Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 17/1 (Spring 2006): 140–20.
Article copyright © 2006 by Jerry Moon.

The Quest for a Biblical Trinity: Ellen White's "Heavenly Trio" Compared to the Traditional Doctrine[1]

Jerry Moon
Andrews University Theological Seminary

In 1846, James White dismissed the traditional doctrine of the Trinity as "the old unscriptural trinitarian creed."[2] A century later, at the 1946 world session of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, the denomination that James White co-founded voted official endorsement of a Fundamental Beliefs statement that explicitly professed belief in the "Trinity."[3] During the sixty years that have passed since that action, a trinitarian view of God has remained dominant among Seventh-day Adventists—despite the general awareness since E. R. Gane's M.A. thesis in 1963 that most of the earliest Adventist leaders were non-trinitarian.[4]

---

[1] Paper presented to the Trinity Symposium, Southern Adventist University, April 1, 2006.

[2] James White, *Day-Star,* January 24, 1846, 25.

[3] "Fifteenth Meeting," General Conference Report No. 8, *Review and Herald,* June 14, 1946, 197. The 1946 GC session met in Washington, D.C. For a discussion of the historical context, see Jerry Moon, "The Adventist Trinity Debate, Part 1: Historical Overview," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 41 (Spring 2003): 122–123.

[4] Erwin R. Gane, "The Arian or Anti-Trinitarian Views Presented in Seventh-day Adventist Literature and the Ellen G. White Answer" (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 1963); Russell Holt, "The Doctrine of the Trinity in the Seventh-day Adventist Denomination: Its Rejection and Acceptance" (term paper, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, 1969); Le Roy Edwin Froom, *Movement of Destiny* (Washington: Review and Herald, 1971), 148–180—although Froom's pleading on the basis of Millerite statistics that a "majority" of the Adventist founders were trinitarian (ibid., 147) has not been supported by the evidence; Merlin Burt, "Demise of Semi-Arianism and Anti-Trinitarianism in Adventist Theology, 1888–1957" (term paper, Andrews University, 1996); Woodrow

What is now debated by some is Gane's second conclusion that Ellen G. White, Adventist co-founder and prophetic voice, was "a trinitarian monotheist."[5] The view that Ellen White was a trinitarian has recently come under attack from a few writers who advocate a return to the semi-Arian position of some early Adventist leaders. While not agreed on all details, these new antitrinitarians generally seem to believe: (1) that Ellen White agreed with *every aspect* of the pioneers' antitrinitarian view of God; (2) that Ellen White's view never changed (she was antitrinitarian at the beginning and always remained so)[6]; therefore, (3) her later writings that seem to express a trinitarian view are not to be taken at face value: they are either "unclear" statements to be read through the lens of her earlier writings, *or* they are inauthentic statements produced not by her, but by others who tampered with her writings.[7] The new antitrinitarians further reason (4) that if the current Adventist doctrine of the Trinity is the same doctrine that early Adventists, *including Ellen White*, rejected, then the current Adventist doctrine of the Trinity is a heresy based on extrabiblical tradition, hence an apostasy from the church's biblical foundations.[8] These are serious charges indeed—if they could be

---

W. Whidden, "Salvation Pilgrimage: The Adventist Journey into Justification by Faith and Trinitarianism," *Ministry,* April 1998, 5–7; Fernando L. Canale, "Doctrine of God," in *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology,* ed. Raoul Dederen, Commentary Reference Series, vol. 12 (Hagerstown: Review and Herald, 2000): 117–150; and Woodrow Whidden, Jerry Moon, and John W. Reeve, *The Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships* (Hagerstown: Review and Herald, 2002), 190–220.

[5] Gane, 67–79.

[6] For example, John Kiesz, an antitrinitarian of the Church of God (Seventh Day), speculates that Ellen White was a "closet trinitarian" who kept that view to herself for half a century until in the 1890s she suddenly broke her silence to challenge the then majority view of the Seventh-day Adventist denomination ("History of the Trinity Doctrine," Study No. 132, <http://www.giveshare.org/BibleStudy/132.trinityhistory.html>, accessed January 2001).

[7] Tim Poirier has provided the most direct and substantial refutation of the charge that Ellen White's trinitarian statements were forged. He takes several of the most important examples and shows that they still exist in Ellen White's handwriting or in typed documents bearing her signature and other handwritten annotations (T. Poirier, "Ellen White's Trinitarian Statements: What Did She Actually Write?" presentation to the Symposium on Ellen White and Current Issues, Andrews University, April 3, 2006, publication forthcoming from the Center for Adventist Research, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan).

[8] See, e.g., [Fred Allaback], "The Doctrine of the Trinity in Adventist History," *Liberty Review* [5250 Johnstown Road, Mt. Vernon, Ohio], October 1989, 4–5, 7–8;

substantiated. But I argue that every premise of this syllogism is false, though some of them may appear plausible at first glance.

In previous research I have traced the development of the Adventist doctrine of God from opposition to the Trinity doctrine as traditionally formulated to acceptance of the biblical concept of one God in three persons.[9] I have also traced the clear progression in Ellen White's visions from 1850 onward, showing that her visions gradually formed her concept of God until by 1898, when she published *Desire of Ages*, she held a trinitarian concept.[10]

This research has shown that: (1) Ellen White agreed with *some aspects, but not with every aspect* of the antitrinitarian views of other early Adventists. (2) Ellen White's view *did* change—she was raised trinitarian, came to doubt some aspects of the trinitarianism she was raised on, and eventually came to a *different* trinitarian view from the traditional one. (3) There is a basic harmony between Ellen White's earliest statements and her latest ones. Even on internal evidence, there is no reason to question the validity of her later, more trinitarian writings. They are completely consistent with the trajectory of her developing understanding of the Godhead, and there is every evidence that they represent her own thought. In her earliest writings she differed from *some aspects* of traditional trinitarianism and in her latest writings she still strongly opposed *some aspects* of the traditional doctrine of the Trinity. (4) It appears, therefore, that the trinitarian teaching of Ellen White's later writings is *not* the same doctrine that the early Adventists rejected.[11] Rather,

---

Lynnford Beachy, "*Adventist Review* Perpetuates the Omega," *Old Paths* [Smyrna Gospel Ministries, HC64, Box 128–B, Welch, WV; website www.smyrna.org], 8/7 (July 1999), 1–14; David Clayton, "The Omega of Deadly Heresies," n.p., n.d. [ca. 2000], in my files; idem, "Some Facts Concerning the Omega Heresy," www.restorationministry .com/Open_Face/html/2000/open_face_ oct_2000.htm; accessed Mar. 10, 2003; and Bob Diener, *The Alpha and the Omega* (Creal Springs: Bible Truth Productions, [ca. 1998]), videocassette.

