

## Andrews University Digital Commons @ Andrews University

---

Faculty Publications

Church History

---

January 2010

# Ellen White and the 'Daily' Conflict

Denis Kaiser

Andrews University, [denis@andrews.edu](mailto:denis@andrews.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/church-history-pubs>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kaiser, Denis, "Ellen White and the 'Daily' Conflict" (2010). *Faculty Publications*. Paper 27.  
<http://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/church-history-pubs/27>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Church History at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact [repository@andrews.edu](mailto:repository@andrews.edu).

## ELLEN WHITE AND THE “DAILY” CONFLICT

Denis Kaiser

*Berrien Springs, Michigan*

### *Introduction*

When theological conflicts surface in the Seventh-day Adventist Church, later generations are usually provided with a variety of interpretations. The topic of this presentation is no exception. The “correct” interpretation of the *tāmîd* (lit. daily, continual, or perpetual) in the book of Daniel (8:11-13; 11:31; 12:11) is a topic that is still discussed at the margins of Adventism. If there had not been a certain statement by Ellen White, this matter would probably not be discussed as much today and the debate between 1900 and 1930 would not have been so heated. Two examples might suffice to manifest the disagreement still present among modern writers. Some, following in the wake of the traditional interpreters, consider this statement to be *the* evidence for Ellen White’s support of the identification of the “daily” as Roman paganism.<sup>1</sup> Others understand the same statement as a proof for the identification of the “daily” as Christ’s heavenly ministration.<sup>2</sup> Her statements on Jesus’ and the OT priest’s daily ministration are seen as a sufficient affirmation of this interpretation and as a rejection of the paganism view.<sup>3</sup> Since she asked the traditional interpreters to refrain from using her writings in their support, this would, after all, indicate clearly her opposition to the interpretation of that group.<sup>4</sup> Further, such statements are frequently employed to show that Ellen White generally rejected using her writings as an authority in doctrinal matters.<sup>5</sup> It is obvious that the understanding of her remarks on the “daily” could not manifest a greater disagreement.

These different positions in various areas—the interpretation of this statement of Ellen White and the significance of her writings in doctrinal matters—show the necessity of investigating

this matter. To understand what a person really said, it is helpful to consult the individual and try to reconstruct the original context. That is why I want to focus in this study specifically on Ellen White’s own statements and the historical setting. Although the study of the historical context cannot solve the question of biblical interpretation, it will assist us in understanding developments, events, and statements in the history of our denomination, and maybe also help us to learn how to deal with conflicts in our own time.<sup>6</sup>

### *The 1850 Statement and Its Historical Context*

Before looking at specific arguments of the two conflicting groups, the atmosphere of the conflict, or Ellen White’s own recollection of what she had actually said, it will be helpful to start with the statement in question itself.

The passage that has been used in support of the paganism view and that is still used to support both interpretations is found in the book *Early Writings*. It is part of a larger passage that actually combined two visions and includes some additional notes. The first vision occurred on September 23, 1850, and dealt with the gathering of Israel, the dates of the 1843 chart, the “daily” and time setting, and the error of going to Jerusalem.<sup>7</sup> The second vision was given on June 21, 1851, and concerned the third angel’s message and continued time setting. When the book *A Sketch of the Christian Experience and Views of Ellen G. White* was first published in August 1851, a part of the second vision was inserted.<sup>8</sup> Further, some notes were added such as a reference to the idea of going to Jerusalem and a statement that the “Old Jerusalem” would not be built up again. With some minor editorial corrections the whole text was reprinted in *Early Writings* in 1882.<sup>9</sup> The text in its entirety follows below:

[On] September 23, the Lord showed me that He had stretched out His hand the second time to recover the remnant of His people, and that efforts must be

redoubled in this gathering time. In the scattering, Israel was smitten and torn, but now in the gathering time God will heal and bind up His people. In the scattering, efforts made to spread the truth had but little effect, accomplished but little or nothing; but in the gathering, when God has set His hand to gather His people, efforts to spread the truth will have their designed effect. All should be united and zealous in the work. I saw that it was wrong for any to refer to the scattering for examples to govern us now in the gathering; for if God should do no more for us now than He did then, Israel would never be gathered.

I have seen that the 1843 chart was directed by the hand of the Lord, and that it should not be altered; that the figures were as He wanted them; that His hand was over and hid a mistake in some of the figures, so that none could see it, until His hand was removed.

Then I saw in relation to the "daily" (Daniel 8:12) that the word "sacrifice" was supplied by man's wisdom, and does not belong to the text, and that the Lord gave the correct view of it to those who gave the judgment hour cry. When union existed, before 1844, nearly all were united on the correct view of the "daily"; but in the confusion since 1844, other views have been embraced, and darkness and confusion have followed.

Time has not been a test since 1844, and it will never again be a test. The Lord has shown me that the message of the third angel must go, and be proclaimed to the scattered children of the Lord, but it must not be hung on time. I saw that some were getting a false excitement, arising from preaching time; but the third angel's message is stronger than time can be. I saw that this message can stand on its own foundation and needs not time to strengthen it; and that it will go in mighty power, and do its work, and will be cut short in righteousness.

---

Then I was pointed to some who are in the great error of believing that it is their duty to go to Old Jerusalem, and think they have a work to do there before the Lord comes. Such a view is calculated to take the mind and interest from the present work of the Lord, under the message of the third angel; for those who think that they are yet to go to Jerusalem will have their minds there, and their means will be withheld from the cause of present truth to get themselves and others there. I saw that such a mission would accomplish no real good, that it would take a long while to make a very few of the Jews believe even in the first advent of Christ, much more to believe in His second advent. I saw that Satan had greatly deceived some in this thing and that souls all around them in this land could be helped by them and led to keep the commandments of God, but they were leaving them to perish. I also saw that Old Jerusalem never would be built up; and that Satan was doing his utmost to lead the minds of the children of the Lord into these things now, in the gathering time, to keep them from throwing their whole interest into the present work of the Lord, and to cause them to neglect the necessary preparation for the day of the Lord.<sup>10</sup>

*The History of the Interpretation of the “Daily”*

Since Ellen White referred to the time before and after the Great Disappointment, I will provide an overview of the arguments and the developments on the topic of the “daily” during those times. Further, I will also present some information on the time of the conflict that will serve as background to Ellen White’s advice and counsel.

