created an awareness and an interest among church members regarding Ellen White's use of sources. The research about Ellen White circulating among Adventist intellectuals for a decade³ is now being dis-

cussed widely among educated Adventists throughout the North American Division.

As in 1919, the central question today for Adventists who believe Ellen White was inspired is this: If we accept that she took much material from others and often made mistakes, what authority should we grant to her words?

Note that it is Ellen White's authority, not her inspiration, that is being questioned. Most of the researchers of the 1970s were thoroughly committed Adventists who showed that using the words of others did not detract from Ellen White's claim to inspiration. Like the men of 1919, most informed Adventists today see no need to debate whether or not she was inspired. Her inspiration cannot be proved or disproved. The decision to believe is one of faith, informed by facts.

But for many who accept the inspiration of Ellen White, there is still a question about her authority. The discussion about Ellen White's authority is widespread in the church. It is not being carried on in the pages of the *Adventist Review*; it is going on in private conversations among friends, within families and in the hearts of thousands of Adventists. Knowing that at least some, and perhaps much, of what Ellen White wrote was not seen in vision but came from the writings of others, Adventists are, for the first time in the history of the church, making the fine distinction between inspiration and authority.

While acknowledging the inspiration of

Donald McAdams, president of the Texas Independent College Fund, received his doctorate in history from Duke University. He was professor of history at Andrews University and president of Southwestern Adventist College for nine years. This essay is based on his presentation at the first national AAF Conference.

their prophet, they are asking themselves whether everything Ellen White said is necessarily true, accurate and therefore authoritative. If church leaders are willing to acknowledge that Ellen White paraphrased and selectively abridged much material from others and that her historical statements are not always accurate, is it not possible that some of her other statements—important statements about science, prophecy, theology and behavior, statements upon which Adventists have built their lives and for which they have sacrificed much—are not accurate? And if Ellen White is not totally original and not always accurate, then in what way is she an authority for individual Adventists and for the church?

The dictionary defines authority as “legal or rightful power,” as in parental or governmental authority; “one that is claimed or appealed to in support of opinions, actions, measures, etc.,” and “power derived from opinion, respect or esteem.” Note that none of these definitions of authority requires or even suggests inerrancy or infallibility. Let me give an example. I am an authority in my home. I expect my children to accept my authority and obey me. And yet I recognize that I am not always right. We sometimes refer to eminent scholars as authorities in their field, but this does not mean we accept everything they say as true. Yet this is the way Adventists have traditionally defined the authority of Ellen White. We have viewed her every statement as true, something that must be accepted, believed and acted upon.

The church certainly has the right to claim this authority for Ellen White, to assert that she does not make statements that are historically, scientifically or theologically inaccurate. But on what basis is this claim made? Is there any way to test this claim, or is it by its very nature untestable? That is, can we say because Ellen White is inspired by God, she is the final authority and cannot be evaluated by any facts or judgments

that are necessarily human?

Such a view of Ellen White's authority, a common view among conservative Adventists, is not logical. If a prophet is not testable, then there is no way to determine who is and who is not a prophet. Anyone can claim divine authority for his “testimonies” or publications and say, “because my information comes directly from God, it cannot be wrong; I, the messenger of divinity, am the test of all other statements of truth; no human data, objective or subjective, can test divinity.” Faced with such a claim from two or more mutually incompatible “prophets,” a prospective believer would be unable to choose which one to believe.

Authority, by its very nature, is something that cannot just be claimed; it must be earned. It is only after scholars have thoroughly studied a subject and written with consistent accuracy that they are accepted as authorities. Only a prophet who speaks the truth and describes reality as it

Knowing that at least some, and perhaps much, of what Ellen White wrote was not seen in vision but came from the writings of others, Adventists are, for the first time in the history of the church, making the fine distinction between inspiration and authority.

is can be accepted as an authority by a body of believers.

One must acknowledge that Ellen White's statements are testable. She does not and cannot stand above empirical data or objective reality—that is, what sane, reasonable and honest people can establish as fact by the use of their senses and reason. Fallible and subjective though our senses and reason be, they are all that we have with which to

perceive reality and to receive the communication of God—whether directly to the mind, by way of the Holy Spirit, or through the words of another, a prophet.

But how, one asks, can observation and reason test a prophet's statements on spiritual and theological matters? Perhaps a prophet can be tested against the facts of science or history, but how can his or her statements on the character of God or the events in heaven before the creation of the world be tested?

Before considering this question, we need to ask another, Does God impart to

There may be rare circumstances when God needs to reveal scientific or historical information to a prophet, but special revelation is required precisely because God needs to give us information we could not otherwise obtain.

prophets information that is readily obtainable by observation and reason? Does it make sense to reveal to a prophet the population of New York City, the circumference of the earth or the length of the year? Would God need to show a prophet the content of Luther's 95 theses, the names of those who signed the Declaration of Independence, or the date for the fall of the Bastille?

There may be rare circumstances when God needs to reveal scientific or historical information to a prophet, but special revelation is required precisely because God needs to give us information we could not otherwise obtain. The questions at the very core of human experience, questions about origin, meaning, destiny, the nature and character of God and how he wishes to be worshiped, could not be answered without God's revelation through inspired messengers. Ellen White made a statement about

divine and human power that makes essentially the same point about divine and human knowledge: "What human power can do, divine power is not summoned to do."⁴

If we acknowledge that all prophets can and must be tested and accept the premise that God does not ordinarily reveal to a prophet scientific or historical information, we have in place the twin pillars on which we can construct a model or conception of inspiration and authority. This model of inspiration will enable us to be honest with the data on Ellen White, logical and systematic in our thinking, and committed to a belief that Ellen White was an inspired messenger of God who spoke with prophetic authority.

What authority, then, does Ellen White have? Let us for purposes of analysis divide Ellen White's writings into two parts. The first part gives information about spiritual matters. In this sphere Ellen White is tested by the Bible, that is, by the true prophets who have gone before her. She is true unless proved false, and she can be proved false only by a clear statement of Scripture that contradicts her own statement. Does this happen? Yes. But only on rare occasions and, in my opinion, with matters of small significance.

A word of explanation is needed on this point. While Ellen White does speak "according to the law and the testimony," she is not a biblical exegete and occasionally assigns a meaning to a text that the text does not have. Preachers sometimes do this when they use a text homiletically. Much of what Ellen White said was in the form of a sermon or originated in that form. We might say that much of what she wrote was an extended sermon to the Adventist people.

Before proceeding to the second part of Ellen White's writings, an additional question needs to be raised. If the part of Ellen White's writings that deals with spiritual matters is tested only by the Bible, how is

the spiritual message of the Bible tested? In short, why would one choose, in the first place, to accept the Bible as a spiritual authority? The answer is a subjective one.

Though there is much historical and scientific data that lends credence to the Bible, one must acknowledge that the Bible is accepted as inspired not because Bible writers claimed inspiration but because a community of people, the Old Testament Jews and the New Testament Christians, as a result of their own experience, came to believe that the various Bible writers were bringing them God's message.

As we study this collection of books we come to understand their experience and find that the messages that appealed to their minds and hearts appeal to ours also. The really important questions that we have about life and meaning we find answered in this book. And we discover by our own experience that when we commit ourselves to live by this book, our lives are enriched and we become filled with joy and the assurance that God is indeed speaking to us.

I find that Ellen White has the same impact upon me. I acknowledge that in spiritual matters I cannot prove her to be true or false, but I believe.

There are many in the church who, with me, acknowledge the recent evidence and yet believe in Ellen White's inspiration. They believe in a fallible and not totally original prophet.

The second part of Ellen White's writings gives information on history, science and other nonspiritual matters. It is not that she wrote specifically for the purpose of giving this information; she always wrote for a spiritual purpose. But to convey truth about spiritual matters, she often used facts and

explanations taken from the general knowledge of her age. As she put it when referring to her use of historians, she presents facts that are "universally acknowledged by the Protestant world." It is in this sphere that Ellen White can be tested by objective facts gathered by human observation and experiment; in short, by the historical and scientific method. In these areas she can and has been shown to be incorrect.

Two very important qualifications need to be made. Ellen White is not wrong when she describes historical events that defy our understanding of the laws of science—that is, miracles. Accounts of miracles are not scientific statements, they are historical statements. They do not give us facts about nature or describe the working of the laws of nature. They describe an event when the laws of nature did not work as they usually do. As such, they are historical statements subject to historical analysis. If reliable eyewitnesses refute a miracle story we can prove it false, but if a witness we accept as inspired describes a miraculous event, we should accept it.

In addition, Ellen White is not proven wrong by the theories of historians, scientists or scholars in any field. For example, she is not proven wrong on her view of the Protestant Reformation by pro-Catholic historians, nor on Creation by the theory of evolution. And she is not proven wrong by indirect evidence—that is, the inferences of scholars based on direct evidence.

One should note that many of the conclusions of scientists and scholars are based on indirect evidence. The religious practices or material level of living of early civilizations, for example, are inferred from human artifacts. The age of the earth is inferred by the direct evidence of the percentage of radioactive elements in a sample of rock. The size and age of the universe is inferred by the red shift in stars. Of course, scientific or historical conclusions based on indirect evidence are not accepted until the

chain of inference is tight, the logic cannot be refuted and there are converging lines of evidence. This is the arena where scientists and scholars disagree. The public sees only the conclusions and is not aware of the qualifications and uncertainties of the scholars doing the work.

Ellen White is not proven false by these conclusions based on indirect evidence, but on occasion, where the chain of evidence is very closely linked and tightly reasoned and where there are several converging lines of evidence, a believer in her inspiration and authority can choose to accept these conclusions even if they disagree with Ellen White's statements.

As believers in Ellen White's inspiration, we give her an authority granted only to Bible writers. All other writers, in everything they say, are considered false unless proven true. Though we do not often ask for proof, we all understand that any speaker or writer carries the burden of proof for all of his or her statements. If challenged, the speaker or writer must produce the evidence. We do not ask this of Ellen White. She is an authority. If we challenge her statements we accept the burden of proof. This is not an insignificant point. It is at the very essence of the meaning of the word *authority*.

Many will find this conclusion unaccep-

table. Those who will not or cannot acknowledge that Ellen White took much material from others and made mistakes will remain convinced that there is no question that needs to be answered. Ellen White is right because she is right. Everything she says is true because it was given to her by the Holy Spirit, even if she happened to see the same words, phrases or ideas in the writings of others. For these people, there is no question about her authority and no need for this discussion.

Others do not see any evidence that Ellen White was inspired. Her writings do not speak to their hearts, and they see no reason to grant her authority, no matter how one defines the word. If she can be shown to be false in areas where she can be tested, they say, then there is no reason to believe that in areas where she cannot be tested she is accurate.

But there are many in the church who, with me, acknowledge the recent evidence and yet believe in Ellen White's inspiration. They believe in a fallible and not totally original prophet. I hope that this paper will make a positive contribution to these believers by showing that one can believe in Ellen White's inspiration and accept her as an authority while acknowledging error in her writings.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The only statement by Ellen White that acknowledges her use of other writers in her own works appeared in the introduction to the 1888 *Great Controversy* and again in the introduction to the 1911 *Great Controversy* (pages xiii-xiv). The statement is ambiguous.

The great events which have marked the progress of reform in past ages are matters of history, well known and universally acknowledged by the Protestant world; they are facts which none can gainsay. This history I have presented briefly, in accordance with the scope observed, the facts having been condensed into as little space as seemed consistent with a proper understanding of their application. In some cases where a historian has so grouped together events as to afford, in brief, a comprehensive view of the subject, or has summarized details in a convenient manner, his words have been quoted; but in some instances no special credit has been given, since the quotations are not given for the purpose of citing that writer as authority, but because his statement affords a ready and forcible presen-

tation of the subject.

This statement was almost never referred to by the White Estate or church writers before 1974. In that year, in an unpublished study of Ellen White's use of Protestant historians, I pointed out that this statement allowed Adventists to openly acknowledge Ellen White's widespread, selective abridgement from Protestant historians. I can distinctly remember some of the brethren arguing that what Ellen White meant when she said, "in some instances no special credit has been given, since the quotations are not given for the purpose of citing that writer as authority, but because his statement affords a ready and forcible presentation of the subject," was that the historians were not the authority, the angel was. With that view of the statement, and with so many other statements in the introduction to *The Great Controversy* describing the visions, it is not surpris-

ing that the statement was so seldom cited. (In fact, I have not found one use of the statement before 1974 to show that Ellen White acknowledged her use of other writers.) Since 1974 the *Adventist Review* and other church publications have quoted the statement often to show that Ellen White acknowledged her use of other writers.

Not only did the Adventist people in general not know that Ellen White paraphrased from others, they believed that information contained in the passages quoted from Protestant historians first came to her in visions. White Estate spokesmen assured the church that the prophet did not depend upon human sources for information. She merely used the words of others to express in clear language that which had already been revealed to her by the Lord. This point was made by W.C. White, Francis Nichol and A.L. White:

The framework of the great temple of truth sustained by her writings was presented to her clearly in vision. In some features of prophetic chronology, as regards the ministration in the sanctuary and the changes that took place in 1844, the matter was presented to her many times and in detail many times, and this enabled her to speak very clearly and very positively regarding the foundation pillars of our faith.

In some of the historical matters such as are brought out in *Patriarchs and Prophets*, and in *Acts of the Apostles* and in *Great Controversy*, the main outlines were made very clear and plain to her, and when she came to write up these topics, she was left to study the Bible and history to get dates and geographical relations and to perfect her description of details.

W.C. White, in a letter to L.E. Froom, December 13, 1934 (unpublished), quoted by W.P. Bradley, "Ellen G. White and Her Writings," *Spectrum*, Vol. 3, No. 2, (Spring 1971), p. 58.

There is illumination by the Holy Spirit. Scenes are presented. Spiritual thoughts and ideas are brought to the mind. Then the prophet takes up his pen and proceeds to present, in the language of men, what has been seen and heard and impressed on his mind in vision. And it is in this context that Mrs. White frankly states that she has drawn, at times, on the language of men as found in histories and other sources.

Francis D. Nichol, in *Ellen G. White and Her Critics*, (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1945), p. 461.

In connection with the writing out of these views of the events of ancient and modern history, and especially the history of the great Reformation of the sixteenth century her reading of D'Aubigne, Wylie, and others proved to be helpful. She sometimes drew from them clear historical statements to help make plain to the readers the things which she was endeavoring to present. Also, by thus corroborating with indisputable historical evidence that which had been revealed to her, she would win the confidence of the general reader in the truths she was presenting.

Just as her study of the Bible helped her to locate and describe the many figurative representations given to her regarding the development of the controversy, so the reading of histories of the reformation helped her to locate and describe many of the events and the movements presented to her in the visions.

A.L. White, "Ellen G. White as an Historian," incomplete publication data, p. 7.

2. In the numerous public responses to Rea's allegations, church spokesmen did not once deny that Ellen White borrowed from others. Elder Neal C.

Wilson, president of the General Conference, explicitly acknowledged that "in her writing Ellen White used sources more extensively than we have heretofore been aware of or recognized."—N.C. Wilson, "This I Believe About Ellen G. White," *Adventist Review*, March 20, 1980, p.8.

Arthur White had acknowledged, even before Rea's charges were made public, partly in anticipation of what was coming and partly in response to my work, that Ellen White had made historical errors. In the third article in a seven-part series in the *Adventist Review*, entitled "The E.G. White Historical Writings," he said, "Would it have been possible for some inaccuracy to have crept into Ellen White's descriptions of historical events or that the historians from whom she quoted may have been mistaken in some points of detail and thus, Ellen White, not being especially informed, allowed these mistakes to slip through into her narrative?" He answered his question with a straightforward affirmative.—A.L. White, *Adventist Review*, July 26, 1979, p. 9.

The most straightforward acknowledgement of Ellen White's use of other writers and her inaccuracies was made by R.W. Olson, secretary of the White Estate, on the back page of the April 15, 1982, *Adventist Review*:

"Ellen White used the works of other authors more extensively than we once thought. She borrowed historical, chronological, descriptive, and theological material. Some of her most beautiful gems were first penned in similar, though not usually identical, words by others. Also, we have found some inaccuracies in her writings, but these do not relate to Christian belief or conduct."

3. Much has changed in the past 14 years. The authority of Ellen White is now widely discussed in the Adventist Church. The research of William Peterson, Donald McAdams, Ronald Numbers, Ronald Graybill, Raymond Cottrell, Walter Specht, Donald Casebolt and Walter Rea has conclusively established the following points:

- Ellen White not only quoted from Protestant historians, she also paraphrased extensively and sometimes closely from them, carrying over into her work not only the words and their ideas but sometimes their historical errors.

- Ellen White not only selectively abridged historians in *The Great Controversy*, she also paraphrased extensively from Bible commentators, devotional writers, writers on the life of Christ and others in all of the Conflict of the Ages series, the Testimonies, and almost everything else she wrote.

- Ellen White's literary assistants made major contributions to her books as finders, paraphrasers, organizers and editors.

- Ellen White was influenced by time, place and person.

For an essay summarizing the research of those scholars and giving the bibliographic data, see Donald R. McAdams' "Shifting Views of Inspiration: Ellen G. White Studies in the 1970s," *Spectrum*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (March 1980), pp. 27-41.

4. *The Desire of Ages*, p. 535.

Formative Authority, Yes; Canonization, No

by Herold Weiss

Ellen White's role as an authority in the Seventh-day Adventist Church changed while she was alive and has continued to change since her death. Through these changes the meaning of her authority has itself changed—both in the claims made for her by church leaders and in the understanding of ordinary church members. In what follows I will trace these changes and suggest that today we must conceive her authority as rooted, not in the kind of person she was, but in the truthfulness of what she said.

A distinction will clarify this. We may speak on the one hand of formal authority, the authority that exists when someone's words are taken to be true just because he or she has said them, quite apart from the question of the words' intrinsic truthfulness. The authority of the words comes from the office the person occupied. But there is another kind of authority we may call internal. It exists, not because of who is speaking, but because the words themselves persuade us. What I am suggesting is this: No longer can Ellen White have formal authority in our community; from now on her authority must be internal, residing in the truth of what she says.

Ellen White's fellow believers first took her to have authority because of her visionary experiences. To the disappointed and confused flock, her visions meant that in spite of the believers' confusion, God was with them. Thus her role in the early years was that of providing confidence to the believers.

When the community passed from its effort to cope with disappointment to that of clarifying its doctrines, Mrs. White's visionary experiences continued to inform it. That is how in the early 1850s our pioneers arrived at "present truth," including the doctrine of the shut door.

But then Mrs. White's role changed. Instead of being the one who symbolized God's blessing on the movement, she became the one who was to rebuke anyone showing weakness of character. Letters of counsel, later collected and reprinted as *Testimonies for the Church*, began to appear. Walter Rea asserts that at this time Mrs. White was a marionette in the hands of her husband James, who as a kind of puppeteer was using her to exercise control over the flock. To me, the evidence shows that Mrs. White was, in fact, a very strong person who would not allow anyone to handle her in this way. What is clear in any case is that as the writer of testimonies, her role was different, though she herself saw this as an extension of her former role of providing comfort to the little flock. It is clear that in this new role she sometimes embellished her counsels, warnings and rebukes with extended copying from literature available to her which

Herold Weiss is professor of New Testament at St. Mary's College, South Bend, Indiana. He received his doctorate in New Testament from Duke University and was a member of the faculty of the SDA Theological Seminary. This essay is based on his presentation at the first national AAF conference.

was, at times, also available to her readers.

In 1858, with the appearance of *The Great Controversy*, Mrs. White changed roles again: she became a literary enterprise. Her contemporaries, some of whom accepted the *Testimonies* as a sign of God's special presence in the community, considered the new materials written for sale by colporteurs to be essentially similar to other books the colporteurs were selling. From the 1880s on, Mrs. White produced a tremendous amount of literature—testimonies, articles and books. Of course, these were all related. The latter fed on the former. Fanny Bolton, one of her literary assistants, had a hard time, indeed, trying to reconcile her preconceived notions of inspiration with the way the articles and books were being put together by Marian Davies and herself. The pressure on Mrs. White to write for the *Review*, the *Signs*, the *Youth's Instructor* and the colporteurs was tremendous. But her authority as an inspired or inspiring author was by now established; she enjoyed her work, and it never became a painful struggle for her. In the early hours of the morning she would write a draft which her assistants revised; later she approved the final draft.

After Ellen White died, her son, W. C. White, took over the production of her books, continuing to do what she had done before her death. Her own books had been compilations of paragraphs from testimonies, letters and articles; the only thing now missing was the approval of the final draft by Mrs. White herself. But another very significant change took place as well. The demand for her authoritative word began to come from a new quarter. She had produced her books to meet the demands of the general reading public. Now they were being produced to meet the demands of a General Conference committee that had decided the church needed something about a particular subject, such as stewardship or parenting. Now others were handling the formal authority Mrs. White had formerly employed for herself. Those who needed an objective authority had found one in her.

During the 1920s and 1930s many of those who had worked with Mrs. White in the production of her books were still alive. But with the death of that generation the claims made on her behalf gained new heights. At the same time, efforts were made to block scholars from access to her materials in the White Estate vault. In the 1950s, when I was a seminary student in Washington, D.C.,

When authority is formal, every position taken by the person who has that authority must be obediently adopted. But in the 1920s and 1930s it was already becoming clear that Ellen White's every word could not be taken as a divine command.

my professors, Dr. Walther, Dr. Loasby and Dr. Heppenstall, had very limited access to these materials. Dr. Walther finally declared that he would no longer teach a course in denominational history because he had no access to the documents. At the same time it was expected that every doctrine we were taught would be buttressed by statements from Mrs. White.

When authority is formal, every position taken by the person who has that authority must be obediently adopted. But in the 1920s and 1930s it was already becoming clear that Mrs. White's every word could not be taken as a divine command. Our college campuses already enjoyed the luxury of paved tennis courts, and around the world some ministers were wearing wedding rings. In the realm of the practical aspects of life, in the world of policies and projects in the church, the authority of Mrs. White had begun to slip. Indeed, the decline had begun rather soon

after her death. Around the world Adventists belonged to labor unions, lent and borrowed money and received aid from the government in order to keep institutions running; sadly enough, many times ecclesiastical managers found themselves with little guidance and made important decisions only on the basis of expediency.

No one has authority unless it is granted. Mrs. White's authority on matters of daily

Genuine Adventism is committed to the gospel and to the truth. It does not claim that we already have the truth on the basis of a confirmatory authority peculiarly our own. The Spirit of Prophecy does not give us a handle on truth; it enables us to search for "present truth."

living has always met with an uneven response. On numerous occasions the church has denied her the authority to dictate on practical matters. This is quite significant, since it was precisely over practical matters of daily life that Mrs. White's *Testimonies* exercised authority in the first place.

Today the authority of Mrs. White on practical matters is invoked only when the objective sought happens to coincide with something that she said at one time or another. And to some degree, this has become the case also in the area of doctrines. She supplies authority for whatever anyone wishes to teach, particularly in the area of esoteric knowledge. How old is the Earth? How tall was Adam? Is there a sanctuary in heaven? Will there be a third world war? Will it be fought in the South Atlantic or in the Caucasus Mountains? Some persons claim to have authoritative answers to all these questions on the basis of a state

ment penned by Mrs. White.