[9] Jerry Moon, "The Adventist Trinity Debate, Part 1," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 41 (Spring 2003): 113–129.

[10] Jerry Moon, "The Adventist Trinity Debate, Part 2: The Role of Ellen G. White," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 41/2 (Autumn 2003): 275–292. See also chapters 11–14 (161–238) in *The Trinity* by Whidden, Moon, and Reeve.

[11] Ellen White's later trinitarianism contains *some elements* that some of the early leaders had rejected, such as the eternal pre-existence of Christ and the full Deity and Personality of the Holy Spirit; but these are clearly taught in Scripture, are fully in harmony with the early Adventists' methods of biblical interpretation, and are completely consistent with the progressive unfolding of Scripture among the early Adventists and in

her writings describe two contrasting forms of trinitarian belief, one of which she always opposed, and another that she eventually endorsed.

The purpose of the present article is to clarify more fully the similarities and differences between Ellen White's view of the "heavenly trio" and the traditional doctrine of the Trinity in order to discover her position in relation to the current debate among Adventists. The scope of this article will not permit consideration of recent Adventist writings on the Trinity, such as those by Raoul Dederen, Fernando Canale, Rick Rice, Fritz Guy, Woodrow Whidden, and others.[12] However, the unique position of Ellen White in the Adventist church justifies taking her as an authentic representative of Adventist theology. Furthermore, those who advocate a return to antitrinitarianism have interacted more directly with her position than they have with more recent Adventist thought on the nature of God.

Two Different Concepts of the Trinity

The conceptual key that unlocks the puzzle of Ellen White's developmental process regarding the Godhead is the discovery that *her writings describe at least two distinct varieties of trinitarian belief,* one based on Scripture alone, and one based on Scripture as interpreted through the lens of Greek philosophy—the same hermeneutic that brought the immortality of the soul into Christian theology. The concept of God that is explicit in her later writings portrays the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as three eternal Persons of intellect, will, and emotions who are united in character, purpose, and love. There is no conflict among them, no working at cross-purposes, no competition, not even disagreement. Thus, they are *not* three gods (as in polytheism or tritheism), but One. Furthermore,

---

the writings of Ellen White. Therefore, I am convinced that *to the extent that the current Adventist belief in the Trinity can be completely based on Scripture alone*, independent of traditional creeds or ancient church Councils, that doctrine represents the biblical truth about God, however imperfectly it may be understood or expressed.

[12] Raoul Dederen, "Reflections on the Doctrine of the Trinity," *AUSS* 8 (1970): 1–22; Fernando Luis Canale, *A Criticism of Theological Reason: Time and Timelessness as Primordial Presuppositions,* Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 10 (Berrien Springs: Andrews UP, 1983), 359; 402, n. 1; F. L. Canale, "Doctrine of God," in *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology,* ed. Raoul Dederen, Commentary Reference Series, vol. 12 (Hagerstown: Review and Herald, 2000): esp. 117–150; Richard Rice, *The Reign of God*, 2d ed. (Berrien Springs: Andrews UP, 1985), 60–61; Fritz Guy, *Thinking Theologically: Adventist Christianity and the Interpretation of Faith* (Berrien Springs: Andrews UP, 1999), 130, also 70, 88, 151, and their notes; Whidden, Moon, and Reeve, *The Trinity*.

their unity is not a mathematical paradox, but a relational unity, analogous to the unity seen in a good marriage, where husband and wife are united in an ever-growing oneness, but without negating their individuality.[13]

Thus, her concept is in harmony with the biblical witness of both the OT and NT.[14] After God said, "Let us make man in our image" (Gen 1:26–27), God proceeded to create humans in a plurality of forms that were capable of becoming one. In Genesis 2:24 God explained His purpose in this—so that these diverse creatures bearing His "image" could "become one." The Hebrew word translated "one" in Gen 2:24 is *ʾeḥād* —not a monolithic singleness [for which Moses could have used *yāḥîd*, "one" or "only"], but a unity formed from multiple components. The same word occurs in Deut 6:4, "Hear O Israel: Yahweh is our God; Yahweh is one [*ʾeḥād*]."[15]

The concept of plurality of persons in unity of relationship becomes more explicit in the NT. For example, Christ prayed that believers in Him may "all" be "one" as He and the Father "are one" (John 17:20–22). Ellen White quotes this passage as proof of the "personality of the Father and the Son," and an explanation of "the unity that exists between Them." She wrote: "The unity that exists between Christ and His disciples does not destroy the personality of either. They are one in purpose, in mind, in character, but not in person. It is thus that God and Christ are one."[16]

In the same year (1905) she wrote elsewhere, "There are three living persons of the heavenly trio . . . the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit."[17] Her concept of the "heavenly trio" differs from the traditional Trinity in that it is based on simple biblical reasoning and biblical presuppositions. It could be called a "biblical" view of the Trinity, and it

---

[13] The dictum of Gen 2:24, "the two shall become one flesh," is not a mathematical paradox, but a statement of relational unity. The fact that Scripture has much more to say about the relational unity of God (see, e.g., John 14–17) does not preclude God's ontological unity, but the ontological unity is certainly less explicit in Scripture.

[14] See Whidden, "The Biblical Evidence for the Full Deity of Christ, the Personality of the Holy Spirit, and the Unity and Oneness of the Godhead," in *The Trinity*, Whidden, Moon, and Reeve, 7–117.

[15] Whidden, *The Trinity*, 33–34.

[16] E. G. White, *Ministry of Healing* (Mt. View: Pacific Press, 1905), 421–422.

[17] E. G. White, *Special Testimonies,* Series B, no. 7 (Sanitarium: n.p., 1905), 62–63, emphasis supplied.

became clearer and clearer in her mind and writings as the years passed and the revelations to her accumulated.