### The Millerite Period

When the Millerites recognized that the word “sacrifice” (Dan 8:11-13) had been supplied by the translators of the Bible and that the use of the term *tāmīd* in Daniel differed from its common OT usage, they excluded the OT background of the term and concluded that the term *hatāmīd* would be an adjective which still needed a noun to qualify.<sup>11</sup> Since in Dan 8:13 the text reads “the daily and the transgression of desolation,” they considered “desolation” to be the missing noun. Based on parallels between Dan 8, 2 Thess 2, and Rev 17, they thought they recognized “two desolating powers” in Dan 8:11-13. The first desolating power, the daily/continual desolation, was pagan Rome which was replaced by the second desolating power, the abomination of desolation, papal Rome. The remark that the word “sacrifice” did not belong to the Hebrew text was very significant because all other interpretations in that time based their view on the word “sacrifice” and considered the “daily sacrifice” as referring to the Jewish sacrifices.<sup>12</sup>

During that time various prophetic charts existed, such as a chart that had been generated by Charles Fitch and Apollos Hale in 1842 and which gave 1843 as the end of the 2,300 years. Although both Fitch and Hale argued for the “daily” being Roman paganism in their other writings, their 1843 chart no longer contained an identification of the “daily” or the note that the number 666 of Rev 13 constituted the years of Roman paganism’s reign. The date AD 508 for the taking away of the “daily” and the beginning of the 1,290 years and the 1,335 years was retained, but no identification or further explanation for the “daily” was provided.<sup>13</sup> Besides some erroneous ways of reckoning (seven times, etc.), the Millerites recognized that the calculation of the 1843 date had been subject to a mistake and they corrected that “mistake” in 1844.

### The Disintegration and Gathering Period

The period between 1844 and 1847 was marked by various divisions and splits. These were not only manifested by splits into different groups but also by contending theological solutions for

the disappointment of October 22, 1844. These differing paths led some groups into such extremes that they totally disintegrated. Other groups were split into still smaller divisions.<sup>14</sup> The term “gathering time” in the above passage refers to the gathering of former Millerites to a group that was characterized by the integration of three new beliefs: the seventh-day Sabbath, the new sanctuary understanding, and the prophetic role of Ellen White. During this period renewed evangelistic efforts (reaching former Millerites) could be seen among the members of this group. The term “third angel’s message” is a collective term referring exactly to those unifying elements, (i.e. the Sabbath, the sanctuary message, the spirit of prophecy, the validity of the October 22, 1844, date, and a rejection of the continued time setting of other groups).<sup>15</sup>

### The Early Seventh-day Adventist Period

Those early Seventh-day Adventists followed the Millerite interpretation of the “daily.” While Millerite interpreters laid the argumentative foundation for the identification of the “daily,” Seventh-day Adventists added nothing that was substantially new. The only innovation was the redefinition of the sanctuary in Dan 8:14 as a heavenly instead of an earthly sanctuary. It is correct that early Seventh-day Adventists adopted O. R. L. Crosier’s views on the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary in Dan 8:14, but they never connected the “daily” in Dan 8:11-13 with the heavenly ministration of Christ. They did, in fact, reject Crosier’s views on the “daily”<sup>16</sup> because these were heavily connected with the views of the “Age to Come” movement.<sup>17</sup> Early Adventist writers believed in the antitypical Day of Atonement, Christ’s heavenly ministration, and the distracting impact of the service of the Mass, but they never connected these points with the “daily” in Dan 8, as some modern writers falsely suggested.<sup>18</sup>

Ellen White’s statements on Jesus’ and the OT priest’s daily ministration were made in the context of the OT sacrificial system and of Christ’s heavenly priesthood as described in the book of Hebrews rather than in reference to Dan 8. They were

not necessarily a rejection of Miller's interpretation of the "daily" as paganism. Also Miller agreed that the OT priests were undertaking daily services while he did not yet understand that there is a sanctuary in heaven. There is no contradiction between the statements made by Ellen White and William Miller.<sup>19</sup> Until the 1870s, Adventists continued to employ Millerite arguments when criticizing differing interpretations. It is apparent that such interpretations had one thing in common: They were all based on the identification of "daily" as sacrifices.

While some writers interpreted the little horn of Dan 8 as Antiochus IV Epiphanes who took away the Jewish sacrifices (167–164 BC), others considered the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem by the Romans in AD 70 and the subsequent ceasing of the sacrifices as the taking away of the "daily," and still others had repeatedly set new dates for Christ's second coming and promoted the idea of the Jews' return to Jerusalem to reinstitute the sacrificial system.<sup>20</sup> All those views were based on the identification of the "daily" as Jewish sacrifices. Crosier deviated a little bit from those views by identifying the "daily" with Christ's continuous sacrifice although he, nevertheless, associated and actively worked together with the proponents of the "Age to Come" movement.<sup>21</sup>

James White made a similar statement as his wife about the same time: "Since the 2300 days ended in 1844, quite a number of *times* have been set, by different individuals for their termination. In doing this they have removed the 'landmarks' and have thrown *darkness* and doubt over the whole advent movement."<sup>22</sup> One month later he criticized again the renewed time setting, pointing to the fact that the 457 BC date as the point of commencement for the 2,300 years is immovable.<sup>23</sup>

Loughborough recollected later that some groups after the disappointment redefined the "daily" as meaning the "Jewish sacrifices."<sup>24</sup> They did, according to him, first focus on AD 31 as the point of commencement for the 1,290 and 1,335 years. When that did not result in a satisfying date, they started to reckon with AD 70 but did not reach a significant date either. Then Loughborough suggested that they finally interpreted the "daily" as Christ's continual offering in our behalf.<sup>25</sup> The redefinition of



the “daily” as sacrifices was accompanied by a rejection of the old time calculations and a continued setting of new times. While until the 1870s, these interpretations were strongly attacked in Adventist publications, later the criticism ceased when such views apparently faded away. Then, explanations of the “daily” became less frequent and more concise; statements made by Millerite writers on the topic received greater attention than the study of the issue itself. The sociological aspect attached to the discussion of the “daily” was summed up well by Stan Hickerson when he suggested that Crosier’s view on the “daily” was “connected with all the wrong people” which made an acceptance of that view rather unlikely.<sup>26</sup> This subconscious influence was also at work in the discussions of the following period.