Mrs. White's formal authority on matters of science and history has also undergone erosion. The revelations for which Ronald Numbers and Walter Rea are well known have had telling effect despite efforts to mount an apologetic counterattack by accommodating her use of sources to her visions.

But it seems to me that, with these new materials before us, Mrs. White's formal authority—the readiness of her readers, that is, to accept what she said as true just because a prophet said it—has in fact been shattered. From now on no one should be able to end a theological dialogue by giving a quotation from Mrs. White.

If we ask why Mrs. White's formal authority has been shattered, it is not first of all because Desmond Ford demonstrated that she was wrong on the sanctuary and Walter Rea showed the extent of her literary dependence. The fundamental reason is that the integrity of her office as a visionary has been legitimately put into question. I think that everyone will have to agree that either consciously or unconsciously she misled us. I also think that it is fair to say that there has been a cover-up by people who knew better—or should have. Some may want to say that she was less than candid about her literary work, while some may find even this description too incriminating and unjust. Others have gone all the way and have charged her with deliberate deception. I think this charge is difficult to prove.

In the aftermath of all the recent research on Mrs. White, even publications representing the church's leadership are presenting altered views. In a recent *Ministry* magazine, for example, we are told that "Mrs. White's prophetic role in shaping doctrine is . . . not normative," and that "Only if we refrain from using Ellen White as a normative authority for doctrine can we hope to meet other Christians on a common ground and expect them to see the validity of our doctrines." And then to cap it off, "If her writings are used to end all doctrinal disputes,

it is almost impossible to maintain the Bible as the normative authority for doctrine."¹ The author goes on to argue that instead of normative authority, Mrs. White had "formative" and "confirmatory" authority. The editors of *Evangelica*² said that with this latter remark the author was taking back what he had given away at first, thus turning the argument into an exercise in sophistry. I would rather like to hear more about what "confirmatory authority" means.

Later I read in the *Adventist Review* a statement put out by the General Conference Committee to encourage discussion of this issue within the church. Among other things it said, "We do not believe that the writings of Ellen White may be used as the basis for doctrine." "We do not believe that Scripture may be understood only through the writings of Ellen White." "We do not believe that the writings of Ellen White exhaust the meaning of Scripture."³ I wondered, reading that, what had happened to the doctrine that the red books are the inspired commentary on the black book. Still later in the *Review* I read that the expression "I saw" on the part of Mrs. White was many times used merely as "a rhetorical device to add emphasis and increase the readability of her report."⁴ This is something I myself had long surmised simply on the basis of what I know about apocalyptic literature.

Other things written recently about Ellen White are even more puzzling. The White Estate put out an essay in which the author suggests that the "I saw" statements are to be understood within the framework of the prophet's "delusional perceptual system," a deficiency in which all humans have a share.⁵ And in *Spectrum* I read that an undeniable cover-up of Ellen White's borrowing was amply justified because "the biblical precedent for a 'cover-up' was established by Christ himself."⁶ I must admit that I never thought I would read arguments in defense of Mrs. White or the policies of the White Estate that were so poorly framed. I fail to see the logic of an argument that says simply because Mrs.

White was a prophet, her personal integrity is sacrosanct.

Mrs. White should never have been defended on grounds that she was endowed with an unimpeachable office that made her every word the truth from heaven. With our small children we don't have to demonstrate strength of character in order to exercise formal authority. But a six-year-old's relation to his mother is not the same as a church's relation to its prophet. The six-year-old may perceive his mother quite differently from what she really is, but Seventh-day Adventists are not six-year-olds. Not anymore.

Genuine Adventism is committed to the gospel and to the truth. It does not claim that we already have the truth on the basis of a confirmatory authority that is peculiarly our own. The Spirit of Prophecy does not give us a handle on truth; it enables us today to search for "present truth." We are no different, in fact, from other Christians who read their Bibles and newspapers and try to use their reason and imagination. But if we face our task responsibly, the Spirit of Prophecy will not fail us. God will bless us and inspire us to a vision of heavenly things that will be true to our times.

A legitimate authority advocates a position and lives from the power of that position, not from consent demanded purely on the formal ground of his or her office.

Many Adventists, perhaps most, want to believe that we have special doctrines, authorized by Mrs. White, that give this church a special identity. But we need not fear the loss of Mrs. White as a formal authority used to end all theological debate. We will no more lose our identity because we cease to preach about the investigative

judgment than we lost our identity when we ceased to preach that in order to be translated you had to be a vegetarian. And in any case, our crisis in the church is not fundamentally a crisis of authority. It is a moral crisis, and we all share in it. What is at stake is not just Mrs. White's moral integrity. At stake is the moral integrity of the Adventist ministry to the world. At stake is the moral integrity of our community. Let us not become fools who defend doctrines at the expense of their integrity.

The important question before this church is not "What is the authority of Mrs. White today?" The real question is "What is the authority of the Adventist message today?" Does it have the inner power to convict the conscience of our own young people and of the world?

Ellen White is our mother and she will continue to be our mother, no matter what. Let us not defend her on the basis that she is a prophet. Whether or not she is a prophet is really not the issue. The real issue is whether or not she is to be canonized. And the present crisis has helped the church to answer that question with a resounding "No!" A whole generation of Adventist theologians has been agonizing over the insidious canonization of Mrs. White. However, it has become clear that she does not have canonical authority, and once the church begins to live according to this understanding a new generation of Adventist theologians may come up to serve the church better than ours has been able.

We will always be grateful to Mrs. White for what she did for us. She does indeed

have formative authority for us in the sense that she had a very definite hand in making us what we are. But from now on, we will have to use our minds under the guidance of the Spirit in order to know how to think and act today.

A legitimate authority advocates a position and lives from the power of that position, not from consent demanded purely on the formal grounds of his or her office. If Jesus had authority with the common people of his day, or if he has authority with us today, it is not because he went about with the title "Son of God" stamped on his forehead. His authority was the authority of the gospel he preached and lived. His authority did not merely command the will; it also transformed the heart. The people reacted positively to Jesus' preaching because he taught with authority and not like the scribes. The difference was that while the scribes used the Old Testament as a formal authority so they themselves could be brokers of authority, Jesus spoke with an inner logic that reached the conscience of his listeners. His words had authority because of what he said. Real authority remains an authority in dialogue, an authority that permits choice.

What church leaders feared most in the 1950s, when I was a seminary student, was that Ellen White's voice would be blended with the realities of the nineteenth century. They wanted her to speak from outside of time, as a voice from eternity. They were afraid of what historical relativism might do to her authority. But their fears, in part at least, were ill founded, for although it is true that the historian relativizes all human voices, it is also true that the historian is the only one who can provide the foundation for any voice of the past to be relevant to our present.

The choice today is not between authority and relativism. The choice is between a formal authority that must be obeyed on account of the fact that it has spoken, and an internal authority that claims our allegiance on account of what it says. Mrs. White's authority cannot be imposed

because she is a prophet. Her formal authority has been shattered. From now on, Mrs. White's authority will depend on what she says, and the church as a body will determine the wisdom of her words by whether or not it decides to accept them. The dialogue with Mrs. White has just begun.

The important question before this church is not "What is the authority of Mrs. White today?" The real question is "What is the authority of the Adventist message today?"

Does it have the inner power to convict the conscience of our own young people and of the world? Mrs. White can no longer function as a formal authority. The temptation for us to be brokers of authority has mercifully been removed. What we need is moral integrity that will give power to our witness. We need always be reminded that when the Lord chooses his agents on earth, he does not make them authorities. He makes them servants.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Ron Graybill, "Ellen White's Role in Doctrine Formation," *Ministry*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (October 1981), pp. 8, 9.

2. *Evangelica*, Vol. 2, No. 5 (Nov. 1981), p. 24.

3. *Review and Herald*, July 15, 1982, p. 3.

4. Ron Graybill, "The 'I Saw' Parallels in Ellen

White's Writings," *Review and Herald*, July 29, 1982, p. 5.

5. Jack Provonsa, "Was Ellen White a Fraud?" White Estate, 1981.

6. Alden Thompson, review of Walter Rea's *The White Lie*, in *Spectrum*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (Summer 1982), p. 51.

In Defense of Compilations

by Arthur L. White

One day in August 1944, R.A. Anderson and L.E. Froom, representing the ministerial association of the General Conference, walked into my office at the Ellen G. White Estate. "Are there in the White Estate files specific counsels on evangelistic ministry," they asked, "that could be drawn together and published as a single volume?" They pointed out that aside from a chapter here or there in *Gospel Workers* and the *Testimonies*, there was no place to which an evangelist could conveniently turn for guidance. Consequently, not a few of the evangelists were a law unto themselves, with varying degrees of success in their work. Anderson and Froom wanted to help in bringing greater uniformity to the evangelistic outreach of the church.

These leaders came to me as chief executive officer of the White Estate because the Estate had previously published nine compilations of Ellen White's writings. Since compilations have evoked comment—even a bit of controversy in some countries—it may be instructive to recount when compilations of Ellen White's work were started, how many there have been all together, why they have been published and how they were edited to avoid the bias of the editors.

Arthur White has just completed the final volume of his autobiography of Ellen G. White. From 1937 to 1978 he was the secretary of the Ellen G. White Estate.

When Were Compilations Started?

Actually, some of the books by Ellen White published in her lifetime were compilations of her earlier writings. She used a series of 19 articles on Martin Luther, published in the *Signs of the Times* in 1883, to form chapters of *Spirit of Prophecy* Vol. IV, the forerunner of the 1888 *Great Controversy*. A series of her *Youth's Instructor* articles on Daniel in 1903, and a series in the *Review and Herald* on Ezra and Nehemiah, appearing in 1907 and 1908, found their way into *Prophets and Kings*.

During the last 30 years of her life Ellen White could not, as in her earlier years, just sit down and write a book. We might like to picture Ellen White working in comfortable, secluded circumstances, with reference works at hand, uninterruptedly writing chapter after chapter. In reality, except for brief periods when she gave a few consecutive weeks exclusively to writing, her work was done under less than favorable circumstances. She spent entire summers traveling from campmeeting to campmeeting, speaking once or twice daily at as many as 14 meetings in almost continuous succession.¹ One tour of the eastern United States took her away from home for seven months. In addition, Ellen White traveled through Europe three times in two years. In Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, England, France and Italy she spoke almost every day,

holding interviews and writing personal testimonies, often describing things God had revealed to her before she met the recipients of the message. During her 70 years of active ministry Ellen White never enjoyed a sabbatical year to slip away to some hideaway spot to concentrate on writing.

Throughout this time, however, she was building up a tremendous reservoir of writings. On trips, whether for a week or three months, she took her office staff with her, carrying typewriters, office supplies and all things needful to carry on her literary work from day to day. Sometimes she wrote on her lap as she traveled by horse-drawn carriage. Other times she wrote on cross-country train trips. As a result, she accumulated innumerable letters, periodical articles, day-by-day journals, transcribed sermons and materials published in pamphlets and books.

In the earlier years, a handwritten copy of Ellen White's communication, many times

At the end of her life, Ellen White anticipated that her writings would continue to be compiled. In her will she authorized "the printing of compilations from my manuscripts."

the only copy, was sent to the person for whom the message was intended. But as the church grew, Ellen White was challenged by the fact that the messages God had given her must be shared with a wider audience. In the year 1868 Ellen White was instructed in vision that by dealing with "the wrongs of one, He [God] designs to correct many."² Of the vision she wrote:

I was shown that which fully justifies my course in publishing personal testimonies. When the Lord singles out individual cases and specifies their wrong, others, who have not been shown in vision, frequently take it for granted that they are right,

or nearly so. If one is reproved for a special wrong, brethren and sisters should carefully examine themselves to see wherein they have failed and wherein they have been guilty of the same sin.³

From the time typewriters came into use in her work in 1883, Ellen White's letters were kept on file, growing to a collection of a thousand pages or more each year. In these letters she endeavored to deal less with applications to particular individuals than with general principles. She wrote in 1905, "I am endeavoring by the help of God to write letters that will be a help, not merely to those to whom they are addressed, but to many others who need them."⁴

Ellen White described how these materials were compiled into books for broad church readership:

I feel very thankful for the help of Sister Marian Davis in getting out my books. She gathers materials from my diaries [day-by-day journals] from my letters, and from the articles published in the papers. I greatly prize her faithful service. She has been with me for twenty-five years, and has constantly been gaining increasing ability for the work of classifying and grouping my writings.⁵

At another time, writing of Miss Davis' work, she explained:

She does her work in this way: She takes my articles which are published in the papers, and pastes them in blank books. She also has a copy of all letters I write. In preparing a chapter for a book, Marian remembers that I have written something on that special point, which may make the matter more forcible. She begins to search for this, and if, when she finds it she sees it will make the chapter more clear, she adds it.

The books are not Marian's productions, but my own, gathered from all my writings. Marian has a large field from which to draw, and her ability to arrange the matter is one of great value to me. It saves my poring over a mass of matter, which I have not time to do. . . . Marian is a most valuable help to me in bringing out my books.⁶

Indeed, at one time Ellen White said, Marian "is my bookmaker."

How Were Compilations Prepared?

It was natural that at the end of her life Ellen White would anticipate that her writings in a wide variety of forms—published and unpublished—would

continue to be compiled. In her will she authorized "the printing of compilations from my manuscripts."⁷

After Ellen White's death her son and my father, W.C. White, continued to supervise compilations of her writings, starting with *Counsels on Health*. When I succeeded my father as executive secretary of the White Estate, the work of compiling Mrs. White's manuscripts continued. When Anderson and Froom came to me I was happy to recommend that the White Estate Board approve a compilation on evangelism. I knew that Ellen White herself would have approved.

The production of this compilation—neither the first nor the last prepared at the White Estate—was typical. In the light of Ellen White's wishes and her own practice, the White Estate board was sympathetic to the request of Anderson and Froom and requested that I investigate the feasibility of the *Evangelism* compilation. I gave some hours to a survey of materials—letters of counsel to various evangelists, sermons, articles in *Gospel Workers* and the *Testimonies* and periodical articles. I reported to the board, Anderson and Froom that ample materials existed. Some days later the advisory council of the

How I Wrote the Ellen G. White Biography

by Arthur L. White

I was greatly surprised when the board of trustees of the Ellen G. White Estate came to me, asking me to complete a definitive biography of Ellen G. White. It was 1966. Sixteen years earlier the task of assembling biographical data—including handwritten diaries and early family letters—was begun. F. D. Nichol, editor of the *Review*, authored the project until the early summer of 1966 when, struck by a sudden aneurysm, he died.

Called upon to continue his work, I hesitated, knowing that some felt a member of the Ellen White family could not be objective in writing her biography. But finally, I agreed.

In the beginning, the work was slow. I was serving as secretary of the Ellen G. White Estate, dividing my time between office duties, teaching and public ministry. But in 1978, when circumstances allowed, I resigned my official position to devote full time to the biography. This allowed the production of a volume a year—quite important, considering my advancing age.

How the Work Progressed

Beginning in the early 1950s, members of the White Estate staff put in typewritten form and on file all diaries and family letters, aggregating several thousand pages. An experienced member of the staff, Miss Bessie Mount, made a 4" × 6" index with some 8,000 cards, noting Ellen White's principal activities. Without this initial preparation, the writing of the biography within

a decade or two by one person would have been impossible.

Working on a year-by-year basis, I first went through the biographical cards, which averaged about 60 per year, choosing the principal events of the year. Then, page by page, I went through the issues of the *Review and Herald* for the year, watching for significant factual data. I typed on 4" × 6" slips of paper key quotations and information, making certain all reference data appeared at the head of the slip. I then scanned diary materials and letters of biographical significance, typing similar notes on 4" × 6" slips. This yielded from 75 to 150 sheets of notes per year.

Then, having in mind two or three 15-page chapters for a given year, I sat down to my faithful Standard Royal typewriter and began to write.

After my retirement in 1978, most of this work was done at home, free from interruptions. I edited as I put the materials together, and further edited before the chapter was passed to my secretary at the White Estate office. She prepared the finished copy on a word processor. Then copies were submitted to 10 or 12 White Estate Trustees and other experienced denominational workers for critical reading and suggestions for correction and improvement before the final approval.

After the manuscript was placed in the hands of the publisher, it was edited and all quotations verified. As the production of each volume proceeded, proofs were read and illustrations chosen by the author from the photograph files of the White Estate and the *Review and Herald*. The volumes were printed in initial editions of 20,000 copies.

ministerial association lodged with the White Trustees an official request for the preparation and publication of a compilation giving counsels to the evangelists and Bible instructors. The board of trustees at their meeting on September 10, 1944, took the following action:

VOTED: That, in harmony with the recommendation of the Ministerial Association Advisory Council, we authorize the compilation of a manuscript, "Counsels to Evangelists and Bible Instructors" [later renamed *Evangelism*], the work to be done by a committee of five, appointed by the chair. The committee named was as follows: A.L. White, W.H. Branson, R.A. Anderson, Miss Louise Kleuser, J.L. Shuler.

Of course, variations of the process I have described have entered into the work through the decade I have been laboring on the project. And various members of the White Estate staff have assisted greatly in various ways.

The Order of Publication of the Six Volumes

The fact that volumes of the biography were published in a somewhat reverse order has occasioned some questions. Here are the principal reasons:

- Books relating to Ellen White's life, long available, contain quite a detailed account of her early life, while very little has been published about her middle and later years. Because of this, and considering my age and some uncertainty about the future, I felt my first efforts should be in areas least covered in print.
- A decade or more ago when the work began, there were some persons still living and available for interviews who were personally acquainted with Ellen White.
- At the outset, the matter of concern was the writing and not so much the publication, but with the manuscript for Volume 5 prepared and Volume 6 well along, the relevance of the materials was such that it was deemed appropriate to begin publication and make the volumes available one at a time, rather than asking readers to wait until the writing was completed.

Throughout the writing of the biography, as I watched how God gave insights, revealed history, provided guidance and imparted instruction through Ellen White, I tried to open to the reader the many-faceted manner in which the Lord of the universe communicated with a member of the human family on earth.

The committee of five met and decided that the forthcoming volume would serve best if it were complete in its coverage. It should therefore draw from all sources published and unpublished, even though doing so would reprint some already published articles. Arthur White and Louise Kleuser were named a working team to prepare the manuscript.

First, the team had to decide what procedures to use. Either an outline could be drawn up and material then researched to develop the manuscript, or all known sources could be consulted and then, with the E.G. White statements as its basis, the manuscript developed. Such a course would minimize the influence of the compilers, allowing Ellen White uninhibitedly to come through in the finished work. Even though this procedure would be the most time-consuming and expensive method, it was chosen as the safest and the best.

Loise Kleuser and I set to work. We first employed the indexes to the E.G. White letter and manuscript files, then perused files of periodicals before looking at Ellen White's books. We followed every clue to locate all relevant materials. Each item was painstakingly copied (no electronic copiers were available in those days) and individually filed. Items tied particularly to a given person were not included. However, there proved to be very few of these. The result of this initial search yielded more than 2,000 sheets.

Even during the selection process, it was easy to see where Ellen White placed her emphasis. A general outline of the subject matter naturally emerged, leading us to set down 22 general divisions (later reduced to 20). With this list of topics before us, we sorted the materials into their appropriate sections. Where there were two, three or more specific statements covering the same point, the strongest or most complete, regardless of source, was chosen. The others were laid aside.

At this point, each section was organized. Overlapping points or phraseology were

eliminated. Because there could be no change in the words employed by Ellen White, the items were arranged and drawn together by employing side headings, highlighting the main point of the item selected. Many prayers were offered seeking guidance of the Holy Spirit as the work was being done, particularly that there be an absolute fairness to Ellen White and the prospective reader in the way materials were employed.

Many prayers were offered seeking guidance of the Holy Spirit as the work was being done, particularly that there be an absolute fairness to Ellen White and the prospective reader in the way materials were employed.

A paragraph from the White Estate minutes of May 2, 1945, seven months after the work began, offers insights in the progress of the project:

The Secretary pointed out that the manuscript for the new book, "Counsels to Evangelists" [later renamed *Evangelism*], is taking shape, and arrangements should be made for a reading committee. It was suggested that this committee be one which could serve the Officers of the General Conference and the Ministerial Association as well as the Trustees. The following committee was appointed: W.H. Branson, L.K. Dickson, F.M. Wilcox, R.A. Anderson, J.L. Shuler, T. Carcich, D.E. Venden, C.A. Reeves, and T.G. Bunch.

Just two months later, the White Estate trustees meeting gave further consideration to the manuscript for the proposed book. The secretary, after reporting that good progress was being made on the project, sought counsel about employing italics to emphasize certain parts of the manuscript. The ensuing action read:

VOTED: That the Trustees feel that it would be out of place to use italics to emphasize certain parts of the manuscript, and might appear to take on the form of private interpretation.

Then there was the question of whether the compilers should be named in the foreword. The secretary pointed out that volumes prepared during Ellen White's life did not list the compilers in order that the focus be on the author. As a result the trustees

VOTED: That the foreword to the *Evangelism* manuscript be signed by the Trustees, and that we request the Secretary to draft a statement for consideration.

The nine readers of the manuscript mainly suggested wording for side headings and referred the attention of the compilers to a very few additional E.G. White statements. With reports in hand, the working team of two examined the entire manuscript, cutting out some repetition of materials and making other suggested adjustments. In its virtually finished form, 25 copies were mimeographed and the adjusted manuscript submitted to the board of trustees of the Ellen G. White Estate (and others) for final approval at their October 25, 1945 meeting. Minutes of that session describe the book:

An analysis of the manuscript indicates that it contains 200,785 words, and if issued with a type page similar to *Testimonies to Ministers* will make a volume, including index and title page, of approximately 675 pages. In analyzing the contents, the Secretary pointed out that 50 per cent of the matter is drawn from the Manuscript Files, 24 per cent from periodical articles, *Special Testimonies*, and out-of-print works, and 26 per cent from the current available E.G. White books. Thus 74 per cent of the manuscripts present materials which were not available prior to the issuance of this volume.

Fourteen months after it was decided to prepare a compilation, *Evangelism* was published. It has enjoyed a good sale, serving effectively as a guide and inspiration to those engaged in evangelistic ministry.

A vital concern to White Estate personnel involved in making compilations was—and is—ensuring that it is fully representative and free from the bias of the compiler. Let me cite an example. A few years before the publication of *Evangelism*, when *Counsels on Diet and Foods* came from the press, I was drawn into the

compilation process. I was aware of a half-dozen E.G. White statements that set forth circumstances in which the use of meat was justified. I am a vegetarian and could very easily have ignored these, but I had no desire to do so; indeed, I would not have dared to do so. The preferences of the compiler must not weigh in selecting materials. The compilation must correctly and completely represent the emphases of Ellen White. For example, all the statements known to exist recognizing a justification for meat-eating are in *Counsels on Diet and Foods*.

In her later years, Ellen White occasionally expressed her desire to get out a book on the Christian home. This project was delayed in order to complete other volumes such as *Acts of the Apostles*; *Counsels to Parents, Teachers and Students*; *Gospel Workers* and *Prophets and Kings*. The book on the home had to wait, and Ellen White passed to her rest before the work could be undertaken.