The Historical Context of the Early Development of Ellen White's Understanding of the Godhead

In the aftermath of the Great Disappointment of 1844, many former Millerites "spiritualized" the second coming by interpreting the biblical prophecies of Christ's return as having a spiritual, not literal fulfillment.[18] Thus they professed to believe that Jesus had come in 1844, not literally, but "spiritually."[19] This view led to a wide range of aberrant behavior. Among the most extreme were the "no work" fanatics who believed that the millennium had already begun as a Sabbath of perpetual rest, and that the way to demonstrate saving faith was to refrain from all work.[20] Others of the "spiritualizers" dabbled in "mesmerism,"[21] joined the Shakers,[22] or even became followers of occult spiritualism.[23]

Both James and Ellen White opposed this "spiritualizing" as deadly heresy,[24] because from their perspective, if the second advent were not a literal, bodily return of the same divine-human Jesus who ascended, but was rather some subjective spiritual "revelation" to the individual heart

---

[18] Richard W. Schwarz, *Light Bearers to the Remnant* (Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1979), 53–54. For the most extensive investigation to date of post-disappointment Millerism, its division and disintegration, see Merlin D. Burt, "The Historical Background, Interconnected Development, and Integration of the Doctrines of the Sanctuary, the Sabbath, and Ellen G. White's Role in Sabbatarian Adventism from 1844 to 1849" (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 2002), 60–272, especially 145, 231–242.

[19] See Burt, dissertation, 145, 231–242; and George R. Knight, *Millennial Fever and the End of the World* (Boise: Pacific Press, 1993), 260..

[20] "They said they were in the Jubilee, the land should rest, and the poor must be supported without labor" (E. G. White, *Spiritual Gifts*, vol. 2 [Battle Creek: James White, 1860], 75).

[21] E. G. White, *Spiritual Gifts*, 62–63; Burt (141–145) cites several unpublished sources.

[22] Enoch Jacobs, editor of the *Day-Star*, led in this move (Burt, 231–242).

[23] Burt, dissertation, 242; George R. Knight, 260.

[24] Re: James White's view; Burt (dissertation, 146–147) lists four such items, each titled "Letter from Bro. White," in *Day–Star* Sept. 6, 1845, 17–18; Oct. 11, 1845, 47; Nov. 29, 1845, 35; and Jan. 24, 1846, 25. For Ellen White's opposition to spiritualizing *theology*, see *Great Controversy*, 582, 674; and *Selected Messages*, 1:170. For examples of her opposition to the behavior that sprang from this theology, see *Spiritual Gifts*, 2:73–75; James White and Ellen G. White, *Life Sketches of James White and Ellen G. White* (Battle Creek: SDA Pub Assn., 1880), 230, 251–252; cf. E. G. White, *Life Sketches of Ellen G. White* (Washington: Review and Herald, 1915), 85–94.

or mind, then the teaching of His literal return had been not merely modified, but destroyed—hence the phrase "spiritualize away." In one passage James charged that the "spiritualizers" "spiritualize away the existence of the Father and the Son, as two distinct, litteral [*sic*], tangible persons, also a literal Holy city and throne of David."[25]

In maintaining that the Father and the Son are "two distinct, literal, tangible" persons, James White certainly did not doubt that "God is spirit" (John 4:24),[26] but he insisted that though "spiritual" beings, Christ and the Father are nevertheless Divine Persons who have a "literal, tangible" existence; They are neither unreal nor imaginary. The trinitarian creeds he knew of made God so abstract, theoretical, and impersonal that God was no longer perceived as a real, caring, loving Being.

For example, one trinitarian creed that early Adventists quoted fairly often was that of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Ellen White's church of origin. That creed says in part, "There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body or parts."[27] This the early Adventists vigorously refuted, citing several biblical passages that portrayed God as having both "body" and "parts."[28]

Ellen White was also much interested in this question.[29] Twice in early visions of Jesus, she asked Him questions related to the "form" and "person" of God. In one early vision, she reported seeing "a throne, and on it sat the Father and the Son. I gazed on Jesus' countenance," she said, "and admired His lovely person. The Father's person I could not behold,

---

[25] James White, *Day-Star,* Jan. 24, 1846, 25; Ellen White used parallel terms: "I have often seen that the spiritual view took away the glory of heaven, and that in many minds the throne of David, and the lovely person of Jesus had been burned up in the fire of spiritualism" (*Spiritual Gifts*, vol. 2 [1860], 74).

[26] In 1877 Ellen White quoted John 4:24 KJV: "God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth" (E. G. White, *Spirit of Prophecy* 2:143). In 1904 she wrote, "God is a spirit; yet He is a personal being, for man was made in His image" (E. G. White, *Testimonies for the Church,* 9 vols. [1855–1909; reprint Mountain View: Pacific Press, 1948], 8:263). James White held that God is "a Spirit being" (idem, *Personality of God* [Battle Creek: SDA Pub. Assn., ca. 1868], 3).

[27] *Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York: Carlton and Porter, 1856), 15.

[28] For instance, Exod 24:9–11; 33:20–23; John 1:18; Heb 1:1–3; Uriah Smith, *The State of the Dead and the Destiny of the Wicked* (Battle Creek: SDA Publishing Assn., 1873), 27–30. Note Smith's polemic against any "mystical interpretation of our current theology" (ibid., 27).

[29] The creed in question was a Methodist creed, and she had been raised Methodist. Furthermore, she was closely associated with early Adventists who cited this creedal detail as one of the unbiblical aspects of trinitarianism.

for a cloud of glorious light covered Him. I asked Jesus if His Father had a form like Himself. He said He had, but I could not behold it, for said He, 'If you should once behold the glory of His person, you would cease to exist.'"[30]

In 1850 she reported, "I have often seen the lovely Jesus, that He is a person. I asked Him if His Father was a person and had a form like Himself. Said Jesus, 'I am in the express image of My Father's person.'"[31] Thus her visions confirmed what her husband had written in 1846, that the Father and the Son are "two distinct, literal, tangible persons."[32] The visions also disproved, to her mind, the claim of the Methodist creed that God is "without body or parts." Thus, these early visions steered her developing view of God away from *creedal* trinitarianism, though they offered nothing directly contradictory to her later statements of what I have called biblical trinitarianism. In her first volume, titled *Spiritual Gifts,*[33] her belief in the Holy Spirit is not in question, for she refers to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in Christ's baptismal narrative. But she does not mention the Holy Spirit in connection with the divine councils about creation and salvation.[34] These statements are basically nontrinitarian in emphasis, but because of their ambiguity, could be read without

---

[30] Ellen G. White, *A Sketch of the Christian Experience and Views of Ellen G. White* (Saratoga Springs: James White, 1851), 43; reprinted, idem, *Early Writings of Ellen G. White* (Washington: Review and Herald, 1882, 1945), 54.