### The Controversial Period

Beginning around the year 1900, a new view gained influence among Adventist church leaders in North America. Ludwig Richard Conradi, president of the European field, had come to the conclusion that the cultic background of the term *tāmîd* could not be rejected but had to be acknowledged.<sup>27</sup> He affirmed that the word “sacrifice” was lacking in the Hebrew text and that it was not by accident that a proper noun was missing. Since *tāmîd* was prefixed with an article, it functioned itself as a noun. Therefore the term not only referred to the daily morning and evening burnt offering but to all regular activities of the Hebrew worship system. Several North American leaders accepted his conclusions. Based on an understanding of biblical typology, they viewed the “daily” as signifying the continual mediation of Christ in heaven. They argued that a taking away of the knowledge of Christ’s continual ministry in heaven made a restoration of the heavenly sanctuary (Dan 8:14) necessary. They considered the “daily” to be taken away through the cultic, political, and military activities done or caused by papal Rome at the beginning of the sixth century (most of the time around AD 508).

When both views clashed between 1907 and 1910, the proponents of the paganism view mostly referred to Millerite and

early Adventist interpreters as well as to the statement which Ellen White had made in 1850 to support their view.

The proponents of the new view considered it to be “impossible to sustain by good history the claim that Paganism was taken away or abolished as the national religion of Rome in 508,” and that is why they wanted to correct this error.<sup>28</sup> Although General Conference president A. G. Daniells favored the new view, he tried to remain objective and unbiased in his treatment of the members of the other party.<sup>29</sup> He was afraid of another theological conflict that would cause the cry of heresy to be sounded, the unsettling of people, and the destructive influence upon the church.<sup>30</sup> Therefore he advised everyone not to discuss, agitate, or print the matter.<sup>31</sup> Thus in July 1908, Daniells tried to convince the editor of the *Watchman* to refrain from the unwise step of republishing Haskell’s 1843 chart, claiming that “up to the present time this matter has been kept out of our papers.”<sup>32</sup>

Yet, Daniells knew at least from Prescott’s complaints about the lack of restraint on the part of “the *Signs* people,” that an article promoting the new view of the “daily” had already been published in early January.<sup>33</sup> Thus Daniells probably just referred to the time since the cease-fire had been agreed upon at the January 26, 1908, meeting at Elmshaven.<sup>34</sup> It was after that meeting that church leaders had “refrained from expressing their view in our papers,” because they wanted to avoid “any controversy.”<sup>35</sup> Daniells suggested that “all parties wait a bit” so that they could get together, study the whole question, and “save an open dispute.”<sup>36</sup>

However, W. W. Prescott apparently viewed himself as being “beyond the danger of making mistakes.” He had the tendency to diverge from clearly defined truths, spending hours on minor points of no real significance “for the salvation of the soul.”<sup>37</sup> His agitating the matter did cause confusion and unbelief, and led people to question the simple truth of God’s word, while keeping them away from the most essential work of heart conversion and life transformation.<sup>38</sup> He was intent on pointing out mistakes and “flaws in our past experience.”<sup>39</sup> Ellen White counseled Prescott not to publish anything “that would unsettle the minds of the people regarding the positions held in the past.”<sup>40</sup>

In December 1909, Haskell was, nevertheless, complaining that Prescott tried to “weave adroitly” some of his personal views into the reading for the week of prayer.<sup>41</sup> Some of the promulgators of the new view claimed that they based their interpretation totally on the Bible, and that Adventists should not need “an infallible interpreter of the Word of God” to provide the lacking support.<sup>42</sup> The writings of Ellen White would have no doctrinal significance but only a “paraenetic” function.<sup>43</sup> It would be necessary to protest against the attempt to hinder a thorough examination of the biblical text, and to search for an infallible confirmation of our teachings in Ellen White’s writings.<sup>44</sup> They felt somewhat relieved when Ellen White stated that she had no light on the matter and was unable to clearly define the controversial points.<sup>45</sup> The new ideas were apparently presented sometimes in an arrogant way, denouncing the reasoning of the supporters of the old view as being absurd.<sup>46</sup> They called upon the members of the old view group to “accept evidence,” and to change the views “when they are proved to be incorrect.”<sup>47</sup> It should be “our sincere aim to know and teach the truth,” since that is more important “than to cling to a traditional teaching.”<sup>48</sup> Thus Prescott stated that “the use of . . . [Ellen White’s] quotation for the purpose of forestalling any candid investigation of our teaching does not seem consistent with that spirit of fairness which opens the way for an unprejudiced consideration of Bible truth.”<sup>49</sup> However, some church members reasoned in response that if Prescott’s argument was accepted, it would be possible to change certain doctrines despite the fact that these had been confirmed by the writings of Ellen White in the past.<sup>50</sup>

It is understandable that the proponents of the paganism view considered the new view of the “daily” as an attack against the prophetic framework and the authority of the writings of Ellen White. Although most of the proponents of the new view still upheld the prophetic interpretation of the denomination, there were some who questioned not only the definition of the “daily” but also the whole interpretation of the Danielic prophecies as well, as the case of Kolvoord shows.<sup>51</sup> Others, like A. T. Jones, got

into trouble with the church in other areas, which was certainly not a recommendation of their views on that topic.<sup>52</sup>

Shortly after the meeting on January 26, 1908, at Elmshaven, S. N. Haskell wrote a letter to Daniells “expressing himself very emphatically regarding the question.”<sup>53</sup> He charged Daniells to make sure that the new view would not be published; otherwise he would publish an 1843 chart to “show our people what was right.”<sup>54</sup> In July of the same year Haskell would have had that chart reprinted in the *Watchman* had not Daniells convinced the editor to refrain from publishing it.<sup>55</sup> After Haskell published his chart privately, Ellen White told him that he should have waited to get all the leading brethren together, and come to an agreement with them before circulating his 1843 chart.<sup>56</sup> He had acted unwisely in bringing up a subject that “must create discussion,” and manifested that “various opinions” existed on the matter.<sup>57</sup> He should not agitate this matter.<sup>58</sup>

Uriah Smith considered the matter of the “daily” as one of the “old landmarks.”<sup>59</sup> The contenders of the old view were apparently not willing to settle the conflict, and to come to unity.<sup>60</sup> The new interpretation of the “daily” was denounced by some as a “deadly heresy,” “new theology,” Satanic innovation, the ultimate apostasy, and the Omega of apostasies, which would “change the original truth,” “the doctrines of Seventh Day [*sic*] Adventists,” and that would “destroy the foundation of the Adventist faith and play into the hands of the opponents of the church.”<sup>61</sup>