Soon after the acceptance of the manuscript for *Evangelism*, the White trustees

Truths are quite as much truths in the abstract as in an immediate setting. The truth expressed in the words, "God is love," needs no context or explanation.

commissioned the preparation of a manuscript on the home, following the methods described for *Evangelism*. The materials assembled made two books, *The Adventist Home* and *Child Guidance*. The procedure of assembling all that Ellen White wrote on a given subject often brings to light such a wealth of materials, it is difficult to hold a volume to desirable limits. Another compilation that ran beyond anticipated limits was the popular *Mind, Character and Personality*, issued in two volumes.

Down through the years the White Estate has been requested to prepare compilations on many subjects. Although the White trustees see no light in providing Spirit of Prophecy counsels already available elsewhere, the posthumous books they have produced have implemented what Ellen White had in mind when she made this statement near the close of her life:

Abundant light has been given to our people in these last days. Whether or not my life is spared, my writings will constantly speak, and their work will go forward as long as time shall last. My writings are kept on file in the office and even though I should not live, these words that have been given to me by the Lord will still have life and will speak to the people.⁸

The Integrity of the Compilations

Questions have occasionally been raised as to whether taking selections from various Ellen G. White sources and putting these together, one after the other, may have created distortions. Others have asked how sentences or paragraphs taken from a letter addressed to an individual can be lifted from the letter and used in a book for general reading. These questions have already been partly answered, but the fuller answer is found in the quality and nature of the materials included in the compilation.

This point in particular should be noted: Statements representing facts, principles and truths are quite as much truth in the abstract as in an immediate setting. The truth expressed in the words, "God is love," needs no context or explanation. Counsel to an administrator pointing out efficient ways to conduct the work of God, or even pinpointing certain weaknesses or dangers, is truth unaffected by circumstances or specific context. Counsel to parents on the proper manner of administering discipline would apply to other families where the same elements exist. Of course there are times when a fuller context might be of

interest, and for this reason each item included in the compilations carries its own source reference, but space limitations prohibit using letters or articles in their entirety.

Even when delivering particular counsels to specific individuals, Ellen White very often couched the message in terms of general principles. This is a point she made in writing of a certain experience in New Zealand. As she visited one of the cities, she became aware of the failure of the evangelist-pastor and his wife, the McCullaghs, to exercise proper control over their three-year-old daughter, and so wrote a message to the parents giving guidance. However, observing the attitudes of the parents and being aware of the sensitive nature of the matter, she did not give them the letter. She later explained in writing to the parents:

I intended to give it to you, but did not do so because I gave a discourse there in which I took up very plainly the principles stated in this letter. You both heard my words, spoken under the power of Holy Spirit, and Sister McCullagh told me that she received this message as given to herself for she needed it. She said that she had never seen the case presented in that light before, and that she would make a decided change in her course of action in regard to her child. But this work has been strangely neglected.

Then she explained a procedure often followed in her work which many times proved effective in avoiding a confrontation that could repel rather than win:

It is my first duty to present Bible principles. Then, unless there is a decided, conscientious reform made by those whose cases have been presented before me, I must appeal to them personally.⁹

With this quality evident in many of the messages directed to individuals, conferences or institutions, it is easily seen that statements of vital principles can well be employed in compilations of E.G. White materials. It is also apparent that counsels that serve the church well can be widely disseminated to benefit its members, thus preparing a people to meet their Lord at his second coming.

In some cases, as counsels on a given topic are drawn together in close proximity, the reader has the benefit of the full range of the presentations of E.G. White on a given point. Sometimes this yields a concentration on a topic, which may seem overwhelming as God's ideals for his church are portrayed. Nevertheless, the assemblage of the materials in this form brings within easy reach phases of important guidance and instruction that should not be overlooked.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Arthur L. White, *E.G. White Biography*, Vol. 3, *The Lonely Years*, pp. 35-71.

2. Ellen G. White, *Testimonies*, Vol. 2, p. 112.

3. *Ibid.*

4. Ellen G. White, Letter 79, 1905.

5. Ellen G. White, Letter 9, 1903 (see 3 SM 93).

6. Ellen G. White, Letter 61a, 1900 (see 3 SM 91, 92).

7. F.D. Nichol, *Ellen G. White and Her Critics*, pp. 675-678, for the full text of the will; p. 677 for the clause containing this provision.

8. Ellen G. White, Letter 371, 1907, to F.M. Wilcox (see 3 SM 76).

9. Ellen G. White, Letter 69, 1896. Cf. *E.G. White Biography*, Vol. 4, *The Australian Years*, pp. 276, 277.

A Vindication of Ellen White as Historian

by Jean Zurcher

Ellen White's reliability in describing historical events deserves to be defended. Some Adventists have raised doubts about Ellen White's inspiration and authority by attempting to prove she made significant errors in her writings about historical events. A favorite target is Ellen White's references to the Waldenses and Albigenses.¹ However, on this topic recent scholarship supports Ellen White, not her critics. There were Waldenses who kept the Sabbath and the Albigenses were indeed Christians.

The Waldenses and the Sabbath

Through ages of darkness and apostasy there were Waldenses who denied the supremacy of Rome, who rejected image worship as idolatry, and who kept the true Sabbath. . . Behind the lofty bulwarks of the mountains—in all ages the refuge of the persecuted and oppressed—the Waldenses found a hiding place. Here the light of truth was kept burning amid the darkness of the Middle Ages. Here, for a thousand years, witnesses for the truth maintained the ancient faith.²

Ellen White has been criticized for saying that a thousand years before the Reformation there

were Waldenses, and that these Waldenses kept the Sabbath. But Ellen White was justified in not tracing the origin of the Waldenses to Pierre Waldo who lived in the 12th century. There existed in Northern Italy, well before Pierre Waldo, various evangelical groups opposing the church of Rome.³ "It was only the malice of their enemies and the desire to blot out the memorial of their antiquity, which made their adversaries impute their origin to so late a period, and to Pierre Waldo."⁴

The real importance of Pierre Waldo consisted in rallying to his cause these various groups, thus founding a religious movement worthy of the attention of the Papacy. The fact that the name of the Waldenses should be mentioned for the first time at the Third Lateran Council in 1179 in connection with Pierre Waldo is not proof that the people took their name from him.⁵ The opposite conclusion can also be sustained. According to ancient usage and the etymology of the name, it seems more logical to affirm with certain historians that Waldo received his name from the "people of the valleys."⁶ Ellen White is perfectly correct to speak of the Waldenses giving their witness for "a thousand years" from the beginning of the Middle Ages.⁷

As for Waldenses observing the Sabbath, we must first point out that Ellen White nowhere says that all the Waldenses were faithful observers of the Sabbath. To the contrary, in the first two pages where she

Jean Zurcher for many years has been secretary of the Euro-Africa Division. He received his doctorate in philosophy from the University of Geneva and was president of the Saleve Adventist Seminary in Collonges.

discusses the churches of Piedmont, Ellen White speaks on the one hand of the defection of the leaders, and on the other hand of the steadfastness of some, of the compromise of many, and the faithfulness of certain ones.⁸

She then says that "the churches [of Piedmont] that were under the rule of the papacy were early compelled to honor the Sunday as a holy day. Amid the prevailing error and superstition, *many*, even of the true people of God became so bewildered that while they observed the Sabbath, they refrained

The remaining seven Waldenses, including their pastor, were burned at the stake. The charge says, "They observed Saturday instead of Sunday."

from labor also on the Sunday." So, "while, under the pressure of long-continued persecution, *some* compromised their faith, little by little yielding its distinctive principles, *others* held fast the truth." It is in this context, and following this general observation, that the so-called erroneous statement of Ellen White is placed. "Through ages of darkness and apostasy *there were Waldenses* who denied the supremacy of Rome, who rejected image worship as idolatry, and who kept the true Sabbath" (emphasis added).⁹

In none of these extracts does Ellen White state that the Waldensian church, with a capital W, observed "the true Sabbath." Elsewhere Ellen White clearly states that "a striking illustration of Rome's policy toward those who disagree with her was given in the long and bloody persecution of the Waldenses, *some of whom were observers of the Sabbath*" (emphasis added).¹⁰

Secondly, although examples of Sabbath observance in the Middle Ages are rare, we know of some Waldenses who observed the true Sabbath in the north of France. The first

of them arrived from Italy in the 11th century. Pierre Waldo himself, according to certain sources, visited the north of France on his way to Germany.¹¹ By the 15th century there were so many Waldenses in the north of France that the inquisitor of Artois complained, "The third of the world is Waldensian."¹²

Paul Beuzart discovered in the archives of the Pas-de-Calais at Arras an account of the martyrdom in 1420 of Ghuillebert Thuling, pastor of several Waldensian congregations.

On March 25, 1420, when Thulin had come from Valenciennes to visit a group of interested people, at Douai, he was arrested with fifteen other persons. Transferred to Arras, these persons were tried before a tribunal of the Inquisition. Two were imprisoned for life. Nine of the tortured ones recanted and were merely punished. Six weeks later, before a crowd of ten to twelve thousand people, the remaining seven Waldenses, including their pastor, were burned at the stake. The bishop's charges of heresy worthy of death have been preserved; "rejection of the worship of the Virgin and the saints who were not in Paradise; disbelief in the Eucharist and the masses on behalf of the dead; refusal to make the sign of the cross; rejection of confessional." Also, the charge says, "they observed Saturday instead of Sunday."¹³ Records of the event state specifically that the pastor, Ghuillebert Thulin, "kept the Sabbath on Saturday."¹⁴

A second manuscript of the Arras' court action, preserved in the library of Douai, states that these heretics observed "the complete Law of the Jews."¹⁵ Probably for this reason also, the martyrs of Arras, in 1420, as some others at Bois-le-duc in 1533, were marked with a yellow cross, a color used to mark Jews during the Middle Ages.¹⁶

The Albigenses and Dualism

While a whole chapter of *The Great Controversy* is dedicated to the Waldenses, there are only two brief references to the Albigenses. The first of these is found in the introduction to the chapter on "Huss and Jerome," describing how the gospel was implanted in Bohemia before the Hussite reform:

Many of the Waldenses and Albigenses, driven by persecution from their homes in France and

Italy, came to Bohemia. Though they dared not teach openly, they labored zealously in secret. Thus the true faith was preserved from century to century.¹⁷

The second reference to the Albigenses is found in the chapter on "The Bible and the French Revolution." Speaking of the persecutions that took place throughout the history of France, Ellen White writes:

Century after century the blood of the saints had been shed. While the Waldenses laid down their lives upon the mountains of Piedmont "for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ," similar witness of the truth had been borne by their brethren, the Albigenses of France.¹⁸

It has been said that these two quotations contain historical errors. First, that Ellen White called the Albigenses the "brethren" of the Waldenses. Second, that she stated that the Albigenses and the Waldenses gave "similar witness of the truth," and thanks to them "the true faith was preserved from century to century." It is said that actually the Albigenses denied most essential Christian doctrines.¹⁹

We must first clarify the names for this group. The name "Albigenses" is generally given to a group of Christians whose movement was born in the region of the city of Albi in the south of France, who in the 12th century withdrew from the Catholic Church to establish what is also called the Cathari Church. Cathari signifies "pure." This name was given them because this group of Christians, beginning in Albi region, said they preached the pure doctrine of the gospel. In this essay "Albigensian" and "the Cathari" are used interchangeably.

Up to the middle of the 19th century we knew the Cathari movement only through the accusations of their persecutors who had to prove they were dealing with dangerous heretics. One of the principal anti-Cathari treatises, the *Liber contra Manicheos*, was written by a former Waldensian, Durand de Huesca, who left Waldensianism to found the order of the "Poor Catholics" about 1207. The main sources of information are declarations made before the Inquisition.²⁰

These were made by persons who were not always in a position to express their beliefs clearly and the declarations were frequently extorted under threat and torture. Also, the reports were made by writers who were better informed about the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle than about elementary biblical truths.²¹

Even the well-known defender of the Catholic point of view, Daniel Rops, put the question to himself: "Is it sure that we know it [Cathari doctrine] exactly?" He is forced to admit: "As far as the Cathari are concerned, it is the trial reports of their questioning, the bulls and the council rules condemning them, which give us information about them, all of which is disturbing none the less."²²

However, today the historian can search authentic Cathari documents that permit researchers to derive information directly from the source. As a matter of fact, thanks to the valuable discoveries in the past decades of 13th-century Cathari manuscripts, it is possible to develop a precise idea of the religion of the Albigenses.²³ Far from being heretics, they were authentic Christians.

Good and Evil

No one will dispute that "the Albigenses' teachings were based on a dualism which sharply differentiated between an evil material world and the pure world of the spirit." The real issue is what kind of dualism is attributed to the Cathari.

In order to justify the crusade launched against the Albigenses and the extermination of a complete race of people, the inquisitors identified the Albigenses as successors of the Manichean sect opposed by the Catholic Church since the fourth century. Having limited their investigations solely to the documents of the Inquisition, a number of historians have continued to make that charge.²⁴

However, the *Book of the Two Principles*, which represents the most radical Cathari dualism, does not teach a "ditheism," that is to say a belief in two eternal and equal gods, but rather "a moral dualism of good and evil, a cosmic dualism of Christ and Satan."²⁵ Rene Nelli, who studied the Cathari dualism in depth, affirms that "the Cathari never stated that the two principles were 'equal': the evil principle alone shows his imperfection."²⁶ Certainly, "the Cathari could call themselves dualists, since they believed in the existence of a quite negative root of evil in eternity, active and positive in the temporal sphere. . . ." But, "the two supernatural personages that the Cathari put truly in opposition were Satan and Christ."²⁷

Thanks to the valuable discoveries in the past decades of 13th-century Cathari manuscripts, it is possible to develop a precise idea of the religion of the Albigenses. Far from being heretics, they were authentic Christians.

It is true that "some historians, unconscious adversaries to Catharism and behind the times," continue to speak "of two *equal* principles of Catharism." However, for the Occitan heretics, the god of good out-matches without doubt the god of evil, in being, in wisdom, in power and in eternity. If the heresiologists would consent to use the vocabulary of the "heretics" which they study—it would be on their behalf a minimum of objectivity—and not that of the 'inquisitors'; if they would call the good principle the *True God*, as the Cathari did, maybe they would find it more natural and more "scientific," not to make the other—the False—its equal (emphasis added).²⁸

More and more specialists in Cathari

teachings are concluding that "the radical dualism of the Cathari appears founded, in the West, on a *completely different problematic than the one of the ancient Manicheism*." (emphasis added).²⁹ Some are going so far as to say that "the dualism of the Cathari is clearly included within the limits of the conception of the Gospel."³⁰

According to the Cathari understanding of the plan of salvation, Christ was finally to triumph over the dominion of Satan in a world entirely given over to evil; he would deliver the people of God from the corruption of this present evil world in order to gather them into another world, on a new earth and with a new heaven.

Without any doubt the Cathari dualism makes a clear distinction between the material world in which mankind lives and the spiritual world where celestial beings dwell. The *Cathari Treatise* makes it clear that we must not confuse the two realms:

"If the kingdom here below, whose prince we know is evil, were the kingdom of Christ and of God, it would never have such heirs, it would never be doomed to such corruption."

In the same treatise, the Cathari clearly express their faith and hope:

How numerous are those who busy themselves as little as possible with the other world and other beings, but are interested only in those that can be seen in this present world. . . . We say that there is another world and other beings who are incorruptible and eternal, which constitute our hope and our joy.

Still again, speaking of life in the world to come, the author refers to a saying of Jesus in these words:

The Son of God spoke also of two worlds when He said: "The children of this world marry wives, and wives take husbands. But those who will be accounted worthy of having part in that other world and in the resurrection of the dead, will not marry any more, and wives will no longer take husbands."³¹

Satan, or the Principle of Evil

Those who accuse the Cathari of religious dualism inevitably charge them with believing, along with Manichean sects, that Satan or the prince

of darkness is the god of evil, creator of the material world. Obviously the Cathari had to defend themselves against such an interpretation of their dualism.³² *The Book of the Two Principles* states emphatically the orthodox Christian doctrine of Creation:

According to our faith, the Lord, our God created and made all things: the heaven, the earth, the sea and all that is in them, and God founded the universe on the Lord Jesus Christ, in heaven and on earth; and all things were created by Him, in Him and from Him, as many authorities have previously pointed it out.³³

Within that orthodox Christian position the *Cathari Treatise* outlines the Albigensian appreciation of the reality of evil:

According to these texts, God created "all things". But as too many people do not know the Holy Scriptures mean by "all things", we say with truth that generally "all" means only good and spiritual things.³⁴

The Cathari could not believe that God was definitely the author of wars, massacres, executions and all the violence described in the Old Testament. That does not mean they rejected these books.

It is inconceivable that "this God, of whom we have previously said that He was good, holy and just, and high above all praise, would be the supreme cause and principle of all evil: which we do most emphatically deny. . . . Since God is not mighty in evil, in that He has not the power to make evil appear, we must firmly believe that there is another principle which, itself, is mighty in evil. It is from him that comes all the evil which has been, is, and will be."³⁵

At no time did the Cathari attribute to him whom they "characterized as the devil," the power of an "evil Demiurge," creator of the "material world." Certainly, the devil is called "the Powerful One" or "the

Powerful-One-in-evil." But far from being the Manichean god of evil, eternally opposed to the god of good, creator of the world of matter, the devil of the Cathari, himself "created by God,"³⁶ is never other than the one by whom evil exists and who will finally be annihilated, just as the Bible teaches. "That is clearly expressed in the divine writings, that the Lord, the true God, will destroy the 'Powerful One' and all his forces, which work every day against Him and His creation."³⁷

Old Testament vs. New Testament God

Critics of the Cathari go on to accuse them of rejecting portions of Scripture, particularly in the Old Testament, that portray God as jealous and avenging in contrast to the New Testament God of love.

The chronicler of Vaux-de-Cernay, for example, states that the Cathari attribute "to the good God the New Testament, and to the evil God the Old Testament." Pierre Clerque, curate of Montailhou, reports on his part that for the Albigenses "all the Scripture with the exception of the gospels and the *Pater* are inventions and lies."

These charges are absolutely false. To the contrary, the Albigensian author of the *Cathari Treatise* cites as biblical authorities passages from Job, the Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel and Daniel, and declares: "We believe that which the witness of the prophets confirm, and what the authorities of the New Testament more fully demonstrate."³⁸

Certainly the Cathari show a preference for biblical passages that portray God as holy, just and good, but that does not mean they rejected portions of the Bible. One who has cast even a brief glance at the *Cathari Treatise* or at the *Book of the Two Principles* cannot fail to be impressed that just as much place is given to the Old as to the New Testament.

In her introduction to the *Ritual Cathare*, Christine Thouzellier has made two very interesting observations in relation to its use of Scripture. "Regarding the Bible, the author of the *Latin Ritual* seems to have no discriminating prejudices, as well as the author of the *Book of the Two Principles*."³⁹

It is precisely the same with the comparisons "unfavorably" made between the God of the Old Testament and "the New Testament God of love." We do not know any Cathari quotation of this kind, and even if there are some, that would prove in no way that the Cathari were not Christians as such. Many Christians of our day contrast the God of Israel to the God of the Gospels. The churches of the Reformation went as far as putting the Jewish law in opposition to Christian grace, concluding thereby that the rule of grace has superseded that of law.

Certain books of the Old Testament cause the Cathari problems. They could not believe that God was definitely the author of wars, massacres, executions and all the violence described in the historical books of the Old Testament. That does not necessarily mean that they rejected these books. They tried rather to give them an interpretation in harmony with the concept that they had formed of the character of God. Luther did the same thing. He called into question the epistle of James, because it did not harmonize entirely with his conception of justification by faith.

Here is a typical example of how the Cathari reinterpreted a verse of the Old Testament, quoted in the New Testament. The question was whether a text implied God or Pilate and the Pharisees were the real authors of the death of Jesus. "For it is written: I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered" (Matthew 26:31). The author of the *Book of the Two Principles* explains:

It was not the true Lord God who Himself, willingly and directly smote His Son, Jesus Christ. If He Himself, willingly and substantially, had perpetrated this homicide, nobody could in any way

accuse Pilate or the Pharisees, for they would have only accomplished the will of God by that, and if otherwise would have committed a sin in resisting the will of the Lord. It is necessary to resolve this difficulty thus: God smote His Son by allowing His enemies to cause Him to die. They would never have been able to do this if the good Lord Himself had not permitted them this power. This is what Christ said to Pilate: 'You would have no power over me, if it had not been given you from on high.' (John 19:11) . . . The true God allowed this crime because there was no better way to deliver His people from the power of the enemy.⁴⁰

Jesus: Wholly Man, Wholly God

One of the most treacherous slanders made by historians against the Cathari concerns their faith in the person of Jesus Christ. These are simply repetitions of charges made in the documents of the Inquisition. Actually, the writings of the Cathari abound with professions of faith in Jesus as the Son of God. For example: "For that reason, the Son of God Himself, Jesus Christ. . ."⁴¹ "The Lord true God has not beaten His Son Jesus Christ. . ."⁴² "As the redemption of this people drew near and the advent of this reign, that is to say, that of the Son of God. . ."⁴³ The *Cathari Ritual* even includes Matthew 16:13-16: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."⁴⁴

It is certainly not by chance that the Cathari had a preference for the writings of John. These, more than all the others in the New Testament, have as their particular aim to prove that "Jesus is Christ, the Son of God" (John 20:31).

Some have also charged that the Cathari rejected Christ's bodily incarnation and resurrection and that they therefore taught that Christ's sufferings on the cross were fictitious, because a good spirit could not be a part of an intrinsically evil fleshly body.

These are the characteristics of a heresy attacked by Paul as well as by John. But the Christ of this docetism heresy is not the Christ of the Cathari. The translation in the Occitan language of 1 John 5:19-21 itself constitutes a masterly rebuttal:

We know that we are of God, and all the world lies in wickedness. And we know that the Son of God has come (*and that he became flesh for us, and died for us, and rose from the dead for us and that He took us with Him*). And he gave us understanding that we might be in His true Son, Jesus Christ is truly God and eternal life" (emphasis added).⁴⁵

We have placed in parenthesis the explanatory gloss of verse 20, which itself alone is sufficient to refute all accusations that the Cathari rejected the incarnation and resurrection as genuine bodily events. The reality of the sufferings and the death of Christ are confirmed in numerous passages. For example, in the *Manuscript of Dublin* we read that "our Lord Jesus Christ redeemed the kingdom with His blood" and that "for their [men's] sins our Lord Jesus Christ suffered and died so that by His death He conquered him who had the power of death, that is the devil, as the apostle wrote to the Hebrews."⁴⁶

Lifestyle: Marriage and Vegetarianism

Those attacking the Albigenses for being dualists charge them with bizarre behavior. One of the most frequently repeated slanders against the Albigenses concerns marriage and family life. They have been accused of condemning marriage and considering the begetting of children a sin because those acts overvalue the evil body in contrast to the good soul.

Here is what Jacqueline Dumesnil, an authority on the Cathari, wrote in refutation of these charges:

Let us say at once that the Albigenses had swarms of children! Esclarmonde de Foix, who is considered to be one of the most important persons of the Albigensian church, and who represented that church as a theologian at the conference of Pamiers where she triumphed gloriously over the Catholic bishops; this same Esclarmonde gave twelve children to her husband! This certainly was not a Platonic union, nor a "mystical" one (as the enemies of the Albigenses would have us believe!). . .