[31] E. G. White, *Early Writings,* 77, emphasis hers.

[32] While there is no record of her denouncing the "trinitarian creed" as did her husband, note the similarity of expression between her view (above) and what he wrote in 1868: "The *Father and the Son were one* in man's creation, and in his redemption. Said the Father to the Son, 'Let us make man in our image.' And the triumphant song of jubilee in which the redeemed take part, is unto 'Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever.'"

"Jesus prayed that his *disciples might be one as he was one* with his Father. This prayer did *not* contemplate *one disciple with twelve heads, but twelve disciples, made one in object and effort* in the cause of their master. Neither are the Father and the Son *parts of the 'three-one God.' They are two distinct beings, yet one in the design and accomplishment of redemption.* The redeemed . . . ascribe the honor, and glory, and praise, of their salvation, to both God and the Lamb" (James White, *Life Incidents* [Battle Creek: SDA Publishing Assn., 1868; reprint, Berrien Springs: Andrews UP, 2003], 343, emphasis added).

[33] The title was an explicit assertion of her claim to have received the gift of prophecy.

[34] Ellen G. White, *Spiritual Gifts,* vols. 1, 3 (Battle Creek: Steam Press of the Review and Herald Office, 1858; Steam Press of the SDA Publishing Association, 1864), 1:17–18, 22–28; 3:33–34.

conflict by Adventists regardless of both trinitarian and antitrinitarian leanings.

Perhaps her first statement that clearly disagrees with her antitrinitarian colleagues came in 1869 in the chapter, "The Sufferings of Christ" (now in *Testimonies*, vol. 2, 200), where in the opening paragraph she declares (on the basis of three NT texts) that Christ in His pre-existence was "equal with God."[35]

Eventually it became evident that the most prominent early Adventist antitrinitarian—James White—was beginning to change his views, apparently following the lead of his wife's visions. In an 1876 editorial, comparing the beliefs of Seventh-day Adventists with Seventh Day Baptists, he included the Trinity among the doctrines which "neither [Adventists nor Seventh Day Baptists] regard as tests of Christian character," that is, not tests of membership. "Adventists hold the divinity of Christ so nearly with the trinitarian," James White observed, "that we apprehend no trial [conflict] here."[36] A year later he proclaimed in the *Review* that "Christ is equal with God." Another remark in the same article shows that he was in sympathy with certain aspects of trinitarianism. "The inexplicable trinity that makes the godhead three in one and one in three is bad enough," he wrote, "but ultra Unitarianism that makes Christ inferior to the Father is worse."[37] While he still opposed the "inexplicable" trinitarian terminology that made God seem unreal, he even more vehemently rejected the antitrinitarian position that made "Christ inferior to the Father." Present-day antitrinitarians who hold that Christ is "inferior to the Father" are not being true to the theology of James White. For yet another evidence of how her visions influenced her colleagues, her

[35] The texts were Heb 1:3; Col 1:19; and Phil 2:6 (Ellen G. White, "Testimony 17 [1869]," in *Testimonies for the Church*, 2:200); cf. "The Son of God was in the form of God, and he thought it not robbery to be equal with God" (E. G. White, *Spirit of Prophecy*, vol. 2 [Battle Creek: SDA Pub. Assn., 1877], 10).

[36] James White, "The Two Bodies," *Review and Herald*, Oct. 12, 1876, 116; cf. Froom, *Movement of Destiny,* 178.

[37] James White, "Christ Equal with God," *Review and Herald*, Nov. 29, 1877, 72.

affirmation that Christ was uncreated[38] came more than 20 years before Uriah Smith published his acceptance of that concept.[39]

In another clear break with the antitrinitarians, she declared in 1878 that Christ was the "*eternal* Son."[40] Ellen White did not understand "eternal" Sonship to imply that Christ was *derived* from the Father, but that "Christ was united with the Father" "from all eternity."[41]

In the years after 1888, she made an even more fundamental departure from the antitrinitarian view when she recognized that a true concept of Christ's atonement demands His full and eternal Deity.[42] "The reconciliation of man to God could be accomplished only through a mediator

---

[38] Ellen G. White, "The First Advent of Christ," *Review and Herald,* Dec. 17, 1872, par. 4; later published in *Spirit of Prophecy,* vol. 2 (Battle Creek: SDA Publishing Association, 1877), 9–10; cf. E. G. White, "Bible Study," *Review and Herald,* Jan. 11, 1881, par. 3.

[39] Uriah Smith, *Thoughts on the Revelation* (Battle Creek: SDA Publishing Association, 1865), 59, calls Christ the first created being; a view he repudiated in *Looking Unto Jesus* (Battle Creek: Review and Herald, 1898)*,* 17, 12.

[40] Ellen G. White, "An Appeal to the Ministers," *Review and Herald,* August 8, 1878, par. 4; Ellen G. White to E. J. Waggoner and A. T. Jones, Feb. 18, 1887 (Letter 37, 1887, in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 21 vols. [Silver Spring: Ellen G. White Estate, 1981–1993], 15:25; also in *Ellen G. White 1888 Materials*, 4 vols. [Washington: Ellen G. White Estate, 1987], 28); idem, "'Search the Scriptures.' John 5:39," in *Youth's Instructor,* August 31, 1887, par. 1; idem, "The Truth Revealed in Jesus," *Review and Herald,* Feb. 8, 1898, par. 2.