J. S. Washburn regarded the “new doctrine of the Daily” as “the heart, the core, the root, the seed theory of all our modern Washington new thought, and Adventist new theology.”<sup>62</sup> He defended the “old view” as follows: “We are face to face with the most subtle apostasy of the ages. The cruel serpent coils with strangling folds about our greatest training school and sinks his deadly fangs into the very souls of our children. If this is not the beginning of the ‘startling Omega,’ and we are not thrilled, aroused and startled, we must indeed be dead, in doubt, in darkness and infidelity.”<sup>63</sup> He stated that if his uncle, the former GC president G. I. Butler, “were to rise from the dead[,] he would stand with me against [Daniells] and Prescott.”<sup>64</sup>

The new interpretation of the “daily” was, however, not the only reason why Washburn criticized Prescott. He sharply attacked him also for having introduced “a brood of new theories” such as the “Higher Criticism” and the “Catholic doctrine of the Trinity.” These and other “false doctrines” would change “the original truth” taught by the Adventist church and exchange it for “a flood of new and strange teachings.”<sup>65</sup> In a different pamphlet he remarked: “But according to the new view of the ‘daily,’ this ‘daily in transgression,’ the devil worship, has become the ‘Continual mediation of Jesus Christ.’ In other words Satan is Christ!! Surely the most astonishing transformation of all ages. If I ascribe the work of Satan to Christ or the work of Christ to Satan is there no danger that I may thus sin against the Holy Ghost?”<sup>66</sup>

While most of these statements stem from a later time, they well reflect the character of the debate. Although Ellen White requested the supporters of the old view to refrain from quoting her writings in their support, they apparently used them even more, making the whole issue become a conflict over her “role as a prophetic/historical interpreter of the Bible.”<sup>67</sup> The supporters of these new views were “undermining the confidence of our sons and daughters in the very fundamentals of our truth.”<sup>68</sup> The supporters of the new view were unsettling “these dates and experiences,” and thereby doing “the work of the enemy of Jesus.”<sup>69</sup> One writer thought that the new view contradicted “the plain statements in ‘Early Writings’ . . . [and] unsettle[d] minds in regard to the inspiration of all the writings of the Spirit of Prophecy and . . . question[ed] the leadership of the Lord Jesus in the entire movement.”<sup>70</sup> He exhorted a younger brother “to hold fast to the faith as first delivered to you . . . and contend for it to the end.”<sup>71</sup>

### *Ellen White’s Views on the Topic*

The historical investigation has shown that Ellen White’s statement was made in the context of renewed time settings which were based on the term “sacrifice.” Her statement almost sounds as if she referred to a specific interpretation but before we can draw a conclusion it will be necessary to examine her own recollection

of that statement. It is nevertheless clear that the debate was very heated, and that this statement pushed the question of the authority of her writings in doctrinal matters to the core of the debate.

### Her Recollection of the 1850 Statement

In 1909, when Arthur G. Daniells asked Ellen White about her 1850 statement, she recalled that “some of the leaders who had been in the 1844 movement endeavored to find new dates for the termination of the 2300 year period . . . for the coming of the Lord.”<sup>72</sup> Whereas this caused confusion among those who had taken part in the Millerite movement, the Lord showed her that the old dates were correct for the 2300 days and should not be revised to set new times for the Second Advent.<sup>73</sup> When asked about the “daily,” it being taken away, the casting down of the sanctuary, etc., she replied that “these features were not placed before her in vision as the time part was,” and that she did not want to provide an explanation of those points.<sup>74</sup> To sum it up, she said, “I do not know what the daily is, whether it is paganism or Christ’s ministry. . . . That was not the thing that was shown me.”<sup>75</sup> When asked about her 1850 statement on the “daily,” she always pointed to the aspect of the settled prophetic time periods and dates as well as the renewed time setting after 1844. In her thinking the “daily” was apparently a kind of concept that was always related to the time periods but never to the specific identification of the “daily.” Therefore, if the pronoun “it” or the phrase “correct view” in her 1850 statement had referred to the identification of the “daily” as paganism, Ellen White would have contradicted herself, for the Lord would have shown her the “correct view” of the “daily,” while later she denied such a fact.<sup>76</sup>

Ellen White stated several times that she was not given any instruction or “special light on the point under discussion.”<sup>77</sup> Since she had no special insight into the matter, she refused the use of her writings in support of either view.

I entreat of . . . our leading brethren, that they  
make no reference to my writings to sustain their views

of “the daily.” . . . I cannot consent that any of my writings be taken as settling this matter. . . . I now ask that my ministering brethren shall not make use of my writings in their arguments regarding this question.<sup>78</sup>

It is correct that she asked Haskell, Loughborough, and Smith not to use her writings to support their ideas. To argue that she therefore clearly voiced her opposition to their interpretation of the “daily” would put statements in her mouth that would contradict each other since she denied knowing anything about the “daily” matter when, of course, she would have known something. Further, it is important to point out that she not only carried decided messages to the supporters of the old view but as well to the supporters of the new view. For example, although she told Haskell that Satan would use his mistake of re-circulating the 1843 chart to create confusion and division among the leading workers of the church,<sup>79</sup> she warned Prescott and Daniells that they were in danger of “weaving into their experience sentiments of a spiritualistic appearance . . . that would deceive, if possible, the very elect.”<sup>80</sup> She had to tell Prescott that he was “not beyond the danger of making mistakes.” He would swerve from clearly defined points of truth, and give too much attention to items that do not need to be handled at all, and that were “not essential for the salvation of the soul.”<sup>81</sup> Since she had not been given any instruction on the matter, and the leading theologians were not in the spiritual condition to get together to settle the problem through the study of the Bible, its presentation would have only a destructive influence so that, under those conditions, it would be better to be silent on the matter.<sup>82</sup>

It should be noted again that the reason she gave for being unwilling to make definite statements on the “daily” was that she had not been given any instruction. She was unwilling to settle the matter by merely guessing without having a clear word from God. There were other instances where she did not want to give a final word on a respective issue.<sup>83</sup> The reason was again that she had not received any clear instruction from God.<sup>84</sup> Yet there were times when she did receive clear instructions on doctrinal

matters to settle a doctrinal controversy,<sup>85</sup> and at other times she shaped the church's understanding of certain doctrinal matters, or received visions that confirmed the conclusions reached by Bible study.<sup>86</sup> Thus she intended her writings "to settle doctrinal issues in the church on those points where God had given her light."<sup>87</sup> Thus while much of her writings are pastoral in nature, their meaning goes beyond that and they are authoritative also in doctrinal matters. She nevertheless pointed to the study of the Bible as the source of doctrines. While the writings of Ellen White should not be used as the basis of doctrine, they have nevertheless the purpose of guiding in understanding the teachings of the Bible and the application of these teachings.