It is true the Albigenses considered virginity as superior to the married state. Their opinion was

based on the word of St. Paul on the subject of marriage (I Cor. 7:32-34, 38). Based on these verses and on other passages of the same epistle. . . the Albigenses required celibacy of the preachers of the gospel, but of these only. As they exercised an itinerant ministry and lived in absolute poverty, one can imagine that there would have been difficulties for them to have the responsibility of a family. All the more so in a time of persecution when they were hounded from place to place, one cannot see very well how they would have been able to support a family. . . It must be noted, however, that there were never more than a million faithful believers. Celibacy therefore remained true of a small minority, and it does not seem to have visibly affected the birth rate!⁴⁷

In any case, to massacre a million people under the pretense that they "destroyed the family" is difficult to understand.

Critics cite as further evidence that the Albigenses were dualists the fact that they were vegetarians. Supposedly they repudi-

Albigenses required celibacy of the preachers of the gospel, but of these only. Celibacy remained true of a small minority, and it does not seem to have visibly affected the birthrate!

ated the eating of meat because they believed in the transmigration of souls. That the Cathari gave as a reason for their vegetarianism the fact that meat excites the sexual passions, is reasonable. Do we not have good reason to believe the same thing, without that constituting a proof of some kind of Manicheanism?⁴⁸

As to the theological reason, no Cathari text justifies saying that they believed in transmigration of souls. All evidence for that charge comes from secondary sources.⁴⁹ This is a pure invention of their accusers, or a bad interpretation of their general attitude toward animals or even of their belief in the resurrection of the dead. Since the doctors of the church believed in the immortality of

the soul, the biblical doctrine of the resurrection became a teaching was completely strange and anachronistic.

Rene Nelli explains very well that "it is perhaps the belief in the *possible* incarnation of devils in owls, snakes, toads or cats, which sometimes stirred the less educated Cathari to accept also—but exceptionally—the transit of souls *lost to God* into vile and 'wicked' animals" (emphasis added).⁵⁰ A story like the one in Mark 5:1-17 might lead them to believe this: "And the devils begged him, saying: Send us into the swine, so that we may enter into them" (v. 13).

The charge that the Albigenses devalued the material world including the body is supposed to be supported by their views on baptism. They are even accused of rejecting baptism of the body by water and substituting baptism by the immaterial Spirit. Once again this is a gross distortion of the facts. It is true that the Albigenses considered baptism of the Spirit more important than baptism by water, basing their belief on the declaration of John the Baptist: "I baptize you with water. . . . He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit" (Matthew 3:11). At a time when the church did not know what to say about the Holy Spirit, the Albigenses made reception of the Holy Spirit a requirement for the spiritual life. They practiced the laying on of hands in order to receive the Holy Spirit; what they called "the baptism of Jesus Christ."

Following what they believed to be the example of the apostles, Albigensian worship included a ceremony of laying on of hands called "the consolation," in reference to the Spirit that Jesus had called the "Comforter."⁵¹ For the Albigensians "the consolation" was a purification rite and only those who had been "comforted" were "good" enough to perform this spiritual baptism. It is also only by the Spirit that the believer was in a position to live in harmony with the commandments of God.

But the Albigenses did not despise baptism

by water. They simply considered it insufficient. The proof is in this statement in the *Cathari Ritual*:

Let no-one think that by this baptism [of the Spirit] which you expect to receive, that you should despise the other baptism [by water], nor all that you have been able to do or say as a Christian or of good until now. But you must understand that it is important that you receive this holy ordination of Christ to supplement that which is lacking for your salvation.⁵²

The Albigenses, Brethren of the Waldenses

Ellen White's statement that the Albigenses were "the brethren" of the Waldenses can be understood in several ways.

From a doctrinal point of view it is extremely difficult to separate the Waldenses from the Albigenses. For both, worship was comprised of reading of the Word of God, the sermon, prayer and benediction. Both groups included two elements in the Lord's Supper; rejected worship of images, veneration of the Virgin, or prayers offered to saints; did not believe in the sacrifice of the mass, nor in the real presence of Christ in the host; and rejected belief in purgatory.

We know also that the Albigenses, just as the Waldenses, believed in the one and triune God: the Creator of the universe; Jesus Christ, the Son of God; and an active, personal Holy Spirit. Both taught that humanity was sinful and corrupt, and that sin puts man in contact with devils. But by his work, Christ provided for cleansing from sins and assured an eternal future to his own in his eternal kingdom. Both groups believed that the people of God live as exiles. This present world, "placed under the reign of evil," should not be confused with the kingdom of God. When the Lord Jesus Christ will come in his glory, he will establish his kingdom and destroy the "Powerful-One-in-evil," "from whom stem all evils."⁵³

The chief articles of faith of the Albigenses paralleled those of the Waldenses. So also

did their actions. Both groups demonstrated their evangelistic spirit by translating the gospel into their native tongues. The Albigenses, like the Waldenses, preached poverty. For both the true faithful ones of Christ are those who follow his example by renouncing both worldly power and possessions.

Ellen White Saw Correctly

If one reads carefully the original texts of Cathari teaching, it is impossible to think of the Albigenses as non-Christians or a Manichean sect. On the contrary, we have every reason to believe that the Albigenses, just as the Waldenses, were authentic disciples of Christ. This was also the opinion of St. Bernard who, in 1147, went to the south of France to try to convert the Albigenses to Catholicism. "Their customs are beyond reproach," he remarked. "They do no harm to anyone, they do not eat the bread of idleness, and they teach that man should live entirely by his own labors."⁵⁴ St. Bernard insisted, "If you ask them what their faith is, it is completely Christian; if you listen to their conversation, there is nothing more innocent; and their deeds are in harmony with their words."⁵⁵

In stating that the Waldenses and the Albigenses were witnesses to the truth, Ellen White certainly did not mean that their doctrines were exempt from mistakes or that

they necessarily possessed the truth in every particular as we understand it today. Nevertheless, their understanding of the plan of salvation, their faith in the Lord Jesus as the Son of God, their hope in his return, and their style of living in the world in the expectation of the restoration of all things stamps them as authentic Christians.

Far from being deceived, Ellen White correctly affirmed that the Albigenses, just like the Waldenses, gave their lives for "the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ." At the same time they bore "similar witness to the truth." Thanks to them, "the true faith was preserved from century

In the case of both the Waldenses and the Albigenses, we believe we have given proof that the author of *The Great Controversy* did not commit gross historical errors.

to century." The fact that she borrowed certain information from the historians of her time, in no way means that she necessarily copied their mistakes. In the case of both the Waldenses and the Albigenses, we believe we have given proof that the author of *The Great Controversy* did not commit gross historical errors.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The most recent and complete statement of such criticisms is by Donald Casebolt, *Spectrum*, Vol. 9, No. 3 (February 1981).

2. E.G. White, *The Great Controversy* (Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1950), pp. 65, 66.

3. Cf. Leroy Edwin Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, Vol. 1, pp. 807-839.

4. Cf. Jacques-Benigne Bosuet, *The History of the Variations of Protestant Churches*, Vol. 2, pp. 110, 120, in LeRoy Edwin Froom, *op. cit.*, p. 830.

5. Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, pp. 56, 66, in LeRoy Edwin Froom, *op. cit.*, pp. 832, 833.

6. Cf. LeRoy Edwin Froom, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, Appendix D, pp. 937-952.

7. Ellen White places the origins of the Waldenses in *The Great Controversy* at "centuries before the birth of Luther" (p. 78), or "hundreds of years before the Reformation" (p. 65), or even "a thousand years" (p. 65).

8. "For centuries," she writes, "the churches of Piedmont maintained their independence; but the

time came at last when Rome insisted upon their submission. After ineffectual struggles against her tyranny, the leaders of these churches reluctantly acknowledged the supremacy of the power to which the whole world seemed to pay homage. There were some, however, who refused to yield to the authority of the pope or prelate."—Ellen White, *op. cit.*, p. 64 (emphasis supplied).

9. *Idem*, 65.

10. *Idem*, p. 577.

11. Cf. Paul Beuzart, *Les Heresies pendant le Moyen Age et la Reformedans la region de Douai, d'Arras et ay pays de l'Alleu*, Le Puy, 1912. Chapter III, pp. 3, 4, 20.

12. *Idem*, p. 67.

13. *Idem*, p. 47.

14. Cf. Roger Guenin, articles in *Revue Adventiste*, April 1960, and *Servir*, 1st quarter, 1960, p. 6.

15. Manuscript 1169, *Bibliothèque de Douai*, cited by Paul Beuzart, *op. cit.*, p. 47. Cf. note 1.

16. Paul Beuzart, *op. cit.*, pp. 48, 49, Cf. note 3.

17. Ellen White, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

18. *Idem*, p. 271.

19. Donald Casebolt, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

20. It should be said that the Inquisition began about 1204, a period in which Pope Innocent III launched the fourth crusade against the Albigenses, with the cooperation of the armies of the king of France.

21. The preachers of the Albigenses had the habit of saying to their Catholic opponents: "It is you who are heretics, and we can prove that from the New Testament."—Jacqueline Dumesnil, *Les Cavaliers de la Nuit*, p. 184, Belgique, 1964.

Having understood this, the Protestant theologian Albert Reville pointed out that in order to know Cathari teaching, "we are reduced to descriptions given by adversaries, by some apostates, and to depositions gathered by the tribunals of the inquisition. Some are disparaging, others suspect, so that we have to beware especially of the tendency of these judges or of these historians, equally biased, to present as direct dogmas or as beliefs positively professed by the Cathari, many ridiculous or repulsive eccentricities which are only the real or assumed consequences of principles admitted by them. Nothing is more deceptive than a method like this." *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, May 1, 1874, quoted by Deodat Roche, *Le Catharisme*, Vol. 1, 1973.

Ellen White was perfectly correct when she stated: "Written in the heavens, the history of the people of God throughout this gloomy period [that of the papal supremacy] occupies but a small place in human annals. One can scarcely discover the existence of these Christians other than in the calumny of their persecutors. Rome's tactics were to suppress all trace of divergence from its doctrines and decrees."—Ellen White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 61.

The historian Pierre Belperron reports this interesting fact, confirming the statement of Ellen White: "In 1235 when the Dauphin, count of Auvergne died, who had accumulated out of curiosity all the

heretical books, the Dominicans constrained his heirs to burn them, and it is regrettable that a lawsuit has not preserved for us a catalogue of this library." *The Crusade Against the Albigenses and the Reunion of Languedoc to France*.

22. Daniel Rops, *L'Eglise de la Cathedrale et de la Croisade*, p. 661. Librairie Artheme Fayard, 16e ed., Paris, 1952.

23. Jean Rouillard, an Adventist pastor, prize winner at the Bible Contest of Jerusalem, member of the society of Cathari studies, published a series of articles in the *Revue Adventiste*, from April to December 1977, under the title: "Knowledge of the Cathari." We find there a detailed description of various Cathari manuscripts actually available for researchers, as well as an article on the main beliefs of the Albigenses. See also the international magazine, *Conscience et Liberté*, 2nd term, 1976.

24. Cf. Daniel Rops, *L'Eglise des Apotres et des Martyrs*, pp. 561-569, Librairie Artheme Fayard, 141e edition, Paris, 1949. See also: *L'Eglise de la Cathedrale et de la Croisade*, pp. 657-678, Paris, 1952.

25. Deodat Roche, *L'Eglise Romaine et les Cathares Albigeois*, p. 171. Arques, 1957.

26. Rene Nelli, *Ecritures Cathares*, p. 19, Editions Planete, 1968.

27. Rene Nelli, *Le Phenomene Cathare*, p. 43, Privat, P.U.F., 1964.

28. Rene Nelli, *La Philosophie du Catharisme, le dualisme radical au XIIIe siecle*, p. 65. Payot, Paris, 1975.

29. *Idem*, p. 10.

30. R. Morghen, *Medioevo Cristiano*, 1958, in Rene Nelli, *Le Phenomene Cathare*, p. 65.

31. *Cathari Treatise*—Jean Rouillard, *Revue Adventiste*, October and December 1977.

In the *Cathari Treatise* the text of John 1:3 is translated as follows: "All things were made by him and without him was not anything made." Rene Nelli explains that it "has to do with relative nonentity and with 'privation': death, darkness, etc. . . ." *Ecritures Cathares*, p. 195.

32. For that reason, we can read in the *Cathari Treatise*: "As some people direct evil criticisms against us on the subject of works and of divine creations, we must . . . grasp more clearly the problem and know the truth of it. First, we honor to the utmost the supreme God, the true God, the Almighty Father, through whom, as we read and as we believe, 'have been made the heaven, and earth, the sea and all that therein is' (Psalm 146:6), as is confirmed by the witness of the prophets and demonstrated even more completely by the authorities of the New Testament." *Cathari Treatise*—Rene Nelli, in *Ecritures Cathares*, pp. 183, 184.

33. Christine Thouzellier, *Livre des deux Principes*, pp. 271, 273. Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1973.

34. *Cathari Treatise*—Rene Nelli, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

35. Christine Thouzellier, *op. cit.*, p. 311.

36. *Idem*, p. 265.

37. *Idem*, pp. 213, 215.

38. Cf. Jean Duvernoy, *Le Catharisme: la religion*

des Cathares, pp. 27, 28, note 3. Edition Privat, Toulouse, 1976. We find in the Appendix II, pp. 120-133, a Scripture index of all biblical quotations. All the books of the Old Testament and of the New Testament appear there, plus certain apocryphal books. Contrary to what is generally thought, the Gospel of Matthew is quoted most often: 165 times compared with 120 for the Gospel of John.

39. Christine Thouzellier, *Ritual Cathare*, pp. 26, 32.

40. Christine Thouzellier, *Livre des deux Principes*, pp. 407, 409.

41. *Idem*, p. 351.

42. *Idem*, p. 407.

43. *Cathari Treatise*—Jean Rouillard, *op. cit.*, October 1977.

44. Christine Thouzellier, *op. cit.*, p. 233.

45. *Occitan Manuscript*, Jean Rouillard, *op. cit.*, October 1977.

46. *Dublin Manuscript*, *Idem*, October 1977.

47. Jacqueline Dumesnil, *Les Cavaliers de la nuit*, pp. 184, 185, Belgique, 1964.

48. Cf. Ellen White in *Counsels on Diet and Foods*, p. 397. See also pp. 389-392, 399.

49. Cf. Rene Nelli, *La Philosophie du Catharisme*, pp. 173-184, Payor, Paris, 1975.

50. *Idem*, p. 184.

51. "So, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,

by the power of our Most Holy Father, the disciples of Jesus Christ were purified by baptism from the stain of their sins. They received from the Lord—as He had received them Himself from His Most Holy Father—the virtue and power of cleansing in turn other sinners by the baptism of Jesus Christ. We find in fact in the gospel of the blessed John, that the Lord Jesus Christ said to His disciples, after the resurrection: 'As my Father has sent me, so send I you.' Having said that, He breathed on them and said to them: 'Receive the Holy Spirit. Sins shall be forgiven to those whom you forgive, and sins will be retained for those whom you retain them.' " *Ritual Cathare*, 9:44-55, Christine Thouzellier, pp. 231, 235.

52. *Ritual Cathare*, 13:73-78, Christine Thouzellier, *op. cit.*, pp. 253, 255.

53. The eschatological vision of the Cathari rests entirely on the teaching of the Scriptures. We find quoted there all the classical references in the Psalms, Daniel, the Gospels, the epistles and the Revelation. Cf. Jean Rouillard, *The Cathari and the Return of Christ*, in *Revue Adventiste*, November 1977, also in *Conscience and Liberty*, No. 12, 2nd quarter, 1976, p. 69.

54. Quoted by Pierre Gosset, *Historie du Moyengage*, Paris, 1876, p. 248.

55. Sermon 65, I, 1495—Quoted by Deodat Roche, *op. cit.*, pp. 83, 84.

The Baptism

by Bonnie L. Casey

I got saved the day my brother was baptized, which is more than I could have said for him. He was baptized by my grandfather in a tank of water next to the organ in the church where my grandfather sometimes preached.

I was terrified of my grandfather, a tall, lean man with pure white hair. His warmest gesture toward me up to that time had been to teach me to mix strawberry jam into my cottage cheese so I wouldn't gag on it. He was a retired missionary who preached long, mesmerizing sermons about Africans named Utu and Bunga whom he had personally saved from sin. I was contemplating getting saved myself at some future date, a process which in my world necessitated a plunge in the baptismal tank. But first I wanted to see if it had any noticeable effect on my brother's character.

My brother needed saving more than anyone I knew, yet his attitude toward his impending immersion had been casual in the extreme. He was 12, four years older than I was, but light-years ahead of me in sophistication. He hung around with older boys who wore Brylcreem on their hair and watched "American Bandstand" when their parents weren't home. He took every opportunity to let me know that he "knew the score." I admired this about him, except where it touched on matters of the divine, and there I thought he ventured into

blasphemy. The night before his baptism he informed me that he was going to keep his eyes open underwater to see if my grandfather's robe floated up. I wanted to be there as much to see if he would really do this as to watch for any alterations in his character.

That Sabbath my grandfather departed from his African notes to preach about little children sitting at the feet of Jesus. Every now and then he would mention my brother to illustrate his point, gesturing down toward him and calling him "this precious soul." All the mothers in the congregation cried and made their children put away their coloring books and listen. My brother sat still, his chin on his chest and his eyes fixed downward. He was tearing his bulletin into a thousand pieces and dropping them onto the floor.

At the end of the sermon, my grandfather and brother went to a room behind the platform to put on their robes. The choir sang all the verses of "Just as I Am" to fill in until they returned. When they failed to emerge at the end of the hymn, the choir sang it all over again.

Finally my grandfather appeared in his black robe, walking toward the center of the tank with the slow, dragging steps of everyone's worst dreams. The water came up to his waist, so that when my brother emerged from the shadows behind him, he was submerged up to his armpits. My grandfather placed one hand on top of my brother's head and held his other hand up in the air, two fingers pointing toward heaven. He began to pray and pronounce blessings upon my brother.

And that's when it happened to me. Being pieced together from bits of half-understood sermons and hymns, my understanding of salvation centered around an experience of inner "glory." As I understood it, when you were saved, Jesus came into you and then shone out of you—sort of like you had swallowed

I felt a deep pit open up beneath me and start to swallow me. A feeling of mixed wonder and terror gripped my throat, and I began to cry—quietly at first, then in big gulping gasps.

a light bulb. This experience had never come to me firsthand, but I felt confident that I would recognize it if it ever did. Such was my faith in my own election.

As my grandfather spoke on and on, I felt a deep pit open up beneath me and start to swallow me. A feeling of mixed wonder and terror gripped my throat, and I began to cry—quietly at first, then in big gulping gasps. Finally my grandfather stopped speaking. I saw him cover my brother's mouth with a handkerchief, and then the scene became a blur. Whatever it was that was swallowing me took over completely. I bent over double and hid my face in my hands.

By the time my brother came up out of the water, I was shaking uncontrollably. My mother thought I was going to be sick and took me out to the ladies' room. I didn't tell her I wasn't sick. I just sat in the stall for several minutes, contemplating the mystery of the divine. Then I flushed loudly and came out, making a show of wiping my mouth with a wad of paper.

We were going to have lunch after church at my aunt's house, which for my brother and me always meant being consigned to the

sun porch at the dreaded children's table. Some of my relatives who didn't usually come to church had come for the baptism, and we were going to have something of a celebration afterwards.

I sat with my brother in the back seat of the car as we drove to my aunt's house. I had stopped crying by this time and was feeling much like my old self. I was thinking about what had happened to me in church and whether I ought to try to explain it to my brother. I looked over at him, slouched against the car door in his Sabbath suit. He didn't look like someone who'd had an encounter with the divine. He didn't look any different at all, except that his hair was wet and slicked back. He felt me staring at him, finally, and turned and glared at me.

"What are you lookin' at?" he mumbled.

"Nothin'," I said.

At my aunt's house, my brother was the center of attention, at least for a while. Everyone had kind words and manly advice for him. They shook his hand and told him he had taken a big step—and how proud they were of him. They told him that from here on he must try to live up to this experience. He told them that he would try. My grandfather took my brother by the shoulders and began talking in his preaching voice. He said things I didn't understand about a Damascus road, and then made everyone close their eyes while he said grace.

My brother had assured me that after he was baptized he would be allowed to sit with the adults for Sabbath dinner. But after grace was over, he was sent out with me and my cousins to the sun porch, where he hunched into his usual seat at the children's table. He was deeply wounded by this insult, but I was glad for the chance to observe him at close range. He brooded and sulked all during dinner. My cousins and I tried to make conversation with him, but he told us to be quiet, referring to us as "you children" and telling us to eat our peas.

I could see no evidence that my brother's

character had changed for the better. If anything, he was more moody and flippant than he had been before. Finally I hit on a test. If he passed it, there was some hope that my brother was capable of being saved. I put on my most serious expression and looked right at him. He was sitting across the table from me, stuffing great globs of apple cobbler into his mouth.

"Did you do it?" I asked.

"Did I do what?" he answered, swallowing another mouthful of cobbler.

"Did you keep your eyes open underwater?"

My brother put down his spoon and wiped his mouth with the back of his hand. He didn't answer my question directly; he just leaned across the table until his leering face was inches from mine, and said, "Longjohns."

It took a few seconds for the full import of what my brother had said to hit me. When it did, I suddenly had a vision of my sainted grandfather standing in a circle of huts, preaching to a group of Africans in his long underwear. It was an image that shocked and enraged me. Forgetting my table manners, I shouted at my brother, "I don't believe you were saved today at all!"

"Well, how would you know? You've never been baptized," he shouted back.

"I know because I got saved today without being baptized. While you were in the tank with grandfather I got swallowed up by the shenanigan glory."

My brother paused and blinked a few times. "The what?" he shrieked.

"The shenanigan glory. You know, like in the hymn. The shenanigan glory that shines forth from within."

Suddenly my brother's face was contorted into a laugh so overpowering that he was silent for the first few seconds. Then he exploded into howling guffaws, pausing between howls just long enough to bellow, "That's shekinah, you twerp! Shekinah glory!"

I put one foot on the seat of my chair and planted my fist just above my brother's gaping mouth. He reeled straight back off his

It took a few seconds for the full import of what my brother had said to hit me. When it did, I suddenly had a vision of my sainted grandfather standing in a circle of huts, preaching to a group of Africans in his long underwear.

chair in a somersault and landed on his back on the floor. I ran around the corner of the table and stood over him, one foot in each of his armpits, ready to defend my honor and the honor of my grandfather. But it wasn't necessary. My brother lay silently beneath me with his eyes closed, his face washed in blood. He looked as saved as I had ever seen him.

The Untold Story of the Bible Commentary

by Raymond F. Cottrell

Seventh-day Adventist study of the Bible came of age with publication of the seven-volume *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* in 1953 to 1957. The proof-text method of interpretation used for doctrinal apologetics began to give way to an objective investigation of Scripture using the historical-contextual-linguistic method.

Prior to the *Commentary*, Adventist books about the Bible usually assumed the dogmatic role of a teacher; the *Commentary* chose the more humble role of a student listening intently in order to hear what the Bible has to say. It eschewed a closed mind, naively content with the illusion of already being in possession of all truth, for an open mind in quest of an ever more complete and accurate understanding of Scripture. It recognized and respected alternative interpretations of moot passages of Scripture and, upon occasion, acknowledged the fact that we do not have all of the answers. Its objective was not to get in the last word on every point of interpretation but to encourage and assist readers in reaching their own conclusions. For the *Commentary*, Bible study became a continuing pilgrimage into truth.