[41] E. G. White, "Christ Our Only Hope, *Signs of the Times,* Aug. 2, 1905, reprinted in E. G. White, *Selected Messages,* Book 1 (Washington: Review and Herald, 1958), 226–228. Sonship in His preexistence denoted that He was of the same nature as the Father, in unity and close relationship with the Father, but it did not imply that Christ had a beginning. For in taking human flesh Christ became the Son of God "in a new sense." From the perspective of His humanity, He for the first time had a "beginning," and also, as a human, He began a new relationship of dependence on the Father.

"In His incarnation He gained *in a new sense* the title of the Son of God. Said the angel to Mary, 'The power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.' While the Son of a human being, He became the Son of God *in a new sense.* Thus He stood in our world—the Son of God, yet allied by birth to the human race. . . . From all eternity Christ was united with the Father" (E. G. White, "Christ Our Only Hope, *Signs of the Times,* Aug. 2, 1905, reprinted in E. G. White, *Selected Messages,* 1:226–228).

[42] Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy* (1888 ed.), 524. Cf. E. J. Waggoner: "Our object in this investigation is to set forth Christ's rightful position of equality with the Father, in order that His power to redeem may be the better appreciated" (*Christ and His Righteousness* [Oakland: Pacific Press, 1890; facsimile reprint, Riverside: The Upward Way, 1988], 19).

who was equal with God, possessed of attributes that would dignify, and declare him worthy to treat with the Infinite God in man's behalf."[43]

Finally, in 1897, Ellen White wrote that the Holy Spirit is "the third person of the Godhead."[44] This affirmation received wider circulation and more permanent form in *The Desire of Ages* (1898).[45] At the same time her belief in the absolute and eternal equality of Christ with the Father was made unequivocally emphatic. "In Christ is life," she wrote, "original, unborrowed, underived."[46] With this clear articulation of the unity of God in a plurality of eternal divine persons, her trinitarianism is essentially complete.[47] All that remains for her capstone statements is to affirm explicitly that the three "eternal heavenly dignitaries," the "three living persons of the heavenly trio," are one in nature, character, and purpose, but not in person.[48]

Thus there is a clear progression from the simple to the complex, showing that Ellen White's understanding did grow and change as she received additional light.[49]

---

[43] E. G. White, "No Caste in Christ," *Review and Herald*, December 22, 1891, par. 1.

[44] *Special Testimonies for Ministers and Workers,* series A, No. 10 (1897).

[45] Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages,* (Oakland, Pacific Press, 1898; Mt. View, Pacific Press, 1940), 671.

[46] Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages,* 530, 671.

[47] In 1899 she reaffirmed the other side of the formula, that in "person," Christ was "distinct" from the Father. "The world was made by him, 'and without him was not anything made that was made.' If Christ made all things, he existed before all things. The words spoken in regard to this are so decisive that no one need be left in doubt. *Christ was God essentially, and in the highest sense. He was with God from all eternity, God over all, blessed forevermore. The Lord Jesus Christ, the divine Son of God, existed from eternity, a distinct person, yet one with the Father"* (Ellen G. White, "The Word Made Flesh," *Review and Herald,* April 5, 1906, par. 6–7, italics supplied [reprinted from *Signs of the Times,* April 26, 1899]).

[48] E. G. White, Manuscript 130, 1901, in *Manuscript Releases,* 16:205, quoted in idem, *Evangelism* (Washington: Review and Herald, 1946), 616 (but there erroneously attributed to Ms. 145, 1901); idem, *Special Testimonies*, Series B, no. 7 (1905), 51, 62–63, quoted in *Evangelism,* 615, cf. 617; idem, *Ministry of Healing*, 421–422.

[49] Fernando Canale has pointed out that this progression is similar to the one presented in the NT. In the gospels, the first challenge was to convince the disciples that Christ was one with the Father. Once their concept of monotheism had been expanded to accept "one God" in "two divine persons," it was comparatively easy to lead them to the next conceptual step, recognizing the Holy Spirit as a third divine person (Canale, "Doctrine of God," 128–130).

The Definition of True and False Trinities

Ellen White's clearest differentiation between two contrasting views of the Trinity was written during the Kellogg crisis of 1902–1907.[50] J. H. Kellogg, M.D., medical superintendent of the Battle Creek Sanitarium, was the leading person of scientific credentials among Adventists in the early twentieth century. Seeking to define biological "life" in theistic rather than naturalistic terms, he eventually theorized that the life of every living thing—whether tree, flower, animal, or human—has the very presence of God within it. This was eventually recognized as a form of pantheism,[51] or more precisely, panentheism, of which traces can be found in his public presentations in the 1890s.[52] The "crisis," however, did not break until 1902, with the writing of the manuscript for a new book, *The Living Temple*.[53]

The Living Temple was primarily a handbook on basic physiology, nutrition, preventive medicine, and home treatments for common ailments. The title referred to the human body as a living "temple of the Holy Ghost," and the opening chapter set forth Kellogg's personal theology that "God is the explanation of nature—not a God *outside* of nature, but *in* nature, manifesting himself through and in all the objects, movements, and varied phenomena of the universe."[54]

Because other leading Adventists had pointed out the weaknesses of this theory,[55] Ellen White hoped at first that she would not have to get involved. But when Kellogg claimed publicly that the teachings of *The Living Temple* "regarding the personality of God" were in accord with

---

[50] On the Kellogg Crisis, see R[ichard] W. Schwarz, *John Harvey Kellogg, M.D.* (Nashville: Southern Publishing, 1970; reprint, Berrien Springs: Andrews UP, 1981), 174–192; idem, *Light Bearers*, 282–298; Jerry Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White: The Relationship between the Prophet and Her Son* (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1993), 274–320.

[51] W. A. Spicer, "Pantheism Here and in Its Ancient Setting," in *How the Spirit of Prophecy Met a Crisis: Memories and Notes of the "Living Temple" Controversy,"* [1938], chapter 13. http://www.sdanet.org/atissue/white/spicer/index.htm, accessed September 18, 2003.

[52] See J. H. Kellogg, "God in Man, No. 1," "God in Nature, No. 2," and "God in Man, No. 3," in *General Conference Daily Bulletin,* 1897, 72–84.

[53] J. H. Kellogg, *The Living Temple* (Battle Creek: Good Health Pub., 1903).

[54] J. H. Kellogg, *Living Temple*, 28, emphasis added.