### The Results of the Conflict

Ellen White saw "no need for the controversy" and the whole discussion, since it appeared to be a subject of "minor importance," or not of "vital importance."<sup>88</sup> Its discussion would only make "a mountain out of a molehill."<sup>89</sup> In her opinion, the difference between the views was not as important as some portrayed it, and its magnification would constitute a big mistake.<sup>90</sup> She said that the differences of opinion should not be made prominent, and if the matter were introduced into the churches, the disagreement caused on this point would make the whole matter even worse.<sup>91</sup> If the issue of the "daily" were agitated, the following results could be seen:

1. People would be exposed to questions that would not confirm their faith in the truth but cause confusion, unbelief, temptation, and the unsettling of their minds. That could lead "to the making of rash moves." All that would especially be the case with such who were not yet "thoroughly converted."<sup>92</sup>

2. People would be occupied by this "unnecessary controversy," and diverted from the necessary searching for "true conversion of heart and life," as well as for a "secure sanctification of soul and mind."<sup>93</sup>

3. The leading brethren would be diverted from the "great questions that should be the burden of our message."<sup>94</sup>



4. The work of the Lord—evangelistic work especially in the large cities—would be delayed and hindered.<sup>95</sup>

5. Some people who were unfavorably looking at the Adventist work would get the opportunity to present the whole matter of doctrinal difference in a way that the impression would be left on minds “that we are not led by God.” Statements would be produced that could easily be misused to injure the Adventist cause.<sup>96</sup>

That is why it was not “profitable . . . to spend so much time and attention in its consideration.”<sup>97</sup> The whole matter was not a crucial question, and should not have been regarded as such.<sup>98</sup>

### A Better Focus

Rather, Ellen White said God wanted to have the leading brethren and pastors spend time on other things:

1. Instead of focusing on such “jots and titles,” pastors should devote their time to training their church members on how to teach others the simple and saving truth for this time.<sup>99</sup>

2. The pastors should talk in an earnest, simple, easy, and clear manner about the “sacred truths,” the “testing truths,” “the binding claims of the law of God,” and “vital subjects that can be easily understood.”<sup>100</sup>

3. They should try to show unity and speak the same things so far as possible rather than reveal “a marked difference of opinion.”<sup>101</sup>

4. It would be wiser for them to speak words that would confirm the believers in their faith.<sup>102</sup>

5. Their first work should be to humble themselves and be reconverted so that the angels of God could cooperate with them and make a “sacred impression” upon their coworkers’ minds.<sup>103</sup>

Reading the above warnings and counsels, one might conclude that the matter of the “daily” should not be studied at all since it is not really important. Yet, Ellen White made other statements in which she stated explicitly her desire that the contending parties should come together, study the issue on the basis of the Bible, and come to an agreement.<sup>104</sup> Thus there was a place for the study of that matter. Yet what she repeatedly regretted was the fact that

the people involved in the conflict had surmised evil against each other. They were unwilling to give up their preconceived opinions and study the matter together with members of the other group.<sup>105</sup>

The atmosphere of the conflict portrayed above supports her statements. Apparently the real problem was not so much the topic of the “daily” itself but the way the leading brethren had handled the matter and treated each other.<sup>106</sup> Therefore the point lying at the heart of the issue was a spiritual problem, namely, irreconcilability, unwillingness to study and talk, and a deportment that was unbecoming for Christians. That explains why, when stating that it is unwise to agitate this matter, she frequently used such phrases as “now,” “at this time,” and “at this point of our history.”<sup>107</sup>

### *Conclusion*

When Ellen White made her statement in 1850, the early Adventists debated with former Millerites who rejected the 1844 date, set new times, and held “Age to Come” views. Her own recollection of the statement shows that when making this statement, she had the time element in mind rather than any specific identification of the “daily.” The history of the conflict shows that we need to be very careful in how we interpret, use, and talk about Ellen White’s statements. The utilization of her 1850 statement for proving either view on the “daily” causes a contradiction in her statements. The rhetoric employed by some people to discuss their opinion on the biblical text left the impression that they rejected Ellen White’s writings. The interpretation that one holds might be correct in a technical sense, but one’s behavior and spiritual attitude may be totally out of place. The study of the history of the “daily” shows how careful we should be when arriving at different interpretations or positions. What might be the impact on the church? What is my spiritual attitude in this matter? How do I view my brother? Does my use of the Bible or Ellen White’s writings weaken people’s faith and confidence in those spiritual authorities? May God grant us wisdom to decide when a certain

matter should be agitated and when it is better to be silent and ask God to change our heart!

---

<sup>1</sup>Marc Alden Swearingen, *Tidings Out of the Northeast: A General Historical Survey of Daniel 11* (Coldwater, Mich.: Remnant Publications, 2006), 39, 40. For a review of the book see Denis Kaiser, Book Review of “Swearingen, Marc Alden, *Tidings Out of the Northeast: A General Historical Survey of Daniel 11*,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 47, no. 1 (2009): 154-157.

<sup>2</sup>Heidi Heiks, *The “Daily” Source Book* (Brushton, N.Y.: TEACH Services, 2008), 11, 12, 29, 30, 32.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, 11, 12, 29, 30.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, 32.

<sup>5</sup>See, e.g., Desmond Ford, “Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment” (n.p., 1980), 12, 15, 606, 616; Ron Graybill, “The Power of Prophecy: Ellen White and the Women Religious Founders of the Nineteenth Century” (Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1983), 113-135; Graeme S. Bradford, *Prophets Are Human* (Victoria, N.S.W.: Signs Publishing Company, 2004), 50, 51, 61; idem, *More Than a Prophet* (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Biblical Perspectives, 2006), 125.