The *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* became the first publication of the church to deal with the entire Bible from Genesis to Revelation in a systematic, expository way. It was the first to base its

comment consistently on the text of the Bible in the original languages instead of an English translation, and first to make consistent use of state-of-the-art archaeological information in an endeavor to recreate the historical circumstances within which each passage was written and to which it was addressed. It was first to make consistent use of variant readings in the ancient manuscripts wherever these clarify a statement or resolve a problem in the text.

Most of the 37 contributors were adequately trained, experienced, dedicated Bible scholars who had been serving the church as college Bible teachers over the preceding 20 years.

The index to Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek words considered in the *Commentary* (see Vol. 7, pp. 996-1017) reflects the endeavor of the contributors and the editors to provide as accurate an understanding as possible of the meaning the inspired writers of the Bible intended their words to convey. The exhaustive subject index on pages 1022 to 1167 enables *Commentary* readers to readily locate information on every Bible topic considered in its 7,949 pages. The 34 introductory articles in the seven volumes, together with an introduction to each book of the Bible, were designed to provide a wealth of information on such subjects as historical, chronological and cultural background, and on the writing and interpretation of Scripture—all of vital importance in understanding the Bible. Finally, the *Commentary* gave every church member instant access to the best information Seventh-day Adventist Bible scholars could provide.

Raymond Cottrell, former associate editor of the *Adventist Review* and *SDA Bible Commentary*, is a consulting editor and frequent contributor to *Spectrum*.

The story begins with two remarkable men, J.D. Snider, who initiated the project, and F.D. Nichol, who carried it through to a successful conclusion. The story of the *Commentary* is basically the story of these two men, and the kind of people they were in large measure explains its success over the past 30 years.

J.D. Snider, Dreamer Extraordinary

The *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* germinated in the fecund mind of J.D. Snider (1889-1976), Review and Herald book department manager from 1936 to 1967. "J.D.," as his friends affectionately knew him, was endowed with the rare gift of anticipating books designed to respond to a particular need, of finding the right people to write them, and of inspiring still other creative people to help him translate his dreams into reality. His success was legendary; if J.D. was for a project, it was certain to succeed.

J.D.'s consuming passion during his tenure as book department manager found ingenuous expression in the title of his classic *I Love Books* (1942), which sold a quarter of a million copies and was translated into several languages. His personal library of 25,000 volumes likewise mutely witnessed to the ardor of his lifelong love affair with books, and over his office door the theme of his life was embossed in wood: "Without a love for books, the richest man is poor."

The idea of a Seventh-day Adventist commentary on the Bible took root in J.D.'s thinking as the result of a persistent demand for classical commentaries such as those of Jamieson, Faussett and Brown; Adam Clarke; and Albert Barnes—all of 19th century vintage and not always in harmony with the Adventist understanding of the Bible. He foresaw the value of an up-to-date Adventist commentary to the church and believed it feasible to produce a major work of such

dimensions within a reasonable time and at a viable cost.

Enter Francis D. Nichol

As commander-in-chief of the *Commentary* project, Snider and the Review and Herald board selected Francis D. Nichol, who had served for the preceding 23 years as associate editor and then editor-in-chief of the *Review and Herald* (now the *Adventist Review*). With Nichol's 30 years of editorial experience and authorship of a score of books, several of them requiring painstaking research and accuracy, Snider and the board had good reason to believe that Nichol was the right man for the job and the person most likely to make the project a success. Nichol knew the Bible, was sensitive to the mood and needs of the church, had the sound judgment to make the product both useful and acceptable to a church sensitive on doctrinal matters, and he enjoyed the confidence of all whose participation would be necessary in order to transform the idea into reality.

Nichol accepted the challenge of the *Bible Commentary* in addition to his full-time job as editor of the *Review*, and gave both of them his formidable thought and drive at the rate of 12 to 15 hours a day, six days a week, for six years. He had the dubious reputation of running a marathon race at the pace of a hundred-yard dash. He was at his desk by four-thirty every morning and expected the same of his editorial associates on the *Commentary*. He usually worked evenings as well, and often Saturday nights.

With his consummate editorial skill Nichol was ever aware of the limits of his knowledge and relied heavily on the expertise of others in their respective fields of competence. He often referred to his editorial role as that of "a broker of other men's brains."

As editor of the *Review*—a post of responsibility and influence usually considered to be second only to the General Conference president—Nichol had a high sense of edi-

torial prerogative and responsibility, which he often reverently remarked he had learned from his illustrious predecessor, F.M. Wilcox. He listened intently to everyone, and when he recognized a valid point he incorporated it into his decision making. But on more than one occasion he said to me: "No one, not even the president of the General Conference, can tell me what goes into the *Review* or what does not. Of course, they can have me fired if I make an irresponsible decision."

The Commentary Team

In consultation with teachers at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary and a few trusted friends, Elder Nichol assembled members of the *Commentary* team. The full-time team consisted of Don F. Neufeld and Raymond F. Cottrell, associate editors, and Julia Neuffer, assistant editor. There were, as well, six part-time editors—making a total of ten. The major prerequisite was expertise in Hebrew and Greek; as for editorial skills, Nichol would provide on-the-job training.

Julia Neuffer was already established as the *Review*'s research specialist. She had majored in archaeology and Near Eastern antiquity at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, and since the late 1940s had worked in close association with Lynn H. Wood and later Siegfried H. Horn on an ad hoc committee of the General Conference on the chronology of Ezra 7. Upon the recommendation of Dr. Horn she was chosen by Elder Nichol to write the chronology articles for Volumes 1 to 3 and 5 of the *Commentary*. Her chief concern was matters of factual detail, for which she was often sent to the Library of Congress. Her penchant for accuracy was notorious.

At the time Nichol called me to join him at the *Review* and *Herald*, I was teaching biblical exegesis at Pacific Union College, where my wife, Elizabeth, and I had been

for 11 years. We arrived in Takoma Park late in September 1952, and began work on the *Commentary* the first day of October. During those five years I invested more than 15,000 hours in concentrated study of every verse of the Bible. At the conclusion of work on the *Commentary* and the retirement of Frederick Lee in 1957, Elder Nichol invited me to join the *Review* staff as an associate editor.

Early in 1953 Elder Nichol invited Don F. Neufeld, head of the Bible department at Canadian Union College, to join our team. He arrived with his wife Maxine and their family in June, at the close of the school year. Don was an expert in Hebrew and Greek, and over the years he made his own translation of several books of both the Old and New Testaments. He was painstakingly careful and accurate in his explication of the Bible, eminently logical in his reasoning

The *Commentary* chose the humble role of a student listening intently in order to hear what the Bible has to say. Its objective was not to get in the last word on every point of interpretation but to encourage and assist readers in reaching their own conclusions.

processes, and meticulous in his use of language.

Never having met each other before the *Commentary* brought us together, Don and I had independently formulated identical principles of exegesis, and from time to time each of us felt constrained to express happy surprise at finding the other following the same principles. This not only made our work together congenial, but resulted in a much more uniform product than would otherwise have been possible. Of course we

both followed the linguistic-contextual-historical method, but even more to our mutual surprise, identical principles in the interpretation of Bible prophecy.

Our auxiliary editorial team consisted of Leona Running, Earle Hilgert, Alger Johns, Herbert Douglass, Bernard Seton and James Cox, who participated variously from a few months to as much as two years. The first two were teachers at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary; the others were graduate students recommended by the Seminary faculty. Leona Running and Alger Johns were simultaneously studying with William Foxwell Albright at Johns Hopkins University in nearby Baltimore.

In any exposition of the Old Testament, an accurate and comprehensive knowledge of archaeology and ancient history is vital. Though not formally a member of the *Commentary* team, Dr. Siegfried H. Horn, recognized by his fellow archaeologists as unexcelled in his field, provided that expertise—both in the planning stage and throughout the editorial process. In addition, he wrote 929 pages of the *Commentary*—more than any other contributor.

The Writers and the Writing

For writers, Elder Nichol logically turned to the Bible teachers in our North American colleges and the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. He visited each campus, interviewing candidates and exploring their areas of expertise, interest and willingness to participate. Later he made specific assignments, stipulated the number of pages for each and set up mutually agreeable target dates. Each writer received a formal contract that promised the munificent sum of one dollar per manuscript page—scarcely enough to pay for typing the manuscript! The privilege of participating in the project was, presumably, to be a writer's principal reward.

Elder Nichol's aspirations for the *Commen-*

tary are reflected in the ten pages of his "Instructions to Commentary Writers." "First and most importantly," he wrote, it is to be "exegetical"; where appropriate it could also be "homiletical." It was to provide Seventh-day Adventists with "a work

Each writer received a formal contract that promised the munificent sum of one dollar per manuscript page—scarcely enough to pay for typing the manuscript! The privilege of participating in the project was, presumably, to be a writer's principal reward.

free of . . . doctrinal errors" and with "emphasis and elaboration" in "those areas of Scripture that are the basis of distinctive Adventist belief." It was not "to crystallize once and for all a dogmatic interpretation" of the Bible, nor to "give sanctuary or support to the pet theories of any individual" or to be "speculative." By avoiding technical theological jargon it was to be "at once learned and simple": "It isn't necessary to use ten dollar words in order to express ten dollar thoughts." It was to take full advantage of the insight into the meaning Hebrew and Greek words provide, but without making a fetish of them. It was to be written for ministers, Bible instructors, Sabbath school teachers, local elders, missionary-minded lay persons and those who "have a special love for the Bible and who wish to study it with greater thoroughness."

The most often expressed criticism of the *Commentary* has been Nichol's listing of all authors without specifying what each wrote. The instructions contained an extended section on the "Anonymity of Writers" in which Nichol explained the reasons for this intentional omission. He felt that since the

manuscripts required fairly extensive revision to achieve the uniform style necessary for a Seventh-day Adventist Bible commentary, they could not be used as vehicles for personal opinions. To protect individual writers from criticism, even on points where the writers and editors might agree, the editors assumed full responsibility for content, although names of the 37 contributors of all seven volumes appear in each volume. Thirty years later these fears no longer seem justified. The accompanying list of authors should be read with the reservation in mind that opinions expressed in the *Commentary* reflect the consensus of the editors and not necessarily always the opinions of the original writers.

The Editorial Process

The manuscripts varied considerably in quality, and thus in the time required to process them for typesetting. Some, such as those by Siegfried Horn and Graham Maxwell, required little or no editing. Others had to be revised or completely rewritten. In some instances the

To protect individual writers from criticism, the editors assumed full responsibility for content of the *Commentary*, although names of the 37 contributors of all seven volumes appear in each volume.

manuscript consisted essentially of the teacher's classroom notes—excellent for use in lectures but impossible as commentary material. In several instances the manuscripts consisted primarily of generalities and homily, with little or no exegesis. In some instances excellent scholars simply

proved to be poor writers. It was the task of the associate editors to remedy these and numerous other defects and to unify the style. Elder Nichol then evaluated the work and made the final decision regarding what the *Commentary* would say, verse by verse.

What should the editors do when they discover that one of the contributors had had his secretary type Albert Barnes' commentary for an entire book of the Bible, word for word from beginning to end, and submitted this as his contribution to the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*? Nichol's solution was to say nothing, pay the stipulated fee, file the document in his circular file, and secure a pinch-hit writer. Understandably, the name of the former writer does not appear among the contributors.

What should the editors do when comment on a major book of the Bible is completely unusable? In this case the writer was suffering the later stages of a terminal disease, yet his high sense of loyalty and responsibility led him to do his best to fulfill his contract. He was paid, of course, but the three editors who wrote what appears in the *Commentary* were unable to use any of his material. In this instance there was not time to secure another writer.

What should the editors do when a major manuscript is three years late and the time is fast approaching when it must be processed in order to keep the project on schedule? Nichol asked his associates to suggest a substitute writer who might be persuaded to fulfill the assignment—almost overnight. The long-delayed document came in the mail a day or two later and proved to be one of the best-written contributions to the *Commentary*.

Inasmuch as this was to be a Seventh-day Adventist Bible commentary, we considered it appropriate, always, to take note of historic Adventist interpretations of a passage. Where two or more interpretations have been held by a significant number of responsible persons within the church, it was our purpose to represent all of them fairly, but to favor an interpretation on

which an informed consensus had crystallized. As editors we did not consider it appropriate to use the *Commentary* as a vehicle in which to promote our personal opinions or those of anyone else. In instances where our collective judgment could not conscientiously support a particular traditionally held interpretation, we sought in an inoffensive way to present the evidence and give the reader an opportunity to make up his or her own mind. At times the expression "Seventh-day Adventists have taught that . . ." or its equivalent was our ironic way of expressing collective editorial judgment that the interpretation so characterized is not exegetically valid. Accurate exegesis was our primary concern.

A little more than halfway through, Nichol figured that the editorial process alone required 11,025 work-hours for each volume, or a total of 77,175 for all seven. For one person to do all of the writing and the editing, nearly 100 years would have been necessary. By enlisting the help of 37 writers, an editorial team consisting of three full-time

and six part-time editors, copy editors, and more than 100 non-editorial readers, Nichol was able to compress the work of a century into five or six years—with a high level of accuracy. In a letter to contributors in August 1955 he wrote:

It is becoming increasingly evident to us that the very nature of this work, which must make a cohesive whole of all that is written . . . demands a tremendous amount of work upon the original manuscripts. This is in no way a disparagement of the authors . . . This heavy total of editorial hours explains, in part, why it is possible to bring out ponderous volumes at a rather rapid rate and still produce works of prime value.

But, for Elder Nichol, quality was even more important than time: The *Commentary* must be as nearly perfect in every respect as possible—biblically, theologically, factually, typographically and stylistically. Accuracy and speed are not usually altogether compatible, but operate in inverse proportion to each other. Nichol demanded both. In order to provide the *Commentary* with both, he set up an elaborate system designed to ferret out every possible type of

“A Day for Toil, an Hour for Sport”

Despite its harrowing pace, the *Commentary* project had its lighter moments. Goaded himself beyond mercy and insisting that everyone who worked with him go and do likewise, Elder Nichol, a man of fabulous vitality, lived three lives during his 69 years. He was a man of compassion and great spirit who could always relate a humorous anecdote to get his point across. With his quick repartee, Elder Nichol was almost never caught speechless. Only twice during the 14 years I was associated with him did I ever see him in that uncomfortable state, and even then only for a fleeting moment.

The first such occasion took place in Tampa, Florida, where he and his wife, Rose, were sequestered, on doctor's orders, for eight weeks during the early months of 1955. He was virtually exhausted, and the prescription was complete rest with no phones ringing, no one knocking, no letters to answer, no galleys to read, and perhaps most important of all, no bothersome associate editors plying him with questions.

No one in Takoma Park knew his whereabouts, except that he was somewhere in sun-drenched Florida. He would call occasionally and crack his taskmaster's lash by long distance, but we could never call him. We were on our own.

After several weeks of relative solitude we (Don; Merwin Thurber, chief book editor; and I) plotted to locate and surprise Elder Nichol. As we departed one snowy Thursday at twilight and drove in shifts all night long, we knew nothing more than that they were somewhere in Florida. Arriving in Orlando, Winter Haven and Avon Park, erstwhile Nichol hideouts, we found no one who had seen him. Then word leaked out. A phone call to Takoma Park revealed that Nichol's secretary, who was in on our little plot, had received a post card from Mrs. Nichol with a picture of their Tampa motel. We headed for Tampa in hot pursuit, only to find the Nichols out for the day. But they were still registered at the little motel on the fringe of town. After a dip in the warm waters of the Gulf off Treasure Island, we returned to the motel where a familiar car with Maryland

error or shortcoming before the presses began to turn. By the time manuscript copy was made into plates for printing, 22 pairs of eyes had read every word of every line in the endeavor to make the resulting product as perfect as humanly possible.

Theological Booby Traps and Roadblocks

From beginning to end the editorial process seemed to be loaded with booby traps of various kinds which, if carelessly handled, could have been the source of real problems for the editors. The very first words of the Bible—"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth"—held us up at an editorial roadblock for three weeks, and Elder Nichol began to wonder out loud when, if ever, we would reach our destination of Revelation 22:20. Comment was written and rewritten, edited and re-edited, typeset and reset.

An entirely different exegetical ambush awaited us at Genesis 30:37 to 31:12, where Jacob informs Laban that God devised the procedure by which he had been able to acquire most of Laban's flocks and herds. As described, however, the strategy was based on two genetic impossibilities—prenatal influence of the kind here described and the transmission of acquired characteristics. The former qualifies as superstition, the latter as science fiction (see Genesis 30:37; cf. 31:4-12). Did God overrule the laws of genetics and let Jacob believe that the procedure produced the result he claimed for it, or was it a ploy Jacob invented to awe Laban into believing that God had directed him to perform? The result was clear, but it is obvious to us today that the conception of spotted and speckled cattle was not the result of the procedure to which Jacob attributed it. In addition to the genetic problems involved is the ethical question: Would God deceive Jacob into thinking that the procedure produced the result, and would He connive with Jacob to

license plates was parked. Armed with a camera, we knocked. As our victim opened the door we shot, point blank, and in the roseate rays of the setting sun, we caught the look of consternation we were looking for. In a sepulchral tone he exclaimed, "By the beard of the prophet! What are you fellows doing here?"

Invited in, we sat and visited with Mrs. Nichol while they finished their supper of fresh Florida strawberries. For at least 15 minutes Nichol himself remained speechless, trying by extrasensory perception to figure out how we had been able to follow him to his lair. Finally he blurted out in a mock self-defense, "I know how you found out. You ploughed my heifer." By process of elimination he concluded his wife must be guilty, however innocent her faux pas had been. We soon excused ourselves, mission accomplished, and set out for home through the night. Nichol was greatly distressed by the fact that we were all traveling together in one car, not so much for our sakes as that of the *Commentary*. What would happen to it if we were all killed in an accident?

Another practical joke we played on Elder Nichol was upon the occasion of his 60th birthday, a few months before completion of the project in the autumn of 1957. Scheming together and including

most of the editorial staff, we plotted a surprise birthday party just before closing time. Don and I contrived a fake radio broadcast, ostensibly over one of the local radio stations, in honor of the occasion. I wrote the script in a broadcast format featuring famous Washingtonians, we had some unfamiliar voices make the recording, and Don arranged to play the tape through a small radio on his desk. To get Elder Nichol's foot firmly in the trap we inveigled Siegfried Horn, our authority on antiquities, to come over from the Seminary to help us resolve a hypothetical question on which we would summon Elder Nichol for counsel.

Arriving in the *Commentary* office Nichol found us editors hard at work and Dr. Horn awaiting his arrival. As Horn began to expound the problem, Neufeld surreptitiously turned on his radio in time for a prerecorded station identification, followed immediately by a sugary eulogy of Nichol as a great Washington celebrity to be honored on the occasion of his 60th birthday. It sounded fabulously genuine. Despite the fact that his intuition told him it couldn't be so, his senses told him that it was so, and Byron Logan's official camera captured both reactions on his face at the same moment. And as the band played on, a large birthday cake was cut and punch flowed freely.

the disadvantage of Laban as the Bible implies?

Another type of problem lurked in Leviticus 11. The identity of a third of the Hebrew names of animals listed as unclean is unknown today, and any attempt at identifying them with known animals is guesswork. How could we comment intelligently (see Leviticus 11:2)? Again, how was the *Commentary* to reconcile the instruction of Deuteronomy 14:22-26—about spending one's tithe for wine, strong drink and whatever a person might lust for—with the Bible admonition that the tithe is sacred and that intoxicating substances are evil?

The so-called "wisdom literature" presented a number of perplexing problems. The book of Ecclesiastes confronted us with the need to determine whether some statements should be considered as inspired or as a reflection of the cynical, perverted reasoning of the writer's wayward, apostate years (see Vol. 3, p. 1060). Also, how did the amorous, erotic Song of Solomon get into the sacred canon? Is it historical or allegorical? Made into a motion picture it would earn an "X" rating, and if offered for sale on 42nd Street in New York City we would consider it pornographic (see Vol. 3, pp. 1110, 1111).

The Old Testament prophets are loaded with booby traps for the inexperienced and unwary. While we were editing Volume 4, I suggested to Elder Nichol that a discussion of principles for interpreting Old Testament predictive prophecy would be desirable. With his blessing, I wrote the article, "The Role of Israel in Old Testament Prophecy" (Vol. 4, pp. 25-38), which affirms that the predictive prophecies of the Old Testament were originally addressed to literal Israel under the covenant and were to have been fulfilled to them had they remained faithful to their covenant obligations and accepted the Messiah when he came.

Prior to editing the comment on Daniel, both Don and I thought of the book of

Daniel as an exception to this otherwise universal rule, but editing the comment on Daniel convinced both of us—contrary to our previous opinion—that this principle applies to the book of Daniel as well. Elder Nichol's overriding pastoral concern, however, led him to insert the parenthetical caveat on page 38 exempting "the book of Daniel that the prophet was bidden to 'shut up' and 'seal,' or to other passages whose application Inspiration may have limited exclusively to our time." This was one of only two or three occasions when Elder Nichol exercised his prerogative as editor-in-chief to override our editorial judgment.

Aware of the problems associated with the traditional interpretation of passages in Daniel and the Revelation, and of the experience of the church in attempting to deal with them, Don and I repeatedly spoke to

If modern literary documents made use of each other as the synoptic Gospels do we would consider it a clear case of gross plagiarism and a valid basis for indicting two of them as infringements of copyright.

each other of being, like Daniel, "astonied by the space of half an hour" and like Paul of spending "a day and a night in the deep." But we did not think the *Commentary* was the right place to make an issue of matters not essential to salvation, and our own pastoral concern led us to do the best we could with the traditional interpretation. Upon one occasion when certain questions were addressed to Elder Nichol in a public meeting, he replied that the *Commentary* would not deal with these matters, and he did not expect to be around when the church was ready to tackle them.

The synoptic problem—the literary relationship of Matthew, Mark and Luke—has

never been resolved to everyone's complete satisfaction. If modern literary documents made use of each other as the synoptic Gospels do we would consider it a clear case of gross plagiarism and a valid basis for indicting two of them as infringements of copyright. Ninety percent of Mark is reproduced in Matthew and Luke, often word for word, and both Matthew and Luke make extensive use of still another, unknown source. A more practical aspect of the problem was whether to comment at length on the same incident wherever it occurs in all three, or in only one of them, and if so which one (see Vol. 5, p. 194)?

It is not possible to determine the precise sequence of events in the ministry of Jesus. What principles should we follow in constructing a harmony of the Gospels, which inevitably involves arranging the events of Christ's life on earth in particular sequence? Furthermore, there is no clear evidence in the Gospels to indicate the length of Christ's ministry; commentators vary all the way from three and a half years to one year (see Vol. 5, pp. 190-201). Despite all statements to the contrary, there is no unambiguous evidence for the date of Christ's crucifixion and resurrection, nor has anyone been able to harmonize the information the four Gospels provide as to when the Last Supper took place. Lurking in the background of this dilemma is the fact that the date of the crucifixion is the anchor point that led to selection of 457 B.C. as the beginning date for 2300 days of Daniel 8:14, yet any suggested date for the crucifixion is arbitrary guesswork (see Vol. 5, pp. 247-266).