[55] W. A. Spicer, (n. 55 above); W. W. Prescott, "Suggestions on Matter Found on Galleys 1–129, Inclusive, of Matter for Dr. Kellogg's New Book, *The Living Temple*," Record Group 11, A. G. Daniells, 1901–1950, J. H. Kellogg Case File, General Conference Archives, Silver Springs, MD.

the writings of Ellen White, she could no longer remain silent. "God forbid that this opinion should prevail," she declared.[56]

> We need not the mysticism that is in this book. . . . [T]he writer of this book is on a false track. He has lost sight of the distinguishing truths for this time. He knows not whither his steps are tending. The track of truth lies close beside the track of error, and both may seem to be one to minds which are not worked by the Holy Spirit, and which, therefore, are not quick to discern the difference between truth and error.[57]

In a follow-up letter, she zeroed in on the core issue: "The Lord Jesus . . . did not represent God as an *essence pervading nature,* but as a *personal being.* Christians should bear in mind that God has a personality as verily as has Christ."[58]

Kellogg countered by arguing that if the Holy Spirit could be everywhere at once (as even the antitrinitarians believed), and if the Holy Spirit were also a Person (as Ellen White had asserted in *Desire of Ages*), then God could be all-pervasive without being impersonal. He tried to convince church leaders[59] that the "pantheism" of *Living Temple* was simply a scientific version of the same doctrine of God that Ellen White had expressed in *Desire of Ages*.

Ellen White, however, insisted that Kellogg's concept of the Trinity was not the same as her concept, and as the conflict dragged on into 1905, she exposed the matter to the church in such stark lines that she could not be misunderstood. The most scathing indictment she ever wrote against a false view of the Trinity, this manuscript labels Kellogg's view as "spiritualistic," "nothingness," "imperfect, untrue,"[60] "the trail of the serpent," and "the depths of Satan."[61] She said those who received Kellogg's view were "giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of

---

[56] E. G. White to the Teachers in Emmanuel Missionary College, Sept. 22, 1903 ("Teach the Word"), in *Spalding and Magan's Unpublished Manuscript Testimonies of Ellen G. White, 1915–1916* [*Spalding-Magan Collection*] (Payson: Leaves-Of-Autumn Books, 1985), 320.

[57] Ibid., 320–321.

[58] Ibid., 324, emphasis added. Kellogg had hinted in *Living Temple* (29–32) that the concept of a personal God was an [ultimately unfactual] construct for the benefit of immature minds, implying that intellectuals such as himself could perceive the reality beyond the anthropomorphism.

[59] See Moon, "Adventist Trinity Debate, Part 2," 286–287.

[60] E. G. White, *Special Testimonies,* Series B, no. 7 (Sanitarium: n.p., 1905), 63.

[61] Ibid., 62, alluding to Rev 2:24.

devils, departing from the faith which they have held sacred for the past fifty years."[62]

In contrast to Kellogg's view, she defined another view that she regarded as "the right platform," in harmony with "the simplicity of true godliness," and "the old, old times . . . when, under the Holy Spirit's guidance, thousands were converted in a day."[63] The antagonism between two opposing theologies could scarcely be drawn in more stringent terms than a disagreement between doctrines of "seducing spirits" and the doctrine of the original Pentecost. She is talking about two contrasting doctrines of the Trinity.

She first described the false doctrine of the Trinity that she rejected. "I am instructed to say," Ellen White wrote,

> The sentiments of those who are searching for advanced scientific ideas are not to be trusted. Such representations as the following are made: "The Father is as the light invisible; the Son is as the light embodied; the Spirit is the light shed abroad." "The Father is like the dew, invisible vapor; the Son is like the dew gathered in beauteous form; the Spirit is like the dew fallen to the seat of life." Another representation: "The Father is like the invisible vapor; the Son is like the leaden cloud; the Spirit is rain fallen and working in refreshing power."
>
> All these spiritualistic representations are simply nothingness. They are imperfect, untrue. They weaken and diminish the Majesty which no earthly likeness can be compared to.[64]

Then she defines what she understands to be the truth about the Godhead.

> "The Father is all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and is invisible to mortal sight.
>
> "The Son is all the fulness of the Godhead manifested. The Word of God declares Him to be "the express image of His person." "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Here [in Christ] is shown the personality of the Father.
>
> "The Comforter that Christ promised to send after He ascended to heaven, is the Spirit in all the fulness of the God-

[62] Ibid., 61.
[63] Ibid., 63–64.
[64] Ibid., 62.

> head, making manifest the power of divine grace to all who receive and believe in Christ as a personal Saviour. There are three living persons of the *heavenly trio;* in the name of these three great powers—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—those who receive Christ by living faith are baptized, and these powers will co-operate with the obedient subjects of heaven in their efforts to live the new life in Christ. [Emphasis supplied][65]

In charging that Kellogg, with his "spiritualistic" Trinity doctrine, was "departing from the faith" Adventists had "held sacred for the past fifty years," and then setting forth another view of the Trinity as the "truth," she clearly distinguished between two varieties of trinitarianism.

Further, Ellen White claimed that in Kellogg's heresy she "recognized the very sentiments" she had opposed among spiritualizing ex-Millerites in 1845 and 1846.[66] The implication is that the spiritualizing of the post-disappointment fanatics, the creedal teaching that God is formless and intangible ("without body or parts"), and Kellogg's impersonal concepts of God were all associated in her mind under the general heading of "spiritualistic theories."[67]

This is directly relevant to the current debate because some have claimed that Kellogg's view that Ellen White condemned is the same view of the Trinity now accepted by the church.[68] This claim is not supported by the evidence.

She clearly rejected any view of the Trinity that makes God impersonal and unreal, but embraced a literal, biblical[69] view of *one God* in *three eternal Persons*, who are *relationally united* in character, purpose, and love.

These affirmations of belief in one God in three persons were sufficiently influential that by 1913, during her lifetime, was published the first explicitly trinitarian belief statement among Seventh-day Adventists. Written by F. M. Wilcox, editor of the *Review and Herald*, a man she designated in her will as one of the original five trustees of her estate, the

---

[65] Ibid., 62–63.

[66] E. G. White, *Selected Messages,* 1:203.