<sup>6</sup>The article is based on Denis Kaiser, “The History of the Adventist Interpretation of the ‘Daily’ in the Book of Daniel from 1831 to 2008” (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 2009). I want to express my appreciation to Stan Hickerson for sharing his insights in his response to the presentation of my paper. See Stan Hickerson to Denis Kaiser, April 5, 2010 (response to Denis Kaiser’s presentation at the 2010 “Ellen White and Current Issues Symposium” at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich.).

<sup>7</sup>Ellen G. White, “Letter to Brethren and Sisters,” *Present Truth*, November 1850, 86-87.

<sup>8</sup>Ellen G. White, *A Sketch of the Christian Experience and Views of Ellen G. White* (Saratoga Springs, N.Y.: James White, 1851), 61, 62.

<sup>9</sup>Ellen G. White, *Early Writings of Mrs. White: Experience and Views, and Spiritual Gifts, Volume One*, 2nd ed. (Battle Creek, Mich.: Review and Herald, 1882), 64. In later editions the passage is found on pp. 74, 75.

<sup>10</sup>Ellen G. White, *Early Writings of Ellen G. White* (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2000), 74, 75 (emphasis added).

<sup>11</sup>Josiah Litch, *The Probability of the Second Coming of Christ About A.D. 1843* (Boston, Mass.: David H. Ela, 1838), 34; William Miller, "A Lecture on the Signs of the Present Times," *Signs of the Times*, March 20, 1840, 6; Joshua V. Himes, "The insertion of an important omission in the minutes of the Low-Hampton Conference," *Signs of the Times*, March 15, 1842, 189; Apollos Hale, *The Second Advent Manual* (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1843), 64; George Storrs, *The Bible Examiner: Containing Various Prophetic Expositions* (Boston, Mass.: Joshua V. Himes, 1843), 43, 111, 112.

<sup>12</sup>Litch, 33, 34; Miller, 6; Storrs, 112. See also P. Gerard Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-Day Adventist Message and Mission* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1977), 33, for other reasons of Miller's opposition against the view that the "daily" could denote the Jewish sacrificial system.

<sup>13</sup>John N. Loughborough, "The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days," *Review and Herald*, April 4, 1907, 10. He suggested that Ellen White's reference to the 1843 chart was proof of the correctness of the Millerite interpretation of the "daily."

<sup>14</sup>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.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, 273-389.

<sup>16</sup>O. R. L. Crosier, "Response to J. Weston," *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 2. This article is a response to J. Weston who had reacted to one of Crosier's previous articles on the same topic. See

J. Weston, "Letter to Bro. Crosier," *Day-Dawn*, March 19, 1847, 1, 2. The article Weston criticized had appeared in the *Day-Dawn*, vol. 1, no. 12, in which Crosier, viewing the "daily" as a "Christian Institution," desired his readers "to examine the meaning of *Daily Sacrifice* in Daniel." Unfortunately, that issue of the *Day-Dawn* is no longer extant.

<sup>17</sup>Crosier's views on the "daily" and his affiliation with the "Age to Come" movement will be discussed in another forthcoming article. There were, however, also some Sabbatarian Adventists who entertained a few points of the Age to Come view. See, e.g., Hiram Edson, *Exposition of Scripture Prophecy: Showing the Final Return of the Jews in 1850* (Canandaigua, N.Y.: Office of the Ontario Messenger, 1849), 3-5, 35, 36; idem, *The Time of the End: Its Beginning, Progressive Events, and Final Termination* (Auburn, N.Y.: Henry Oliphant, 1849); David Arnold, "Daniel's Visions, the 2300 Days, and the Shut Door," *Present Truth*, March 1850, 62, 63.

<sup>18</sup>Walter E. Straw, *Studies in Daniel* (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Emmanuel Missionary College, 1943), 54, 55; George McCready Price, *The Greatest of the Prophets: A New Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Mountain View, Calif.: Pacific Press, 1955), 174; Francis D. Nichol, ed., *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 7 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1955), 4:64, 65; Egerton Wilberforce Carnegie, "The Historical Setting and Background of the Term 'Daily'" (M.A. report, Andrews University, 1971), 22-26; George Burnside, "Daily?" (n.p., n.d.), 3, 4; Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White: The Latter Elmshaven Years (1905-1915)* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1982), 6:247; Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 25-28, 30.

<sup>19</sup>Heiks, *The "Daily" Source Book*, 11, 12, 29, 30, suggested that contrast between Ellen White and William Miller.

<sup>20</sup>John Fonday, "The Twenty-Three Hundred Days," *Bible Examiner*, November 1848, 175, 176; Edson, *Exposition of Scripture Prophecy*, 3-5, 35, 36; idem, *The Time of the End*; Jonathan Cummings, *Explanation of the Prophetic Chart, and Application of the Truth* (Concord, N.H.: Barton & Hadley, 1854), 246; "Interpretation of Symbols, Figures, &c," *Advent Herald*,

March 3, 1849, 36; F. H. Berwick, *The Grand Crisis: The Lord Soon to Come* (Boston, Mass.: n.p., 1854), 82.

<sup>21</sup>In “Death ends a life full of endeavor,” 10, it is stated concerning Crosier that “in 1847 he became editor of the [Joseph Marsh’s] *Advent Harbinger*, published in Rochester, N.Y.” This shows his early involvement with Joseph Marsh who originated the “Age to Come” ideas. Crosier worked for the *Harbinger* until 1853. See O. R. L. Crosier, “Early History of Ontario County Revealed in Story of Late Owen R. L. Crozier,” *Daily Messenger*, November 22, 1923, 23. About 1850 Crosier began to substitute the “s” in his last name with a “z.” Seventh-day Adventists nevertheless prefer the spelling “Crosier” instead of “Crozier.”

<sup>22</sup>James White, “Comments on Brother Miller’s Dream,” *Present Truth*, May 1850, 74 (emphasis supplied).

<sup>23</sup>James White, “Our Present Position,” *Review and Herald*, December 1850, 13.

<sup>24</sup>Loughborough, “The Thirteen Hundred and Thirty-Five Days,” 10.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, 10. He rejected this idea because (1) Christ was offered only once and not continuously, (2) the “mystery of iniquity” was already at work in Paul’s day, and (3) the loss of faith in Christ’s sacrifice has been a gradual process and did not take place at a “definite date.” Further, of course, he rejected it because he believed that Ellen White had affirmed the Millerite position.