Often Don and I would spend an hour or two, or sometimes—on an important point—a day or more, exploring the problem together in order to arrive at a considered decision as to what the *Commentary* should say on a particular passage of Scripture. Upon one occasion we proposed to Elder Nichol that a weekend retreat for the *Commentary* editors should be devoted to the subject of prophetic fulfillment, the relation of Old Testament prophecy to the New Testament,

the "little apocalypse" of Matthew 24 (including "this generation"), and the imminence of the *parousia* ("presence" or "coming") of Christ clearly expressed throughout the New Testament. Meeting at the large Milesburn cabin beside the Appalachian Trail in Micheaux Forest about 30 miles west of Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, we devoted several hours to a discussion of the various issues and found our way through to the position to be taken on these matters.

Aware of the periodic theological hurricanes that brew in Australia and eventually reach North America, I suggested to Elder Nichol that we might do well to give our Australian brethren an opportunity to read galleys on the book of Hebrews. I suspected that some of them would take vigorous exception to some of the comments we as editors had already agreed on, and that it would be preferable to obtain their responses before publication rather than after. He agreed, and a few days later we met with some of the Australian leaders who were in Washington for meetings.

Members of the editorial team were familiar with the principles of textual criticism, as it is called, and in writing and editing the New Testament commentaries we examined several thousand variant readings and selected those we considered deserving of attention. Periodically we would confer in the capacity of a textual criticism seminar and reach a consensus on the weight to be given each variant to be mentioned in the *Commentary*. (See Vol. 5, pp. 146, 147, for an explanation of the system we devised for expressing the weight of evidence for a particular reading. Interestingly, the system later adopted by the editors of the Bible Society *Greek New Testament* was very similar to ours. See their introduction, pp. x and xi.)

What should an editor do with "proof texts" that inherently do not prove what is traditionally attributed to them—as, for example, Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:6; Revelation 12:17 and 19:10; Daniel 12:4;

Isaiah 2:4 and Micah 4:1, 2; and most of the texts usually cited with respect to "the law"? In most of these and a number of other passages, pastoral concern led us to conclude that the *Commentary* was not the place to make an issue of the Bible versus the traditional interpretation, much as this disappointed us as Bible scholars and would be a disappointment to our scholarly friends who know better.

Ellen G. White and the Bible

One of Elder Nichol's basic requirements was that the *Commentary* should at no point express any concept that could be construed as a contradiction of the writings of Ellen White. We were, of course, familiar with her published works, but nevertheless kept one editorial eye fixed on the Conflict of the Ages series, which parallels the Bible account. In addition, we asked the various readers of galleys and foundry proofs to call our attention to any items we as editors might have missed.

It was not long before we discovered that Ellen White sometimes construes a passage to mean something different from what the original context requires; we also discovered why she does so.

First and foremost we were to be faithful to the Bible, but in so doing we could avoid comment that might appear to contradict comment by Ellen White. Generally speaking, references to her writings in the body of the comment are inserted, not as authority for the statements made, but in confirmation or for comparison.

It was not long before we discovered that Ellen White sometimes construes a passage to mean something different from what the

original context requires; we also discovered why she does so. When dealing with a passage in its historical context—as throughout the Conflict series—she consistently deals with it contextually and her comment comports with the Bible. But when her primary objective is homiletical application of a passage to our time she often quotes the Bible out of context, applying the principle involved but in a way that seems to contradict the Bible. In such instances she uses the Bible to *illustrate* her point, not to exegete the Bible. New Testament writers often quote the Old Testament in the same way. Exegetical and homiletical uses of Scripture are both legitimate, but it is a gross misuse of Scripture to construe their—or her—homily as exegesis.

A prime illustration of Ellen White's homiletical use of Scripture is her comment on "the law" in the book of Galatians. In *Acts of the Apostles*, where she deals with the historical situation in Galatia, she consistently identifies "the law" as the ceremonial system—accurate exegesis. But when, as in *Selected Messages* (pp. 233, 234), she applies the principle of legalism to our day she identifies "the law" as the Decalogue—homily. In effect she is saying that we can no more be saved today by keeping the law than the Galatian believers could be saved by observing the ceremonial law; now, as then, salvation is by faith alone.

Something the same is true of Ellen White's application of Old Testament predictions that originally applied to Israel of old, and to the closing events of earth's history. According to Nahum 1:9 for instance, affliction would not arise again from Assyria. Ellen White applies the statement to the ultimate end of all evil in a universal sense (as in *The Great Controversy*, pp. 485, 612; and Exodus 12:37 cf. *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 334). Sometimes she bases her comment on a wrong meaning of an English word (as in 2 Thessalonians 2:9 cf. *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 686).

An Exhaustive Climax to an Exhaustive Project

The exhaustive index to the seven volumes of the *Bible Commentary* (Vol. 7, pp. 1022-1167) was the last of our 12 herculean labors. None of us had any formal training or experience in compiling an index of these proportions, but realizing the need for a good index and the fact that the compilation of one requires special expertise, Nichol sent Julia Neuffer, assistant editor of the *Commentary* and research specialist, for a course in indexing at nearby Catholic University of America. She thus became our authority for index content, style and clarity, as she had been our authority on so many other things essential to the project. Her favorite illustration of poor indexing was a series of "see" references which sent the hapless reader on a wild goose chase that eventually led him back to the original entry without locating the information he sought: (1) Wild goose chase. *See* Chase, wild goose. (2) Chase, wild goose. *See* Goose chase, wild. (3) Goose chase, wild. *See* Wild goose chase.

As I read page proofs for the seven volumes, I had been blue-penciling items to be indexed. Each entry was typed on a separate three-by-five card, and all of the cards were classified and alphabetized. Eventually our *Commentary* office was cluttered with boxes containing thousands upon thousands of cards. Inasmuch as the index had to include Volume 7 itself, in which it was to appear, final preparation of the index could not begin until we had read the last proof and filed the last entry card.

Climaxing his courtship with the *Commentary* for more than seven years, J.D. Snider insisted that Volume 7, and thus the complete *Commentary* set, be ready for the 1957 Christmas trade, and when page proofs for Volume 7 were finally in hand, read and indexed, the seven furies took control of the *Commentary* office and pandemonium prevailed. Fourteen of us (editors, copy edi-

tors and proofreaders) literally worked around the clock shift by shift, day after day, for ten days to complete the process of transforming the thousands of card entries into the index as it appears in Volume 7. Work halted about ten minutes before sundown Friday night and began again ten minutes after sundown Saturday night. By the close of those ten days we had produced an exhaustive index, and we ourselves were exhausted.

Why Did It Succeed?

The ultimate measure of the *Commentary's* success is the extent to which it illumines the Bible for those who aspire to a better understanding of Scripture. This cannot be measured directly, of course, but there are a number of indirect means including, chiefly, the response of the church in purchasing it and how often it is quoted in other church publications such as the Sabbath school *Lesson Quarterly*.

During the 1950s and 1960s the open theological climate in the church was favorable to the honest way in which the *Commentary* editors, in their dedication first to the Bible and then to the church, sought to deal with the Bible and with the teachings of the church in relation to the Bible.

From the publisher's point of view the best estimate of success is the sales report. It was originally hoped that 5,000 sets could be sold within three years of the time the last volume was off the press, and with that in view the original printing order for Volume

1 was 5,160. But even before Volume 7 was ready 23,000 sets had been purchased at the prepublication price of \$55.65 for the seven volumes. By the close of 1984 more than 83,000 complete sets had been sold, the current price being \$174.50. Were J.D. Snider alive he would have good reason to be jubilant.

Although the *Commentary* was not intended for reading like an ordinary book, a surprising number of people have told me of reading every word of it from beginning to end!

One of Elder Nichol's important goals was to make the *Commentary* acceptable to the church. Thirty years without complaint about its consensus understanding of the Bible is strong evidence that the church feels comfortable with the *Commentary*. This is not to suggest that everyone agrees with it at every point or that the *Commentary* is without flaw; even the editors did not personally approve of every concept it expresses. It does mean, however, that the church accepts it and identifies with it. The fact that the *Commentary* respects differences of opinion is doubtless an important factor in its acceptance. That Adventist Bible scholars, who realize that the traditional Adventist understanding of the Bible has not always been strictly biblical, also feel reasonably comfortable with the *Commentary* and find it useful, is another measure of its success. Six key factors were responsible for this success:

1. J.D. Snider's vision—his awareness of the need for an Adventist Bible commentary, together with his belief that the church was ready for it, that Adventist Bible scholars could and would write it, and that the Review and Herald could publish and market it at a price sufficient to cover the cost of production. "J.D." was the only person at the time who had that vision and was in a position to implement it, and his vision proved to be correct at every point.

2. F.D. Nichol's editorial expertise. He was probably one of a very few persons in the church at the time who combined all of the qualities essential to planning and executing the project: editorial experience, a concept of what the *Commentary* should be, sensitive awareness of the thinking and the mood of the church and its

leaders, open-mindedness and willingness to respect points of view with which he differed, appreciation of scholarship and a penetrating analysis of other people's reasoning, the high esteem in which he was held by the entire church, including its leaders and the contributors, an almost fanatical penchant for accuracy, and a passionate drive to carry the project through to completion within a relatively brief period of time.

3. The willingness of the publisher to venture a quarter of a million dollars, which eventually became half a million "initial expense" (the cost before the presses begin to turn), and the dedication of Review and Herald personnel to the project.

4. The content—the labors of the contributors and the editors to make the *Commentary* faithful to the Bible and to the Adventist understanding of Scripture.

5. The dedication of the church at large to the Bible and the value its members place on a better understanding of it.

6. The openness of the church at the time the *Commentary* was written and published. During the 1950s and 1960s the theological climate in the church was favorable to the honest way in which the *Commentary* editors, in their dedication first to the Bible and then to the church, sought to deal with the Bible and with the teachings of the church in relation to the Bible.

The *Commentary* was strictly a publishing-house project with the blessing of the General Conference. The Review and Herald Publishing Association accepted both financial and theological responsibility. In other words, the project was unofficial, with credit for success or blame for failure going to the publisher and not to the General Conference. This arrangement protected the General Conference from criticism in case the *Commentary* posed either a financial or theological problem. Had the project been sponsored and controlled by the General Conference, the *Commentary* would inevitably have taken a dogmatic, apologetic position on points of exegesis and interpretation where differences of opinion existed; this would have alienated the respect of many and limited the *Commentary's* value and usefulness. Without training and expertise in biblical and theological matters, administrators would have found themselves in the embarrassing position of having to make decisions they were not competent to make. The fact that the publisher, with its Bible-

scholar editors, made these decisions and accepted responsibility for them protected the General Conference in case errors of judgment were made, errors for which it could then disavow responsibility.

Long-term Influence

Though not by design on the part of those who convened it, the 1952 Bible Conference opened the door to a 15-year climate of openness and freedom to study the Bible objectively rather than apologetically, during which the church made rapid progress in its understanding of the Scripture. Elder Nichol often commented that except for the 1952 Bible Conference it would not have been possible to produce the *Commentary* because the editors could not have operated with sufficient freedom to make it objective and therefore worthwhile. In turn, the *Commentary* consolidated the openness and freedom that began in 1952 and continued for several years.

As a result of this climate of openness and freedom it was possible to build into the *Commentary* advanced principles of Bible study that set the *Commentary* free from the outmoded proof-text method of study. These advanced principles make the Scriptures in the original languages, the ancient manuscripts, the context in which a statement occurs, and the historical setting normative for its meaning. The purpose of this method of study is to ascertain what the inspired writers, guided by the Holy Spirit, intended their words to mean, and thus to give the Bible an opportunity to interpret itself. It avoids the common proof-text method of reading into the Bible whatever the would-be interpreter may imagine it means.

Inevitably, the editors found that certain passages of Scripture, taken in context, do not support the traditional proof-text con-

cepts usually attributed to them. As editors we would have been unfaithful to the Bible if we had not set forth what we conscientiously believed to be the true meaning of a passage. At the same time, with appropriate pastoral concern, we included the traditional interpretation, and were thus able in most instances to be faithful to the Bible and at the same time recognize a historic Adventist position. By offering more than one interpretation of a passage we made clear to *Commentary* readers that we were not freezing Adventist theology into a creed, despite fears in some quarters that we would attempt to do so. We realized also that some church members, used to the dogmatic, proof-text approach, would feel uncomfortable and threatened by the openness of the *Commentary*, but we believed that in time the church would come to appreciate the virtues of openness and that our endeavor to be faithful to the text of Scripture would have a corrective effect.

Publication of the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* was an epochal event in the history of the church, one whose full import is yet to be perceived. With the clearer and more complete understanding of the Bible reflected in the *Commentary* as a basis, together with continuing study of the Bible by sound principles, competent Adventist Bible scholars of a future generation will be able to improve on what we were able to do.

Editors' note: Significant revisions of a few general articles in the first edition of the SDA Bible Commentary were completed in 1976. Begun by Ray Cottrell, the revisions were completed under Ray Woolsey's supervision. Geoscience Institute staff—primarily Ariel Roth—revised the articles in Volume 1 on Creation and the flood. (See W. W. Hughes' "Shifts in Adventist Creationism," in *Spectrum*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 47-50.) The section on lower criticism or editing of biblical manuscripts was rewritten for the article on "Lower and Higher Criticism" in Volume 5. Historical maps in Volume 7 were revised when Rand McNally acknowledged errors unnoticed for decades in their depiction of places in Egypt and the Niger Desert. Rand McNally thanked Julia Neuffer, assistant editor of the first edition, for bringing the needed corrections to their attention. Throughout the seven volumes, metric measurements were added to English measurements, and where necessary, values of coins were compared to wages of their day instead of to the fluctuating value of the dollar.

Appendix

Index to the Commentary

In the indexes that follow, contributors to the Commentary are listed with their works. Employing institutions, where noted, are shown in parentheses (see key). Number of pages shown in parentheses represent total number of pages contributed. This figure includes maps and charts not provided by the respective authors and the text of the Bible (KJV) for each chapter.

It is important to remember that all manuscripts were edited and that the editors accepted full responsibility for all contributions in their final form. The point of view set forth may or may not reflect the opinion of the author whose name is listed for a particular article or book of the Bible.

Key: AUC = Atlantic Union College; CME = College of Medical Evangelists (now Loma Linda University); CUC = Canadian Union College; EMC = Emmanuel Missionary College (now Andrews University); FC = Florida Conference; GC = General Conference; HC = Helderberg College; LSC = La Sierra College (now Loma Linda University); PUC = Pacific Union College; R = Retired; R&H = Review and Herald Publishing Association; SMC = Southern Missionary College (now Southern College); TS = Theological Seminary (now Andrews University); WMC = Washington Missionary College (now Columbia Union College).

Author Index

Andreasen, M.L.¹ (TS)

Leviticus, Hebrews (221 pages)

Caviness, L.L. (PUC)

Esther, Song of Solomon

Christensen, O.H. (EMC)

Joshua (130 pages)

Cottrell, R.F.² (PUC)

Synoptic Gospels, John 1-4

4: The Role of Israel in Old Testament Prophecy

5: The Fourfold Gospel Narrative; Major English Translations (712 pages)

Froom, L.E.³ (TS)

4: Interpretation of Daniel

7: Interpretation of the Apocalypse (69 pages)

Hammill, R. (SMC)

Judges (120 pages)

Hardinge, L. (WMC)

Colossians (37 pages)

Hartin, L.H. (PUC)

Galatians (60 pages)

Hartwell, R.H.⁴ (FC)

7: John and the Isle of Patmos (6 pages)

Heppenstall, E.E. (LSC)

2 Corinthians (107 pages)

Hilgert, E. (TS)

Jeremiah 46-52, Lamentations, Daniel 10-12, John 5-6, Revelation 1-11

5: "Lower" and "Higher" Biblical Criticism, Chronology of the Pauline Epistles (230 pages)

Horn, S.H. (TS)

Genesis, Exodus 1-18, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel 1, 3-6

1: Languages, Manuscripts, and Canon of the Old Testament; Archeology and the Recovery of Ancient History; Historical Background of the Patriarchal Period; Daily Life in the Patriarchal Age; Weights, Measures, and Money Values in the Old Testament

2: Ancient World From c. 1400 to 586 B.C.

3: Musical Instruments of the Ancient Hebrews; Ancient World From 586 to 400 B.C.; Tables of Elephantine and Jewish Papyri

4: Chronology of the Old Testament Prophets

5: Ancient Jewish Literature; "Lower" and "Higher" Biblical Criticism

6: Chronology of the Acts

7: The Seven Churches of Revelation (929 pages)

Hyde, W.T. (PUC)

Proverbs, 1-3 John, Jude (133 pages)

Jemison, T.H. (WMC)

Philippians (44 pages)

Johns, A.F.⁵ (LSC)

James (47 pages)

Loasby, R.E. (TS)

Numbers, Deuteronomy, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, 1-2 Peter, Revelation 17-22

1: Names of God in the Old Testament (451 pages)

Ludgate, T.K. (HC)

1 Corinthians (164 pages)

Marsh, F.L. (EMC)

1: Science and Creation (24 pages)

Maxwell, A.G. (PUC)
Romans (186 pages)

McMurphy, E.J. (SMC)
Titus, Philemon (28 pages)

Minchin, G.H. (AUC)
Ephesians (55 pages)

Murdoch, W.G.C. (TS)
Psalms 107-150, Daniel 2, 7-9 (121 pages)

Neufeld, D.F.⁶ (CUC)
Ezekiel, John 7-21 (272 pages)

Neuffer, J. (R&H)
1: Chronology of Early Bible History
2: Hebrew Calendar in Old Testament Times;
Chronology from the Exodus to the Exile
(a compilation)
3: Chronology of Exile and Restoration
5: A Basis for New Testament Chronology
(212 pages)

Pease, N.F. (CME)
Job (120 pages)

Price, G.M.⁷ (R)
Evidences of a Worldwide Flood (28 pages)

Read, W.E.⁸ (GC)
Revelation 12-16 (42 pages)

Smith, C.O. (AUC)
1-2 Thessalonians (58 pages)

Specht, W.F. (LSC)
Jeremiah 1-10 (61 pages)

Thiele, E.R. (EMC)
2 Samuel, 1-2 Kings, 1-2 Chronicles, Isaiah
(845 pages)

Thurber, M.R.⁹ (R&H)
1: Outline of Sanctuary Service (13 pages)

Walther, D.¹⁰ (TS)
7: Reformation and Onward (39 pages)

Wearner, A.J.¹¹ (UC)
John (see note)

Weniger, C.E. (TS)
Psalms 1-106
3: Poetry of the Bible (269 pages)

Wirth, W.G. (CME)
Exodus 19-40, Jeremiah 11-45, Minor
Prophets, 1-2 Timothy (470 pages)

Wood, L.H.¹² (TS)
1 Samuel
1-7: All art maps
5: Between the Testaments (278 pages)

Yost, F.H.¹³ (TS)
Acts
5: Jews of the First Christian Century
6: Early Christian Church
7: Medieval Church (495 pages)

NOTES ON AUTHORS

1. Andreasen, a veteran teacher at the Seminary, had recently retired.

2. Cottrell was teaching biblical exegesis at Pacific Union College at the time assignments were made, and moved to Washington, D.C., to edit the *Commentary* in September 1952.

3. Froom was retired and on special assignment for the General Conference, writing *Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, on which subject he lectured at the Seminary.

4. Hartwell was a pastor in the Florida Conference, selected because of his personal acquaintance with the Isle of Patmos.

5. Johns was teaching at La Sierra College at the time assignments were made but transferred to Washington, D.C., in 1955 to attend the Seminary. While in Washington he completed his doctoral degree under William F. Albright at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore.

6. Neufeld was head of the Bible department at Canadian Union College at the time assignments were made, and moved to Washington, D.C., in June 1953 to join the editorial team. In addition to his *Commentary* assignments, he edited the *SDA Bible Dictionary* and the *SDA Encyclopedia*, and, with Julia Neuffer, the *SDA Bible Students' Source Book* (which became volumes 8, 10 and 9,

respectively, of the Commentary Reference Series subsequently added to the seven volumes of the *Commentary* as a ten-volume set).

7. Price had been a teacher for many years in various colleges but had long since been retired at the time assignments were made.

8. Read was chairman of the General Conference Biblical Research Committee, and was selected for this assignment because of his major presentation on Armageddon at the 1952 Bible Conference.

9. Thurber was book editor for the Review and Herald Publishing Association. He was selected for this assignment because of special research he had done.

10. Walther's name is unaccountably missing from the list of contributors.

11. Wearner, veteran Bible teacher, was head of the Bible department at Union College but suffered a terminal illness before his assignment was completed. The editors greatly appreciated his heroic effort under the most difficult circumstances.

12. Wood drew all of the art maps for all seven volumes.

13. Yost's primary assignment at the time was as secretary of the Religious Liberty department. He had been teaching for many years at the Seminary and still taught an occasional class there.

General Articles Index

Volume I

- Languages, Manuscripts and Canon of the Old Testament: S.H. Horn.
- Science and Creation: F.L. Marsh (The article in the revised edition of the *Commentary*, "The Creationist Model of Origins," was prepared by the staff of the Geoscience Research Institute.)
- Evidences of a Worldwide Flood: G.M. Price (The article in this revised edition of the *Commentary*, "Genesis and Geology," was prepared by the staff of the Geoscience Research Institute.)
- Archeology and the Recovery of Ancient History: S.H. Horn.
- Historical Background of the Patriarchal Period: S.H. Horn.
- Daily Life in the Patriarchal Age: S.H. Horn.
- Weights, Measures, and Money Values in the Old Testament: S.H. Horn.
- Names of God in the Old Testament: R.E. Loasby.
- Chronology of Early Bible History: J. Neuffer.
- Outline of the Sanctuary Service: M.R. Thurber.
- Maps and line drawings (all volumes): L.H. Wood.
- Ellen G. White Comments (all volumes): Ellen G. White Estate.

Volume 2

- Ancient World from c. 1400 to 586 B.C.: S.H. Horn.
- Hebrew Calendar in Old Testament Times: J. Neuffer
- Chronology from Exodus to Exile: J. Neuffer (compiler)

Volume 3

- Poetry of the Bible: C.E. Weniger.
- Musical Instruments of the Ancient Hebrews: S.H. Horn.
- The Ancient World from 586 to 400 B.C.: S.H. Horn.
- Chronology of Exile and Restoration: J. Neuffer.

Volume 4

- Chronology of the Old Testament Prophets: S.H. Horn.
- Role of Israel in Old Testament Prophecy: R.F. Cottrell.
- Interpretation of Daniel: L.E. Froom.

Volume 5

- The Period Between the Testaments: L.H. Wood.
- Jews of the First Christian Century: F.H. Yost.
- Ancient Jewish Literature: S.H. Horn.
- Language, Manuscripts and Canon of the New Testament: S.H. Horn.
- "Lower" and "Higher" Biblical Criticism: S.H. Horn and E. Hilgert.
- The Fourfold Gospel Narrative: R.F. Cottrell.
- Maps and Diagrams on the Life of Christ: L.H. Wood.
- A Basis for New Testament Chronology: J. Neuffer.
- Major English Translations of the Bible: R.F. Cottrell.

Volume 6

- The Early Christian Church: F.H. Yost.
- Roman History in New Testament Times: F.H. Yost.
- Chronology of the Acts of the Apostles: S.H. Horn.
- Chronology of the Pauline Epistles: E. Hilgert.