[67] Ibid., 204.

[68] Bob Diener, *The Alpha and the Omega,* videocassette.

[69] Bible texts that Ellen White cited as supporting various aspects of a trinitarian view include Rom 8:16 (*Evangelism* [Washington: Review and Herald, 1946], 617); 1 Cor 2:10–14 (ibid.); John 16:7–14 (ibid., 616); John 14:16–18, 26; 16:8, 12–14 (*Desire of Ages*, 669–671); and Col. 2:9 (*Evangelism*, 614).

article was published on the same page after one of her articles, virtually guaranteeing that she would see it.[70] "Seventh-day Adventists believe," Wilcox explained, "1. In the divine Trinity. This Trinity consists of the eternal Father, . . . the Lord Jesus Christ, . . . [and] the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead."[71]

Summary and Conclusions

The change from Adventist rejection of the traditional doctrine of the Trinity to acceptance of a biblical trinitarian doctrine was not a simple reversal. When James White denounced creedal trinitarianism in 1846, Ellen White agreed with *both his positive point*—that "the Father and the Son" are "two distinct, litteral [sic], tangible persons"—*and his negative point*—that the philosophical trinitarianism held by many did "spiritualize away" the personal reality of the Father and the Son.[72]

Soon after this she added the conviction, based on visions, that both Christ and the Father have bodily form—rejecting the teaching of one trinitarian creed that God is "without body or parts." Then, step by step, she affirmed the eternal equality of Christ with the Father, that Christ was not created, and that a true concept of His atonement demands a recognition of His full and eternal Deity. All of these points differed from the antitrinitarians and brought her closer to trinitarian thinking.

In the 1890s, when she become convinced of the individuality and personhood of the Holy Spirit, she referred to the Holy Spirit in literal and tangible terms much like those she had used in 1850 to describe the Father and the Son. For instance, addressing the church at Avondale College in 1899, she declared, "the Holy Spirit, who is as much a person as God is a person, is walking through these grounds, unseen by human eyes . . . . He hears every word we utter and knows every thought of the mind."[73]

Her capstone statement came in 1905. She wrote, "There are three living persons of the heavenly trio; . . . three great powers—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit."[74] In the same year she defined Their unity

---

[70] F. M. Wilcox was editor of the *Review and Herald* from 1911–1944 and one of the original five trustees appointed by Ellen White to superintend her estate.

[71] [F. M. Wilcox], "The Message for Today," *Review and Herald*, October 9, 1913, 21.

[72] James White, *Day-Star,* January 24, 1846, 26.

[73] E. G. White, *Sermons and Talks,* vol. 2 [Silver Spring: E. G. White Estate, 1994], 136–137; also in *Evangelism,* 616; and *Manuscript Releases*, 7:299.

[74] E. G. White, *Special Testimonies,* Series B, no. 7, 63.

in relational rather than philosophical terms: "The unity that exists between Christ and His disciples does not destroy the personality of either. They are one in purpose, in mind, in character, but not in person. It is thus that God and Christ are one.[75]

Since Ellen White clearly held the basic formula of one God in three persons, it can hardly be denied that her view is essentially trinitarian. However, her view differs from traditional trinitarianism in the following important respects.

1. She rejected at least three of the philosophical presuppositions undergirding traditional trinitarianism: (a) the radical dualism of spirit and matter, which concluded that God could not have a visible form; (b) the notion of impassibility, which held that God had no passions, feelings, or emotions, hence could have no interest in, or sympathy with, humans[76]; and (c) the dualism of time and timelessness, which led to the notions of "eternal generation" and "eternal procession."[77] Her rejection of all these

---

[75] E. G. White, *Ministry of Healing*, 421–422.

[76] Aristotle styled God the "Unmoved Mover" because he reasoned that if God so much as thought about flawed, mortal, material beings, His absolute perfection would be spoiled. Aristotle's God was "impassible," that is, free of all passions (feelings and emotions)—the exact opposite of the God portrayed in Isaiah 53:4–6 and Hebrews 4:15. Roger Olson, a historian of theology, summarizes the situation: "Augustine's God, though trinitarian, is made captive to the Greek philosophical theology of divine simplicity, immutability, and impassibility, and turns out to be more like a great cosmic emperor than a loving, compassionate heavenly Father. Anselm denied that God experiences feelings of compassion at all. . . . Those who rightly criticize Deism for subverting biblical teachings by overwhelming them with Enlightenment philosophical and natural religion, ought to consider the extent to which classical Christian doctrines of God have been unduly influenced by Greek philosophical categories of metaphysical perfection (Roger E. Olson, *The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition and Reform* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999], 530). See also Fernando L. Canale, "Doctrine of God," in *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology,* ed. Raoul Dederen, 117–118, 126, 128–129, 132, 138–140, 145, 148–150.

[77] See Moon, chap. 11, in *The Trinity*, by Whidden, Moon, and Reeve, esp. 167–174. Malachi 3:6, "I am the Lord, I do not change," means that His character is unchanging, hence trustworthy. Heb 13:8 makes the same claim for God the Son, that He is "the same, yesterday, today, and forever." But the philosophical notion of timelessness says God has no "yesterday," no past or future, but is static, immobilized in an "eternal present." When Jesus said, "I proceeded and came forth from God (John 8:42), the plain meaning of His speech to his initial hearers was a claim: 'My witness of the Father is trustworthy, because I know Him intimately, it is He who sent me into the world, and I speak as His appointed representative' (loose paraphrase of John 8:14–17, 28–29, 38, 42). But Greek philosophy reasons that if Jesus came from outside the world, He also came from outside time, hence He must have pre-existed in timelessness. Since timelessness was theorized

concepts constitutes a radical departure from the medieval dogma of the Trinity.