<sup>26</sup>Hickerson to Kaiser, April 5, 2010. He pointed out that Miller’s position was opposed by theologians who asserted that the “daily sacrifices were removed by Antiochus IV Epiphanes and would be restored in a restored temple in a restored Jerusalem in the glorious end times.” Then Crosier as an “early proponent of a variant of the ‘new view’ began to advocate extreme Age to Come views.” Clorinda Minor, among others, even moved to Palestine to participate in the “glorious restitution of all things.” Thus the interpretation of the “daily” as Christ’s heavenly ministration was stained with “guilt by association” since it was “connected with all the wrong people.”

<sup>27</sup>Ludwig Richard Conradi, *Die Weissagung Daniels oder, Die Weltgeschichte im Lichte der Bibel* (Hamburg: Internationale

Traktatgesellschaft, 1898), 155, 156, 175-178; idem to Ellen G. White, April 17, 1906, 1, 2, 6, 7.

<sup>28</sup>Arthur G. Daniells to I. A. Ford, July 15, 1908; Ludwig Richard Conradi to John N. Loughborough, April 16, 1907, 3.

<sup>29</sup>See Daniells, July 15, 1908.

<sup>30</sup>Arthur G. Daniells, “In Interview at Elmshaven,” January 26, 1908.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid.; idem, July 15, 1908, 1.

<sup>32</sup>Daniells, July 15, 1908, 1.

<sup>33</sup>M. C. Wilcox, “The 2300 Days,” *Signs of the Times*, January 8, 1908, 6; W. W. Prescott to Arthur G. Daniells, January 10, 1908, cited in Gilbert M. Valentine, *W. W. Prescott: Forgotten Giant of Adventism’s Second Generation*, Adventist Pioneer Series (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2005), 219.

<sup>34</sup>The following persons were present at that meeting: Ellen G. White, A. G. Daniells, W. W. Prescott, J. N. Loughborough, S. N. Haskell and Hetty Haskell, W. C. White, C. C. Crisler, and D. E. Robinson. See Daniells to I. A. Ford, July 15, 1908, 1.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., 2.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., 2, 3.

<sup>37</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 21 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1990), 10:334, 359. Prescott apparently dominated the discussion at the meeting at Elmshaven “so thoroughly that the Haskells felt steamrollered.” See Jerry A. Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White: The Relationship Between the Prophet and Her Son*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 19 (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1993), 420. “He had talked for four hours and only then let Haskell and Loughborough respond.” See Valentine, 220.

<sup>38</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223-225.

<sup>39</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106.

<sup>40</sup>Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White*, 6:248.

<sup>41</sup>Stephen N. Haskell to Ellen G. White, December 6, 1909. Valentine, 231, called the statement in the week of prayer reading “a veiled allusion to the idea” of the “daily.”

<sup>42</sup>Bert Haloviak, “In the Shadow of the ‘Daily’: Background and Aftermath of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers’ Conference” (Washington, D.C.: Office of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, November 14, 1979), 37.

<sup>43</sup>Ludwig Richard Conradi to Arthur G. Daniells, October 11, 1910.

<sup>44</sup>William A. Spicer to Ludwig Richard Conradi, September 7, 1910; cf. Conradi to Loughborough, April 16, 1907, 1.

<sup>45</sup>Cf. Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:107, 12:224. They believed that her 1850 statement pertained not to the historical identity of the “daily” but to the time periods. See Arthur G. Daniells, “Interview with Mrs. E.G. White Regarding the Daily,” September 25, 1931; William C. White to George B. Starr, September 22, 1930.

<sup>46</sup>Thus Conradi stated that the term “daily” refers to the true sanctuary service, and “is as far from pertaining to heathenism as day is from night.” Patronizing Loughborough, he told him that he would be happy, if after the latter has studied the matter for himself, he “will in the future present the clear meaning of the Bible to the readers of the *Review*.” See Conradi, April 16, 1907, 2, 4. W. H. Wakeham stated, “How far-fetched it seems to apply this to paganism in the sixth century, and to the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem in A.D. 70, which had not been recognized as a sanctuary of God for 30 years.” See W. H. Wakeham, *Outline Lessons on the Books of Daniel and the Revelation*, Tentative edition (Berrien Springs, Mich.: College Press, 1927), 47.

<sup>47</sup>W. W. Prescott, *The Daily: A Brief Reply to Two Leaflets on This Subject* (n.p.: The Author, [1924]), 1, 23.

<sup>48</sup>*Ibid.*, 1, 23.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>50</sup>Haskell to Ellen G. White, December 6, 1909.

<sup>51</sup>John Kolvoord and Moses E. Kellogg, *The Vision of the Evening and the Morning: A Study of the Prophecy of Daniel VIII* (Battle Creek, Mich.: n.p., 1907), 21-41. Kolvoord had discovered that the word *tāmīd* is connected with the burnt offerings and that the Jews referred to the daily sacrifices later just as the *tāmīd*. He interpreted the little horn as Antiochus IV Epiphanes who took



away the daily sacrifices. See *ibid.*, 21, 22, 49-41. While at this time Kolvoord had already separated himself totally from the church, his published views have certainly caused a certain kind of uneasiness in Adventism, and also among the supporters of the new view, since it was not really a recommendation of their views on the “daily.” When Prescott was asked to rebut this book and affirm the traditional view, he declined because he could not agree with Uriah Smith’s explanations of the “daily.” See Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 218. See also E. J. Waggoner who gave up his belief in the 2,300 years as coming to an end in 1844, interpreting the days no longer as years but as “evening and morning sacrifices.” See Ellet J. Waggoner, *The “Confession of Faith” of Dr. E. J. Waggoner* (n.p.: Albion F. Ballenger, n.d.), 14, 15; Woodrow W. Whidden, *E. J. Waggoner: From the Physician of Good News to the Agent of Division*, Adventist Pioneer Series (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2008), 347. Further, Waggoner rejected the transfer of the sins to the heavenly sanctuary, and its cleansing, based on his erroneous understanding of atonement. See Whidden, 347-354.