Volume 7

- The Medieval Church: F.H. Yost.
- The Reformation and Onward: D. Walther.
- John and the Isle of Patmos: L.H. Hartwell.
- The Seven Churches of Revelation: S.H. Horn.
- Interpretation of the Apocalypse: L.E. Froom.

Subject Index

- Genesis:** S.H. Horn
Exodus 1-18: S.H. Horn
Exodus 19-40: W.G. Wirth
Leviticus: M.L. Andreasen
Numbers: R.E. Loasby
Deuteronomy: R.E. Loasby
Joshua: O.H. Christensen
Judges: R. Hammill
Ruth: R.E. Loasby
1 Samuel: L.H. Wood
2 Samuel: E.R. Thiele
1-2 Kings: E.R. Thiele
1-2 Chronicles: E.R. Thiele
Ezra: S.H. Horn
Nehemiah: S.H. Horn
Esther: L.L. Caviness
Job: N.F. Pease
Psalms 1-106: C.E. Weniger
Psalms 107-150: W.G.C. Murdoch
Proverbs: W.T. Hyde
Ecclesiastes: R.E. Loasby
Song of Solomon: L.L. Caviness
Isaiah: E.R. Thiele
Jeremiah 1-10: W.F. Specht
Jeremiah 11-45: W.G. Wirth
Jeremiah 46-52: E. Hilgert
Lamentations: E. Hilgert
Ezekiel: D.F. Neufeld
Daniel 1, 3-6: S.H. Horn
Daniel 2, 7-9: W.G.C. Murdoch
Daniel 10-12: E. Hilgert
Minor Prophets: W.G. Wirth
Synoptic Gospels: R.F. Cottrell
John 1-4: R.F. Cottrell
John 5, 6: Earle Hilgert
John 7-21: D.F. Neufeld
Acts: F.H. Yost
Romans: A.G. Maxwell
1 Corinthians: T.K. Ludgate
2 Corinthians: E.E. Heppenstall
Galatians: L.H. Hartin
Ephesians: G.H. Minchin
Philippians: T.H. Jemison
Colossians: L. Hardinge
1-2 Thessalonians: C.O. Smith
1-2 Timothy: W.G. Wirth
Titus: E.J. McMurphy
Philemon: E.J. McMurphy
Hebrews: M.L. Andreasen
James: A.F. Johns
1-2 Peter: R.E. Loasby
1-3 John: W.T. Hyde
Jude: W.T. Hyde
Revelation 1-11: E. Hilgert
Revelation 12-16: W.E. Read
Revelation 17-22: R.E. Loasby

The Adventist Heritage Calls for Ordination of Women

by Bert Haloviak

Ordination of women to full gospel ministry is called for by both the historical heritage of the Seventh-day Adventist Church and by the guidance of God through the ministry of Ellen G. White. It is particularly helpful to look at the church's 107 years of licensing female ministers.

Ellen S. Lane was the first Adventist woman to hold a ministerial license. In 1868 she received a "preacher's license" from the Michigan Conference. This was a genuinely significant step if the action of the 1878 General Conference is to be taken seriously. Commencing on October 4, this "largest gathering of Christian Sabbath-keepers ever assembled in this country," adopted the following resolution:

RESOLVED, That those who apply for a license to preach the third angel's message, before they receive a license, be examined by a competent committee in regard to their doctrinal and educational qualifications.¹

The "license to preach" or "ministerial license" was taken very seriously by the denomination since it was seen as the route to the full ordination and reception of ministerial credentials. After the General Conference session on October 7, the Michigan

Conference gathered on the very campground where the General Conference session was being held, and renewed Ellen Lane's license. Also following the session, Julia Owen received a similar license from the Kentucky-Tennessee Conference. Both women were wives of ordained ministers, and both had indicated a marked "calling" to ministerial labor.²

In 1879 Kansas and Minnesota joined the list of conferences licensing women. Illinois issued licenses to 10 different women ministers. At the time of the 1881 session, at least seven women held ministerial licenses.³

Ellen White actively involved herself in the examinations that occurred prior to the issuing of licenses, and she attended many of the conference proceedings where ministerial licenses were issued to women. At the Kansas Conference proceedings of 1879, the committee on credentials and licenses made their initial report, after which it was observed, "Sister White spoke at some length on the subject of licenses." At the afternoon meeting, the committee submitted a further report that contained ten additional names, including that of Hattie Enoch. The next year, in Oregon, Mrs. White observed that she had met with various licentiate applicants and that she had recommended that some not receive licenses.⁴

Phase two of the licensing process begun in 1878 occurred at the 1881 General Conference Session. Two resolutions seem per-

Bert Haloviak is assistant director of the office of General Conference archives and statistics. This article has been condensed by the editors from a longer essay Haloviak wrote for C.E. Bradford, president of the North American Division. It was distributed to members of the special General Conference committee on the role of women in the Adventist Church.

tinent to the question of the ordination of women.

RESOLVED, That all candidates for license and ordination should be examined with reference to their intellectual and spiritual fitness for the successful discharge of the duties which will devolve upon them as licentiates and ordained ministers.

RESOLVED, That females possessing the necessary qualifications to fill that position, may, with perfect propriety, be set apart by ordination to the work of the Christian ministry.⁵

The first resolution was adopted, but there was obvious division of opinion upon the second and it was referred to the General Conference Committee. There, it apparently died. Ellen White was not present at the 1881 session, nor did she apparently comment upon it. If one takes the position that Ellen White's silence indicates disapproval of ordination or, if the issue were important, it would have been resolved by her through a vision, then one is faced with the question as to why Ellen White approved the licensing of women. Such licensing obviously set women upon the path to ordination. The General Conference discussion of ordination of women soon after their licensing makes that clear.

The 1884 and 1885 General Conference sessions discussed various issues concerning licensing and ordination, leading to the 1886 publication of "The Church: Its Organization, Ordinances, Discipline," by J.H. Waggoner. He observed:

The Conferences always give licentiates to understand that the first giving of licenses is only a trial. . . . By giving him a license [however] they strengthen his conviction that it [is] his duty to preach. (p. 19)

Waggoner also noted that the license did not authorize the licentiate to celebrate the ordinances, administer baptism, organize churches or solemnize marriages. It is interesting to note that a number of state legislatures did allow licensed ministers to perform the marriage ceremony, but the issue apparently never came to a question of court resolution in the 19th century.⁶

The ministry continued to be upgraded through the 1870s and into the 1880s, and women continued to be licensed by local

conferences. At the 1887 General Conference Session, the General Conference implemented what had been done at the local conference level nine years earlier when it licensed Ruie Hill and Hattie Enoch to serve in General Conference mission areas within the United States.⁷

G.I. Butler observed that Smith Sharp, president of the Kansas Conference, was making full use of licentiates there, especially in personal-type revival ministry. Butler observed to Ellen White:

Among these are Marshall Enoch and his wife who is a public speaker who labors with her husband. Elder Cook [Kansas minister, soon to become president of the conference] thinks she is a better laborer in such things than any minister in the state.⁸

After 15 years of ministry in the United States, Elder and Mrs. Enoch pioneered the work in Bermuda.

Butler observed that there were other "promising licentiates coming up" in Kansas and mentioned "a young lady, Presbyterian, a school teacher, who was candidate for County Superintendent of Common School," as one prospect.⁹

Ellen Lane began her ministerial experience during her husband's ministry in Ohio. Initially assisting him during a time of illness, Lane attained increasing proficiency as a speaker. Together with J.O. Corliss they pioneered the work in Tennessee. Ellen Lane was licensed in Michigan when they returned to that state, and both she and her husband conducted evangelistic meetings to the time of his death in 1881. Mrs. Lane continued an extremely effective ministry as a licensed minister until 1889.

Women's Ministry and the New York Experience

At the turn of the century, the president of the New York Conference, G.B. Thompson informed one ministerial license candidate that workers are usually asked to "show by bringing in some fruit of their work that they have a call

in this direction, and then the conference, if they show a call to that work, is willing to take them on and give them some [financial] help."¹⁰ Lulu Wightman provided tangible evidence of her "call" to the gospel ministry. Indeed, the results from her evangelism would rank her not only as the most outstanding evangelist in New York state during her time, but among the most successful within the denomination for any time period. Between 1896 and 1905, Wightman's pioneer work as a licensed minister helped raise churches in places where Adventism had never gained a foothold before: Hornellsville, Gas Springs, Wallace, Silver Creek, Geneva, Angola, Gorham, Fredonia, Avoca, Rushville, Canandaigua and Penn Yan. After her husband was licensed in 1903, they jointly established churches in Avon, Lakeville, Hemlock, South Livonia and Bath.

The ministry of Wightman can be pursued at length merely by reading the local news-

"The fact that men and women are converted to God through the preaching of women should suffice. . . . It is high time for women to begin to preach the word and that the Lord is with them in power and might may be perceived by all who are not looking through smoked glass."

—John Wightman

papers in places where she held evangelistic meetings. The Gorham, New York, *New Era* reported:

Mr. & Mrs. Wightman, who have been here about eight months, preaching and working in the interests of the S.D. Adventists, left for Rushville on Monday, where they will locate and do missionary work in their cause, and in connection look after the flock there. During their residence

here these people have made many friends and have converted some to their religion, and their departure is regretted by many who even did not agree with their views, as they were intelligent social, and good citizens. They will probably return next summer when they can preach in the tent.¹¹

Wightman had married a former newspaper editor who worked with her without ministerial pay for seven years. He received some remuneration from colporteur work. Lulu Wightman was also the sister of K.C. and E.T. Russell, both of whom were prominent workers within the denomination.

A study of Mrs. Wightman is especially useful to an analysis of a history of women's ministry because the records of the New York Conference during the 1890s and 1900s have been well preserved. Such a study is also useful because her husband was quite articulate and, on at least one occasion, spoke on the issue of ordination at a time when women themselves appear not to have openly discussed the matter.

Wightman's initial experience in seeking ministerial labor provides an interesting variation to the usual policy of the 19th century. Since she was considered the finest singer in the New York Conference, she was offered some remuneration if she labored in tent meetings during 1896, but her husband could receive no conference remuneration. However, that year instead of focusing upon music at camp meetings, Wightman, with her husband's assistance, established churches at Hornellsville and Gas Springs.

The next year, S.M. Cobb, who had ministered in New York state since 1884, wrote to the conference president:

I say as I have said all the time in reference to Sr. Lulu Wightman, that a good lady worker will accomplish as much as good as the best men we have got, and I am more and more convinced that it is so. Look at Sr. Lulu W's work; she has accomplished more the last two years than any minister in this state, and yet the Conf. has held her off [at] arms length, and refused to recognize her as a suitable person to present the truth, when in fact she was out of sight of the very ones that opposed her, in point of ability (you know who I mean) . . .

I am also in favor of giving license to Sr. Lulu Wightman to preach, and believe that there is no reason why she should not receive it, and if Bro.

W. is a man of ability and works with his wife and promises to make a successful laborer, I am in favor of giving him license also.¹²

Wightman's ministry was temporarily delayed for several months in 1897. However, despite the birth of her daughter, Ruth, in August of that year, Wightman received a ministerial license at the New York Conference proceedings of September 10. She commenced meetings in Avoca, New York, on November 11.

At Avoca, Wightman was confronted with attacks that were often made upon Seventh-day Adventist women ministers in the 19th century, when one of the ministers from the area observed that Paul "suffers not a woman to teach." Wightman's husband responded by citing Scriptural evidence for women's ministry and by citing the evidence of observation:

The fact that men and women are converted to God through the preaching of women should suffice. . . . It is high time for women to begin to preach the word and that the Lord is with them in power and might may be perceived by all who are not looking through smoked glass.¹³

The ministry of the Wightmans in New York state illustrates the 19th century practice of the husband-wife ministerial team. However, while both had strong evangelistic leanings, Lulu Wightman was the more effective and enthusiastic evangelist.

Wallace [a church] had not ought to be deserted just now, but as evangelists we ought to be moving on. Moving on is what does the work.

We don't like the idea of going to the churches too much. We prefer getting right into new fields.¹⁴

Wightman used evangelistic methodology with broadsides, flyers and newspaper advertisements. She usually advertised herself as a "Bible evangelist." Her commitment to evangelism was such that she tried to leave companies of believers even in out-of-state places where she "vacationed" for health reasons. She purposely chose places where churches were not established.

The following two snatches of correspondence illustrate the nature and irony of the Wightman ministry. The first item is addressed to Lulu Wightman's husband by

the president of the New York Conference, and the second illustrates the full scope of her ministry:

Enclosed find a small token of appreciation from the Conference Committee for your work in *assisting your wife* [emphasis added].

Sister Wightman is one of the active laborers of the New York Conference, and has labored successfully for several years in the field as a minister in tent work in the summer and in halls, etc. in the winter.¹⁵

John Wightman was licensed as a minister in 1903, some six years after his wife, and ordained in 1905. It was in 1903 that the General Conference statistical secretary began to make close observations about

Mrs. Wightman's work was considered by three or four former committees as being *unquestionably* that of an ordained minister, and so they fixed her compensation as near the "ordained" rate as possible.

local conference reports. He noted that in New York state 60 percent of the new members joining the church entered as the result of the efforts of "two licensed ministers" (the Wightmans) and one Bible worker (Mrs. D.D. Smith). At the time, the New York Conference had 11 ministers and two Bible workers.

Apparently the result of licensing John Wightman caused a discussion concerning the question of salary for the husband-wife team. When the conference president suggested that Mrs. Wightman "voluntarily lower her salary" from \$9 to \$7 per week to conform to the usual licentiate salary of \$7, her husband felt grieved. He wrote a private letter to the president of the New York Conference in 1904 which reveals that the question of ordaining Lulu Wightman had come up at the 1901 annual meeting of the New York Conference.

Mrs. Wightman's personal work was considered by three or four former [auditing] committees as being that of an ordained minister *unquestionably* [emphasis in original]; and yet, at Oswego [location of 1901 New York Conference meeting], they felt (brethren Daniells and Thompson, to which opinion Elder Underwood and others strongly demurred) that a woman could not properly be ordained—just now at least—and so they fixed her compensation as near the “ordained” rate as possible. As her capability was recognized and general fitness known to all, and work continued, the \$9 is still as fitting under the circumstances as before.¹⁶

It should be observed that Underwood had just served a term as president of District No. 1 [becoming the Eastern Union at the 1901 General Conference reorganization]. In effect, according to John Wightman, the General Conference president and the local conference president opposed the ordination of Lulu Wightman. It would appear that the presence of A.G. Daniells at the New York Conference in 1901 was more from accident than by design. The former union president “and others” “strongly” disagreed with the premise that

“If there were twenty women where there now is one . . . we should see many more converted to the truth. The refining, softening influence of Christian women is needed in the great work of preaching the truth.”

—Ellen G. White, 1879

1901 was an inopportune time for ordaining women.

The Wightmans' ministry continued and embraced a variety of roles. Mrs. Wightman attained state and national acclaim in religious liberty lectures before a number of state legislatures. Her husband proudly wrote of her:

Yesterday a resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives inviting Mrs. Wightman to address the representatives in the House of Representatives chamber on “The Rise of Religious Liberty in the United States.” I believe this action upon the part of the Missouri legislature is unprecedented in the history of our people.¹⁷

Tragically, the Wightmans would come to a point where they no longer felt comfortable within the ministry and membership of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The issue of women's ministry would, however, receive its greatest impetus from the one in whom they came to lose confidence, Ellen White.

Ellen White and the Ministry of Compassion

Ellen White's attitudes on the role of women are, of course, important. In the late 1870s, Ellen White began to observe centralization of the Tract and Missionary organization and tendencies within the church in general to allow “one man's mind and one man's judgment” to become a determining factor in decision making.¹⁸ The result, Ellen White affirmed, was a lessening of the spiritual life within the churches. She would continue to make similar observations two decades later.

Her solution during the late 1870s and early 1880s and 1890s was for a more “pastoral,” personalized ministry that more directly involved women. In early 1879, Mrs. White urged:

Women can be the instruments of righteousness, rendering holy service. . . . If there were twenty women where now there is one . . . we should see many more converted to the truth. The refining, softening influence of Christian women is needed in the great work of preaching the truth. . . . Zealous and continued diligence in our sisters toiling for the spread of truth would be wholly successful, and would astonish us with its results.¹⁹

Mrs. White focused upon another phase of ministry that she would again emphasize in the 1890s.

We are lacking in deed of sympathy and benevolence, in sacred and social ministering to the

needy, the oppressed, and the suffering. Women who can work are needed now, women who are not self-important, but meek and lowly of heart, who will work with the meekness of Christ wherever they can find work to do for the salvation of souls.²⁰

When she saw a tendency for an elder in a local church to "dictate and control matters" to the detriment of the sisters within that church, Ellen White strongly observed:

It is not always men who are best adapted to the successful management of a church. If faithful women have more deep piety and true devotion than men, they could indeed by their prayers and their labors do more than men who are unconsecrated in heart and in life.²¹

She went on to make the broad observation that the "dictatorial spirit" present in that local church, was a general weakness in churches and felt "grieved for the people of God."

By 1895, Ellen White wrote what must have been a bombshell:

Women who are willing to consecrate some of their time to the service of the Lord should be appointed to visit the sick, look after the young, and minister to the necessities of the poor. They should be set apart to this work by prayer and laying on of hands.²²

Mrs. White was calling for ordination at a time when women had apparently not previously been formally ordained to any type of work. The 1976 edition of the *Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia* reads:

Since in the New Testament there is no record of deaconesses having been ordained, they are not ordained in the SDA Church. (p. 379)

Mrs. White not only was in favor of some form of ordination of women to church work, she also advocated that they be paid with tithe funds.

In addressing the question of the nature of the 19th-century church, with its focus upon husband-wife ministry and the question of tithe usage, Mrs. White observed that she received "light upon this subject" even prior to her going to Australia in 1891.

Injustice has been done to women who labor just as devotedly as their husbands, and who are *recognized by God as being as necessary to the work of ministry as their husbands* [emphasis added]. The method of paying men-laborers and not their wives, is a plan not after the Lord's order. . . This arrangement. . . is liable to discourage our sisters

from qualifying themselves for the work they should engage in [i.e. ministry]. . . Seventh-day Adventists are not in any way to belittle women's work. . . This question is not for men to settle. The Lord has settled it. You are to do your duty to the women who labor in the gospel.²³

Clearly reacting to the team evangelistic efforts so successfully conducted by J.O. Corliss in Australia, Mrs. White's next statement informs us why she was looking for "hundreds of laborers" where there was then one:

After the community has been stirred by a well organized campmeeting, then shall the workers pull up stakes and leave to attend another campmeeting and let the work ravel out? I say, divide the workers and have some take right hold, giving Bible readings, doing colporteur work, selling tracts, etc. Let there be a mission home to prepare workers by educating them in every line of the work. This will not leave the work to ravel out. The good impressions the messengers of God have made upon hearts and minds will not be lost. This house-to-house labor, searching for souls, hunting for the lost sheep is the most essential work that can be done. . .

It seems Ellen White was ready during the 1890s for full ordination of women in the ministry of the church.

There are ministers' wives, Srs. Starr, Haskell, Wilson and Robinson, who have been devoted, earnest, whole-souled workers, giving Bible readings and praying with families, helping along by personal efforts just as successfully as their husbands. These women give their whole time, and are told that they receive nothing for their labors because their husbands receive wages. I tell them to go forward and all such decisions will be revised. The Word says, "The laborer is worthy of his hire." When any such decision as this is made, I will in the name of the Lord, protest. I will feel it my duty to create a fund from my tithe money, to pay these women who are accomplishing just as essential work as the ministers are doing, and this tithe I will reserve for work in the same line as that of ministers, hunting for souls, fishing for souls. I know that the faithful women should be paid wages as is considered proportionate to the pay received by ministers. They carry the burden of souls, and should not be treated unjustly. These sisters are giving their time to educating those newly come to the faith and hire

their own work done, and pay those who work for them. All these things must be adjusted and set in order, and justice be done to all.²⁴

Ellen White is clearly calling for a paid women's ministry. Her statements concerning their being paid from tithe were even more startling in the setting of the severe economic crisis being faced by the church at the time. Her statements obviously anticipate the 20th-century church with its pastoral-instructional functions. Ellen White affirmed that she was not troubled over the "poor souls" who were laboring for nothing for she "will not allow it to go thus."²⁵

Beginning in June of 1895, Ellen White wrote a series of articles that focused upon methodologies designed to evangelize the cities. Methodology was born of the experiences in Australia, but designed to be applied universally. One of the proposals made by Ellen White in her series of articles that appeared in the *Review and Herald* was that women involved in this evangelistic methodology "should be set apart to this work by prayer and laying on of hands."²⁶

When Ellen White's wording is compared to what she would later write concerning women receiving tithe and true gospel ministry, it seems to indicate that Ellen White was ready during the 1890s for full ordination of women in the ministry of the church.

On July 9, Mrs. White was obviously endorsing the evangelistic team approach so successfully used by Corliss in Australia when she wrote:

Should not all have an opportunity to learn of Christ's methods by practical experience? Why not put them to work visiting the sick and assisting in other ways. . . Women who are willing to consecrate some of their time to the service of the Lord should be appointed to visit the sick, look after the young and minister to the necessities of the poor. They should be set apart to their work by prayer and laying on of hands. In some cases they will need to counsel with the church officers [conference] or the minister [conference]; but if they are devoted women, maintaining a vital connection with God, they will be a power for good in the church.²⁷

Ellen White is here talking, not about local

church Dorcas work, but about what was then termed the Christian Help Work. The scope of that work usually transcended the local church because it involved instruction by a conference employee and because it was designed to absorb more than local funds. The "counsel" Ellen White referred to prior to ordination meant seeking approval from conference officials, not primarily from local church officials.

Ellen White's *Review and Herald* articles make it abundantly clear that her concept of ministry called for a broadening, rather than a narrowing, of the burden of "ministering." Her focus seemed more in the line of "pastoral" work and she often called for a ministry during this period that stressed more the teaching-personal labor kind of ministry than that of "sermonizing."

Ellen White's emphasis affected the United States and her articles and messages brought the Christian Help Work to a high level of activity. Obviously responding to the focus of Ellen White, O.A. Olsen urged Abbie Winegar, recent graduate of the medical course, to work "on the principles of health, and Christian Help Work" during a visit in the Upper Columbia Conference. Olsen wrote the president of that conference:

The Conference could well afford to be at some expense in utilizing her time for awhile in the work. Now, I know that times are hard; I know that you have a severe time out there, and that funds are scarce. I appreciate all that, and we may feel that we can not expend funds upon such a line of work; but from the light that God has given me, and from the practical results that have come under my observation, I am satisfied that any Conference that can have the opportunity, can well afford to expend some money in that line of work, even if there has been curtailment in some other lines. . .

Hereafter this branch of the work will receive much more attention than it has in the past. This must be so, if we shall meet the mind of the Spirit of God.²⁸

The Christian Help ministry very prominently affected the denomination. Ministers, including some women, were making this the primary focus of their evangelistic thrusts by that year.²⁹ Indeed, by 1899, Aus-

traliasia alone maintained four separate institutions providing foundation to the Christian Help ministry, one of which was the Rescue Home in Napier, New Zealand, which was actively guided by "Pastor" Margaret Caro, a licensed minister.