2. She described the unity of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit in relational rather than ontological terms. While the traditional doctrine defined the divine unity in terms of "being" or "substance," she focused on the volitional and relational dimensions of Their unity, a unity of "purpose, mind, and character."[78] In this sense her concept of the "heavenly trio" is a more humble concept than the traditional Trinity doctrine. As Fernando Canale observes, "In no way could human minds achieve what the classic doctrine about the Trinity claims to perceive, namely, the description of the inner structure of God's being. Together with the entire creation, we must accept God's oneness by faith (James 2:19)."[79]

---

to be an eternal present, if Christ "proceeded" from the Father in timelessness, then His "procession" from the Father is eternal. It had no beginning (no past), no ending (future), but is eternally "proceeding." Thus dualism interprets a simple statement of Jesus about His coming into the world as a word about His ultimate origins. Two implications are drawn from this: first, that "the Father was the only one of the three persons who did not come from another" (Bonaventure, quoted in Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, 5 vols. [Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1971–1989], 3:278). The Eastern Orthodox concept differs in details, but also holds that only the Father "is ungenerated, the Son is generated by the Father, and the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son" (or as some say, "from the Father only") (*Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* [*ODCC*], art. "Trinity"). A second implication is that if eternity is a timeless, "eternal present," then whatever happens to God, is still happening and will continue to happen forever. From this comes the theory of the "eternal generation of the Son." Some include the Holy Spirit in this "eternal generation," since He too is said to "proceed" from the Father [John 15:26] (*ODCC*). To this John Calvin retorted, "it is foolish to imagine a continuous act of generating when it is evident that three persons have existed in one God from eternity" (*Institutes*, I.xiii.29). Yet, despite brilliant, famous, and learned opponents (see Justo L. Gonzalez, *History of Christian Thought*, *From the Protestant Reformation to the Twentieth Century*, vol. 3 [Nashville: Abingdon, 1975], 91–92), the theory of the "eternal generation of the Son" remains a part of the Roman Catholic Trinity doctrine to this day (see Richard M. Hogan and John M. LeVoir, *Faith for Today: Pope John Paul II's Catechetical Teachings* [New York: Doubleday, 1988], 12–14). But the doctrine is warranted only on the basis of the Aristotelian concept of timelessness.

[78] Ibid. This gives a deep practical meaning to the doctrine of the Trinity. If the Trio's unity is relational, then the biblical statement, "God is love," is seen to be not just descriptive, but definitive. Without love, the Three would not be One. And without plurality, God could *have* love for others, but not *be* love in Himself.

[79] Canale, "Doctrine of God," in *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology,* 150. "[H]aving departed from the philosophical conception of God as timeless and having embraced the historical conception of God as presented in the Bible, Adventists envisage the relation between the immanent and economic Trinity as one of identity rather than

3. Ellen White's emphasis, however, on the relational unity of God does not preclude an ontological unity (of "being" and "substance") as well, but recognizes that the evidence for ontological unity "transcends the limits of our human reason."[80] Both Canale and Fritz Guy have warned against the danger of tritheism if the relational unity is overemphasized to the exclusion of the ontological unity.[81]

4. Since Ellen White described the divine unity in relational rather than philosophical terms, she had no need for Kellogg's scientific-philosophical metaphors—different states of light or water—by which he attempted to explain the relations among the Trinity. She saw such metaphors as not merely inadequate, but intrinsically misleading and false.

5. For all these reasons, Ellen White's writings never use the term "Trinity." An uncritical use of the term "Trinity" could have led others to accept concepts to which she was diametrically opposed. The traditional doctrine of the Trinity did contain a core of biblical truth, but that truth was distorted by philosophical presuppositions alien to Scripture. The only method by which the scriptural elements in the doctrine could be separated from the nonscriptural elements was to simply set aside the traditional doctrine and seek to understand God on the basis of Scripture alone. In so doing, Adventists eventually became convinced that the basic concept of *one God in three eternal persons* was indeed found in Scripture. In their progress toward that conclusion, they temporarily held some of the heterodox views that the larger church had wrestled with

---

correspondence. The works of salvation are produced in time and history by the immanent Trinity [Fritz Guy, "What the Trinity Means to Me," *Adventist Review,* Sept. 11, 1986, 13] by way of its different Persons, conceived as centers of consciousness and action. Consequently, the indivisibility of God's works in history is not conceived by Adventists as being determined by the oneness of essence—as taught in the Augustinian classical tradition—but rather by the oneness of the historical task of redemption [Raoul Dederen, "Reflections on the Doctrine of the Trinity," *AUSS* 8 (Spring 1970): 20]. The danger of Tritheism involved in this position becomes real when the oneness of God is reduced to a mere unity conceived in analogy to a human society or a fellowship of action. Beyond such a unity of action, however, it is necessary to envision God as the one single reality which, in the very acts by which He reveals Himself directly in history, transcends the limits of our human reason [W. W. Prescott, *The Saviour of the World* (Takoma Park: Review and Herald, 1929), 17]. In no way could human minds achieve what the classic doctrine about the Trinity claims to perceive, namely, the description of the inner structure of God's being. Together with the entire creation, we must accept God's oneness by faith (James 2:19)."

[80] Canale, "Doctrine of God," in *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology,* 150.

[81] Canale, "Doctrine of God," 150 (in n. 73 above); Fritz Guy, *Thinking Theologically*, 70.

during the early centuries of the Christian era. By discarding tradition, however, and building a doctrine of God on Scripture alone, Adventists came eventually to a view of the Trinity that they believe is truly biblical.[82]

Regarding the conflict in the denomination today, both Ellen White and other early Adventists testify that faithfulness to the spirit of the pioneers does *not* mean never varying from the precise understandings they held. As J. N. Andrews declared in 1854: "If the Advent body itself were to furnish the *fathers* and the *saints* for the future church, Heaven pity the people that should live hereafter. Reader, we entreat you to prize your Bible."[83]

Ellen White agreed. "Greater light shines upon us than shone upon our fathers," she urged. Therefore, "we cannot be accepted or honored of God in rendering the same service, or doing the same works, that our fathers did. In order to be accepted and blessed of God as they were, we must imitate their faithfulness and zeal,—improve *our* light as they improved *theirs*,—and do as they would have done had they lived in our day. We must walk in the light which shines upon *us*, otherwise that light will become darkness."[84]

Jerry Moon is an Associate Professor of Church History at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University. He also edits *Andrews University Seminary Studies*. jmoon@andrews.edu

[82] Canale, "Doctrine of God," in *Handbook of Seventh-day Adventist Theology,* 150.
[83] J. N. Andrews, *Review and Herald*, January 31, 1854.
[84] E. G. White, *Testimonies*, 1:262.