Ellen White believed that the ordination of women to ministry was appropriate and has pointed us to a Biblical rationale for ordaining women, based on Isaiah 58.

The true disciple, in whose heart Christ abides, shows forth to the world Christ's love for humanity. He is God's helping hand. . . [Note: the term "helping hand" is especially relevant since it was the name given several of the Christian Help Work missions in Australia. There were also a number of

Christian Help Work missions in the United States called helping hands.

If men *and women* would act as the Lord's helping hand, doing deeds of love and kindness, uplifting the oppressed, rescuing those ready to perish, the glory of the Lord would be their reward. . .

Wake up, my brethren and *sisters*. You must do the work that Christ did when he was upon this earth. Remember that you may act as God's helping hand in opening the prison doors to those that are bound. . .

Of those who act as his helping hand the Lord says, "Ye shall be named *priests* of the Lord; men shall call you *ministers* of our God [Isaiah 61:6]. . . Shall we not try to crowd all the goodness and love and compassion we can into the lives, that these words may be said of us? [emphasis added]."³⁰

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. *Review and Herald*, October 17, 1878, pp. 122, 124.
2. *Review and Herald*, October 17, 1878, p. 127; and November 14, 1878, p. 158.
3. Information gleaned by checking all conference proceedings listed in the *Review and Herald* during 1877 and 1881.
4. *Review and Herald*, June 12, 1879, p. 190; W3a, June 14, 1880.
5. *Review and Herald*, December 20, 1881, p. 392.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 48, 51.
7. 1887 General Conference Session Reports, pp. 16-17.
8. Butler to Ellen White, May 24, 1881 (Butler, G.I. 1880-81 WE).
9. *Ibid.*
10. Thompson to Brother Sands, April 13, 1900, NYC 11 Bk., p. 125.
11. Cited in *New York Indicator*, January 31, 1900.
12. S.M. Cobb to A.E. Place, August 6, 1897, NYC 11, 1897 incoming.
13. John S. Wightman to S.W. Pratt, copy, December 15, 1897, NYC 11, 1897 incoming.
14. Lulu Wightman to A.E. Place, January 27, 1898, and S.H. Lane, November 1, 1904, NYC 11, 1898 and 1904 incoming.
15. G.B. Thompson to John Wightman, August 13, 1901; and Dear Brother, January 30, 1902. NYC 11 Bk., pp. 450, 518.
16. John Wightman to S.H. Lane, September 2, 1904. NYC 11, 1904 incoming.
17. John S. Wightman, "Sunday Legislation Defeated," *Missouri Workers' Record*, April 28, 1909.
18. Ellen White to Stephen Haskell, October 29, 1880, H55, 1880; Ellen White to James White, W.49, 1880.
19. *Review and Herald*, January 2, 1879, p. 1.
20. *Ibid.*
21. J33, 1879.
22. *Review and Herald*, July 9, 1895, p. 434.
23. Ellen White, "The Laborer Is Worthy of His Hire," Mss. 43a, 1897, MR 267.
24. I191a, 1898. 6ST, 1897-1898, pp. 62, 68, 69.
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Review and Herald*, July 9, 1895, p. 434.
27. *Ibid.*, pp. 433, 434.
28. O.A. Olsen to Dr. Abbie Winegar, May 22, 1895; and R.S. Donnell, May 21, 1895. RG 11, Bk. 14, pp. 386, 379, 380.
29. The secretary of the General Conference reported:
I have been writing to some brethren in other sections of the country about the Christian Help Work, especially where they are starting it anew. It seems that the work is taking that turn; in fact the Lord has called especial attention of all churches, and especially those that are in the large cities, to this line of work. (L.A. Hoopes to W.T. Drummond, September 20, 1897. Rg 21, Bk. 22, p. 491).
30. Ellen White, January 17, 1901, B7 1901. ST 1901, pp. 298, 301-303.

Women Licensed as Ministers, 1878-1975

Editors' note: Following is a partial list of women "licensed to preach" by the Seventh-day Adventist Church from 1878-1975. This list, compiled from the Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook, indicates the date each candidate first received ministerial license and the conference or other organization issuing the license. Beginning in 1915, listings were made only for every fifth year. Special thanks to Josephine Benton, who is writing a history of Adventist women ministers, for her aid in preparing this chart.

1878		1902	
Anna Fulton	Minnesota	Mrs. S.N. Haskell	Greater New York
Ellen S. Lane	Michigan	Minnie Syp*	Oklahoma
Julia Owen	Kentucky-Tennessee		
1879		1904	
Libbie Collins	Minnesota	Alma Bjedigg	Finland Mission
Hattie Enoch	Kansas	Mrs. J.E. Bond	Arizona
Libbie Fulton	Minnesota	Bertha E. Jorgensen	South Dakota
Lizzie Post	Minnesota		
1880		1910	
Anna Johnson	Minnesota	Pearl Field	Nebraska
		Mrs. Ura Spring	Nebraska
1881		1920	
Ida W. Ballenger	Illinois	Ella H. Osborne	Northern California
Helen L. Morse	Illinois	Mina Panasuk	North Dakota
		Emme Wells	Greater New York
1884		1925	
Ruie Hill	Kansas	Mrs. E. Flo Hawkins	Illinois
		Mrs. B. Miller	East China Union Mission
1886		1930	
Ida W. Hibben	Illinois	Carol Bond	Southern California
		Mrs. E. Eder	Northern Texas
1887		Beulah Langdon	Northern Texas
Mrs. S.E. Pierce	Vermont	Pearl Stafford	Oregon
1893		1935	
Flora Plummer	Iowa	Lucy Andrus	Hopei Mission (China)
1894		1945	
Margaret Caro	New Zealand	Jessie Curtis	East Pennsylvania
1895		1960	
Mrs. S.A. Lindsay	New York	Mrs. W.H. Anderson	Central Union Conference
1898		Marye Burdick	Georgia-Cumberland
Sarepta Irish Henry	General Conference	Edna J. Cardey	Potomac
Lulu Wightman	New York	Freda Ford	Kentucky-Tennessee
		Lucia H. Lee	Georgia-Cumberland
1899		Emma Phillips	Kentucky-Tennessee
Edith Bartlett	British Conference	Mary Saxton	Potomac
		Mary E. Walsh	Pacific Union
1900		Mrs. J.W. Wilhelm	Kentucky-Tennessee
Hetty Haskell	General Conference		
Mina Robinson	British Conference	1965	
1901		Lois Mays	Potomac
Carrie V. Hansen	Utah	Julia Ross	Potomac
Emma Hawkins	Iowa		
Mrs. E.R. Williams	Michigan	1970	
		Mrs. Phil Neal	Kentucky-Tennessee
		Mrs. Harry Weckham	Kentucky-Tennessee
		1975	
		Josephine Benton	Potomac
		Clare Yauchzie	Ontario

*Spelling of family name later changed to Sype.

More on Baby Fae

To the Editors: I feel impelled to comment on the ethics of the Baby Fae case. The question of scarce resources addresses not only whether an organ is available; it also includes whether the money resource is available. Is it right to use the total income of seven or eight wage earners to support one kidney dialysis patient who is unable to care for himself? Is it right to take a patient who is suffering from metastatic cancer to open-heart surgery? The cost of surgery is largely paid for by either insurance or taxes. Where do we draw the line? I for one do not want myself subjected to such ordeals. Nor would I want any of my loved ones to undergo such things. If the doctors did not hope to gain financially, or if they had to donate their time for such procedures, I doubt there would be much of it done. Likewise, since fully one-third of Loma Linda University's charges to the paying patients is used to cover those who do not pay, is it right to add to the bill others pay for what such procedures cost?

Kenneth Noel
Madison, AL

To the Editors: As a social worker in a children's hospital, I found the April 1985 issue of *Spectrum* with the articles on Baby Fae especially relevant. I was able to pass the magazine on to my colleagues, who also found the reports informative and thought provoking.

Spectrum is a magazine of superb quality. I eagerly look forward to each issue and read it from cover to cover.

Cherise Baker Whited, ACSW
Leawood, KS

Biblical Criticism

To the Editors: Alden Thompson (Vol. 16, No. 1) misperceives the objections of conservative Adventists to the historical-critical method. We might argue to what extent the descriptive methodologies of this approach can be safely used by Bible-believing Christians. The disturbing truth is that the naturalistic presuppositions disavowed by Thompson are in fact being used by some in our scholarly circles. An arbitrary though convenient distinction is drawn between doctrines considered "essential to salvation" and those design-

nated "peripheral." I have yet to see *Spectrum* print a single article doubting the historicity of the resurrection, though mainline Christians have done this on the same basis by which traditional Adventism is now being questioned. Seventh-day Adventist revisionists are no different from their counterparts in the broader Christian world. Their focus of study may be different, but their presuppositions are the same. In Ben McArthur's words, historical criticism seeks to find "causal explanations within the temporal realm" for religion (see *Spectrum*, Vol. 10, No. 3, p.11). This is certainly being done in Adventism today.

Thompson misunderstands the White Estate's comparison of Ellen White's literary practices to Scripture. It is not a salute to the merits of historical criticism, but a needed reminder that this method is no respecter of doctrines. Often fallacies are best exposed if taken to their ultimate conclusion. If Ellen White's authority is reduced because of source dependency, the same must be done to the Bible. This is all that is being said.

Thompson's claim that Adventists neglect Bible study because of Ellen White is not supported by the facts. I for one know hundreds of Ellen White-loving Adventists, and have yet to meet one who has this problem. In 1980 a professional survey (available from the White Estate) by Des Cummings, Jr., and Roger Dudley showed that daily personal Bible study was a habit with 82 percent of those who read Ellen White's books regularly, while only 47 percent of those who did not read Ellen White pursued regular Bible study. Anyone vaguely familiar with Ellen White's works knows the Bible is profusely quoted and passionately upheld. Those in danger of neglecting Scripture haven't read Ellen White enough.

Kevin D. Paulson
Loma Linda, CA

To the Editors: A bravo to Alden Thompson for his excellent treatment of a very sensitive issue. Just three brief points in reaction.

First, readers might get the impression that Seventh-day Adventist biblical studies professionals are more or less equally divided about the validity of historical-critical study methods. Not so! My research in preparation for my presentation before the Methods of Bible Study Committee convinced me that nearly all Adventists trained in Old Testament or New Testament hold that a believer can legitimately use the tools of biblical criticism.

Second, Gerhard Hasel's rejection of all aspects of the historical-critical method depends formally upon his definition of the "historical-critical method." If

anti-supernatural assumptions are not essential to the definition of the method, his objection to its use loses its force. One look at the minutes of Consultation II demonstrates that his biblical studies colleagues in Adventism do not accept the definition of the method upon which Hasel insists.

Finally, *Understanding the Living Word of God* may bring us Gerhard Hasel's recent word on form-criticism. It is not, however, Hasel's only word. In his excellent book *The Remnant: The History and Theology of a Biblical Idea*, the Andrews University Press edition of his doctoral dissertation, Hasel gives what in context has to be read as a rather more positive assessment of form criticism: "Nevertheless, form criticism has brought about a greater awareness of external forms and has emphasized and stimulated the appreciation of literary units" (second revised and enlarged edition. Andrews University Monographs, 5. Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1972; p. 245, note 112). One can understand such a remark as aimed at the reading committee of a dissertation. But if Hasel is sure that "scholars who acknowledge the indivisible divine-human nature of inspired Scripture have not been able to accept the premises, procedures and goals of form criticism" (*Understanding*, p. 155), the above footnote should perhaps have been deleted from AUP editions of his dissertation.

Larry Mitchel
Pacific Union College
Angwin, CA

Modest Proposals on Women

To the Editors: I am disappointed in the proposals of the Role of Women Committee, as reported in *Spectrum* (Vol. 16, No. 2) to establish an "'affirmative action' plan for the involvement of women in the work of the church . . . to open to women all aspects of ministry in the church which do not require ordination" and "to give special emphasis to the work of Bible instructors, both men and women, and to . . . restore this ministerial category to importance and accord it proper recognition in the work of the church." Here we have what appears to be a plan to permanently exclude women from any position requiring ordination—clearly in contradiction of that same commission's strong support of the practice of ordaining women as local church elders "as each division may see its way clear to proceed."

When we ordain women as local church elders and as deaconesses, we are ordaining women to the gospel ministry. On what basis do we then deny ordination to women who are serving in full-time gospel ministry as pastors in our churches? Are not those who serve in full-time ministry more worthy of being "set apart for ministry" by ordination than those

who only give part of their time in ministry? I believe that denying women ordination to the pastoral ministry when we already ordain them to ministry as deaconesses and elders is evidence of the same sort of sexist prejudice which was once the basis of the denominational practice of paying lower salaries for women doing the same work as men—a practice which the federal courts have declared illegal in the celebrated *Merikay Silver v. Pacific Press* and *Lorna Tobler v. Pacific Press* cases. Sexist prejudice at that time cost this denomination the services of several very talented people and more than \$1 million in legal fees and judgments. Sexist prejudice now may cost us even more dearly—it may cost us the loss of services from hundreds, even thousands, of dedicated and talented, but now disillusioned, women.

Should there ever come a time when there are not an adequate number of qualified male candidates to serve as pastors of our churches, we will find many reasons, biblical statements and Ellen White quotations to justify ordaining women to pastoral ministry. But at the present time there is a surplus of male candidates, so we hear arguments such as those which recently appeared in a letter to the *Adventist Review* where it was suggested that we should not ordain women because "many of the young men graduating from a theology course in our colleges cannot be hired because of a lack of funds."

If "the Spirit gives gifts to whom he will," on what basis do we deny the exercise of those gifts or the recognition of those gifts by ordination because we may not be ready to change old customs or traditions for which we can find no biblical basis? Under such circumstances do we become guilty of making "void the word of God by our own traditions"? Can we not believe that the mere presence of a spiritual gift indicates that the Spirit has prepared both the church and the world for the exercise of any gift that he has given to meet a present need of the church for growth or ministry?

In light of the biblical doctrine of spiritual gifts, we should not even be asking whether we should ordain women to serve in full-time ministry. Our task regarding both men and women who may have potential for any ministry is fourfold:

1. To recognize that "the Spirit gives gifts to whom he will" and that he may choose to disregard gender as he distributes his gifts.
2. To identify those who have been given such gifts by providing suitable opportunities for the manifestation of those gifts.
3. To recognize the presence of those gifts by ordination—"setting them apart" for appropriate ministries.
4. To encourage the further use of each person's gifts "to prepare God's people for works of service, so that the body of Christ may be built up until we reach unity in the faith and in the knowledge of the Son of God and become mature, attaining to the whole measure of the stature of Christ."

Wayne Willey, Pastor
Amesbury, MA

To the Editors: Much discussion has appeared recently in your journal about the rights of women, but I wish to draw your attention to a not-dissimilar threat to the integrity of our social fabric and God's divine plan: the movement to abolish slavery. Inspired and egged on by the godless anti-slavery agitators, some in our own ranks have begun to clamor for the abolition of slavery. Twenty years ago we never heard such foolishness, but now the abolitionist movement is all the rage among worldings. Naturally, some of our more impressionable and unstable church members have begun to harp on the same theme.

One would think that a good look at the leaders of the abolitionist movement would sober them down immediately. Why, William Lloyd Garrison has no use whatever for organized religion. He is an antichrist who calls our nation's constitution nothing but a "covenant with death." And who has not heard of the notorious Fanny Wright with her brazen advocacy of free-love. Little wonder she adopts the abolitionist cause as well.

Don't Christians know that their only safety is following God's Word just as it reads? The Bible is not silent on this issue. When Paul wrote "Slaves, obey your masters," he clearly supported the divinely ordered relationship between slaves and masters. Those who cry that such passages are "culturally conditioned" cannot see the lengths of liberalism to which such a careless hermeneutic will certainly lead them. Surely, if Jesus had intended that we do away with slavery, he would have told us plainly in his Word.

Some would carelessly use Galatians 3:28 to support the abolition of slavery. But when Paul speaks of there being no more "bond nor free, male nor female," he refers only to our status in Christ, not to our condition in society. True, the slave and his master are equally sinners before Christ, but the slave must maintain proper submission in the material world.

One of our Reformation historians has pointed out that Rome's apostasy began when it enjoined what God had not forbidden, and ended when it forbade what God had enjoined. God has surely enjoined slavery in his Word. Why would he give slaves instruction in proper behavior if he did not endorse the institution? But the apostate abolitionists would have the church forbid what God has enjoined. Our polls indicate that even in the North, where slavery does not exist, most Christians feel it should be left alone. There, as elsewhere, abolitionists are often taught the true sentiments of their communities when mobs made up of gentlemen of property and standing drive them from their chapels and schoolhouses.

This agitation threatens the whole fabric of our society. God has assigned each to his proper place in society: the animal in the shed; the slave in the shanty; the woman in the house; the man in the office, the pulpit and the halls of Congress. True, slavery was not God's original intention, but once

Adam and Eve fell, God instituted a divine order of relationships that gave man headship over women and slaves. Disturb this order and neither the nation nor the church nor the home will ever be safe again.

The church should declare itself immediately in favor of slavery. We have studied this matter long enough. If we do not act at once, we will be subjected to intense lobbying from pressure groups. It is time to put an end to the question once and for all.

Ron Graybill
Wheaton, MD

Octagenarian Cheer

To the Editors: Thank you for *Spectrum*! First I've ever seen of it. Very good! All Seventh-day Adventists need it. Keep it up. I've been a Seventh-day Adventist for 52 years. I'm 83. Three cheers for 1985. God bless you!

Glen Sevits
Paradise, CA

CORRECTION

Vol. 16, No. 3 should have listed the University of Mississippi as the site where Dr. James D. Hardy performed the first primate-to-human heart transplant.

HALF-PRICE SALE

Miss An Issue?

Past issues of *Spectrum* are now available at **HALF** the cover price. At just two dollars per issue, you can build a complete library of *Spectrum's* thought-provoking articles, news stories, letters and book reviews.

Browse through the titles below. Catch up on those you missed. Share extra copies with friends. This is an offer too good to pass by! Limited time opportunity.

How many?

- ☐ The Church and the Courts (Vol. 9, No. 2)
Is the Church Responsible to the State?
The Christian, Homosexuals and the Law
Neal Wilson Talks about Court Cases
A New Doctrine of the Church?

- ☐ Commemorative Issue (Vol. 10, No. 4)
Trends in Ellen White Studies
Reports on Ford and Rae
Recounting the Sanctuary Debate
Tension Between Religion and Science

- ☐ Food (Vol. 11, No. 3)
A Radical Case for Vegetarianism
Unclean or Unhealthful?
Are Vegetarians Intellectually Honest?

- ☐ Missions (Vol. 12, No. 3)
Converting Entire Peoples
Plight of the Boat People
Adventists Face Homosexuality
Growing Up Gay Adventist

How many?

- ☐ Reshaping the NAD (Vol. 13, No. 1)
Case for an Independent North American Division
Must Polygamists Divorce?
The Sabbath and the International Dateline

- ☐ The Local Church (Vol. 13, No. 4)
What Must a True Adventist Believe?
Income Sharing Within the Congregation
What Does the Bible Say About Divorce?

- ☐ The Sanctuary Revisited (Vol. 14, No. 1)
Is the Investigative Judgment Relevant?
A Call to Moral Seriousness
The Psychological World of Ellen White

- ☐ Adventists and the Bomb (Vol. 14, No. 2)
Must Christmas Oppose Nuclear Arms?
Casting out Demons
Campmeeting Adventist Style

- ☐ The Great Creation Debate (Vol. 15, No. 2)
Odyssey of a Creationist
Who Killed Azaria?
Women Pastors Begin Baptizing

Please print clearly. This is your mailing label:

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

TOTAL ISSUES ORDERED X \$2 = \$ _____

POSTAGE: \$1 in U.S./Canada
\$2 other + _____

(Same price no matter how many issues purchased—order more save more!)

OFFER EXPIRES DECEMBER 31, 1985

TOTAL ENCLOSED \$ _____

Spectrum Advisory Council

Floyd and Charlene Andersen
Ted Benedict
Charles and Julie Bensonhaver
Doug Bertleson
Viveca Black
Larry Botimer
Bernard and Neridah Brandstater
Bruce and Betty Branson
Roy Branson
Floyd and Mary Brauer
M.L.S. Brown
Morris Brustett
Robert and Marilyn Burman
Harold Campbell
B.H. Carson
Glenn Coe
Douglas Collins
Patricia Cople
Molleurus and Dos Couperus
Eryl Cummings
Raymond Damazo
James and Mary Dunn
Thomas and Bonnie Dwyer
Richard and Juanita Engel
Rene and Mary Evard
Walt and Lois Fahlsing
James and Erika Fallbeck
Joy and Gerald Fuller
G. Elaine Giddings
Gary Gilbert
David and Joyce Grauman
Sanford Graves
Octavian Gregorescu
John Griffen
Paul Gruzensky
William Hafner, Jr.

Gordon and Nadine Hale
F.E.J. Harder
Jon Hardt
Milford and Cheryl Harrison
Robert and Sally Hasselbrack
John Hodgkin
Wilfred and Margaret Huse
Fil Inocencio
John and Marjorie Jacobson
Bernard and Dorothy Johnson
Eugene and Liv Joergenson
Elton and Marga Kerr
William and Dorane King
Richard and Claire Knieram
Alice Koelsch
Edward and Ruth Komarniski
Albert and Elizabeth Koppel
Irwin and Doreen Kuhn
Alvin and Verla Kwiram
Melvin and Karen Lake
Robert and Anita Lang
Fred Lee
Andrew Leonie, III
Charles Lindsay
Bradley and Roberta Litchfield
Ewald Lonser
Felix Lorenz
Richard and Heidi Ludders
Edward and Marilyn Lugenbeal
Robert and Marguerite Marsh
Donald McAdams
Kenneth and Irene McGill
W.M. Meek
Ken and Mary Moe
Robert and Jacqueline Moncrieff
Lyla Neumann

N.W. Northey
Daniel and Marilyn Patchin
Daniel Paulien
Thomas and Sharon Pellow
Wayne Rahming
Winslow and Verna Randall
Alfredo and Martha Rasi
Alvin Ratzlaff
Robert Rausch
Walter Rea
Merlin and Arlene Reeder
Barbara B. Renschler
Gordon Rick
William and Anieta Rippey
Jan Rushing
James Sands
Michael Scofield
Donald and Ursula Shasky
Gordon and Lovina Short
Walter and Grace Stilson
Dennis and Jodi Swena
Leonard and Carlene Taylor
James Thomas
Thais Thrasher
Dort and Nancy Tikker
Lorna Tobler
Darwin and Faye Tompkins
Thorvaldur and Lou Anne Torfason
Robin and Nancy Vandermolen
John and Nancy Vogt
Harold and Ella Mae Wallar
Kenneth and Karla Walters
Harry Wang
James Webster
Rodney and Barbara Willard
William Woods

The *Spectrum* Advisory Council is a group of committed *Spectrum* supporters who provide financial stability and business and editorial advice to ensure the continuation of the journal's open discussion of significant issues. Each member has pledged a minimum of \$500 each year for three years. For more information, contact

Robin A. Vandermolen
1416 N. Louise
Glendale, CA 91207
(818) 246-0077

Or call the Association of Adventist Forums: (301) 270-0423