<sup>52</sup>Washburn believed that the originators of the new view have been people like E. J. Waggoner, A. T. Jones, J. H. Kellogg, and W. W. Prescott. See Haloviak, 32. See also A. V. Olson, *Through Crisis to Victory, 1888-1901: From the Minneapolis Meeting to the Reorganization of the General Conference* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1966), 304-312, for more information on the diverging path of A. T. Jones.

<sup>53</sup>Stephen N. Haskell to Arthur G. Daniells, January 27, 1908; Daniells to I. A. Ford, July 15, 1908, 2.

<sup>54</sup>Haskell to Daniells, January 27, 1908; Daniells to I. A. Ford, July 15, 1908, 2.

<sup>55</sup>Daniells to Ford, 2, 3.

<sup>56</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106.

<sup>57</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>58</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>59</sup>Conradi to Ellen G. White, April 17, 1906, 6, 7.

<sup>60</sup>Arthur L. White, “Concerning Elder A. G. Daniells: A Statement Relating to Elder A. G. Daniells and the Presidency

of the General Conference” (Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Publications, December 4, 1953), 2. A. G. Daniells did express frequently his desire and hope to get together with the members of the old view group. See Daniells to I. A. Ford, July 15, 1908, 2, 3. When, in May 1910, Ellen White and her son invited the members of both groups to “a meeting for prayer and Bible study,” the supporters of the old view were not willing to participate since in their opinion further dialogue would be fruitless. See Stephen N. Haskell to Ellen G. White, May 30, 1910; William C. White to Starr, September 22, 1930.

<sup>61</sup>O. A. Johnson, *The Daily, Is it Paganism?: A Brief Review and Critical Examination of the Daily in Daniel 8:11, 12, 13; 11:31; 12:11* (College Place, Wash.: The Author, 1909); George I. Butler to Ellen G. White, July 3, 1910; Leon Albert Smith and F. C. Gilbert, “*The Daily*” in *the Prophecy of Daniel* (n.p.: The Authors, n.d.), 2, 31; J. S. Washburn, *The Startling Omega and Its True Genealogy* (Philadelphia, Pa.: The Author, 1920), 9-16; idem, *An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells and an Appeal to the General Conference* (n.p.: The Author, 1922); idem, *The Fruit of the “New Daily”* (Toledo, Ohio: The Author, 1923); Claude E. Holmes, *Have We an Infallible Spirit of Prophecy?* (Washington, D.C.: The Author, 1920), 1, 11.

<sup>62</sup>Washburn, *An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells*, 24, 34.

<sup>63</sup>Washburn, *The Startling Omega and Its True Genealogy*, 16.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., 24, 34. Valentine, *W. W. Prescott*, 220-235, has pointed out that some of the supporters of the old view were suspicious of everything Prescott did.

<sup>65</sup>Washburn, *An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells*, 24, 34. Douglass, 440, shows that other questions were agitated that widened the split in Adventism. Such issues were “the Eastern question, the Arian-Trinity controversy, the two covenants, the ‘daily’ (Dan. 8:11-13), beginning and ending of the 1260 years, . . . the king of the north (Daniel 11),” and “how to interpret Ellen White.”

<sup>66</sup>Washburn, *The Fruit of the “New Daily,”* 12.

<sup>67</sup>George R. Knight, *A Search for Identity: The Development of Seventh-day Adventist Beliefs*, Adventist Heritage Series

(Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2000), 127, 139, 171; Haskell to Ellen G. White, December 6, 1909; Holmes, *Have we an Infallible Spirit of Prophecy?*, 1, 11; Washburn, *The Startling Omega and Its True Genealogy*; Claude E. Holmes to Arthur G. Daniells, May 1, 1922, quoted in Knight, 139.

<sup>68</sup>Washburn, *An Open Letter to Elder A. G. Daniells*, 28.

<sup>69</sup>George B. Starr to C. P. Bollman, September 1930, 3.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid. Daniells had at one point said that the *Early Writings* statement was an “imperfect statement.” See Haloviak, “In the Shadow of the ‘Daily’,” 30.

<sup>71</sup>Starr to Bollman, September 1930, 3.

<sup>72</sup>Daniells, “Interview with Mrs. E.G. White Regarding the Daily.” The content of the interview was apparently written down on September 25, 1931.

<sup>73</sup>Ellen G. White, *Early Writings*, 243; Daniells, “Interview with Mrs. E. G. White Regarding the Daily.”

<sup>74</sup>Daniells, “Interview with Mrs. E. G. White.”

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., quoted in Richard W. Schwarz, *Light Bearers to the Remnant: Denominational History Textbook for Seventh-day Adventist College Classes* (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 1979), 399.

<sup>76</sup>Julia Neuffer, “The Gathering of Israel: A Historical Study of Early Writings, pp. 74—76” (Ellen G. White Estate Research Document), 12.

<sup>77</sup>Ellen G. White, “Pamphlet 20—A Call to the Watchmen,” 1910, 5, 6; idem, *Notebook Leaflets from the Elmshaven Library* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1945), 2:159; idem, *Selected Messages* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1958), 1:164; idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224; Arthur L. White, *The Ellen G. White Writings* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1973), 61.

<sup>78</sup>Ellen G. White, “Pamphlet 20,” 5, 6; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:159; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164; Schwarz, 399; Moon, 422.

<sup>79</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106.

<sup>80</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223-226, 20:21, 22.

<sup>81</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 10:334, 359.

<sup>82</sup>Ellen G. White, "Pamphlet 20," 6, 13; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:159, 161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164, 168; idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106, 20:18.

<sup>83</sup>Such examples were the identity of the 144,000, the law in Galatians, or the identification of the king of the north of Dan 11:40-45. See Robert W. Olson, *101 Questions on the Sanctuary and on Ellen White* (Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1981), 42; Moon, *W. C. White and Ellen G. White*, 415, 416; Gerhard Pfandl, *The Gift of Prophecy: The Role of Ellen White in God's Remnant Church* (Nampa, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2008), 80; Denis Kaiser, "Daniel 11:40-45 in Adventist Perspective: A Historical Survey and Evaluation" (Term paper, Andrews University, 2008), 1, 6, 7. While Ellen White had first refused to identify the law in the book of Galatians, she later stated that it is both laws, "the ceremonial and the moral code of ten commandments." See Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, 1:233-235.

<sup>84</sup>Arthur L. White, *The Ellen G. White Writings*, 60.

<sup>85</sup>John H. Kellogg's pantheistic views about the Godhead, A. F. Ballenger's ideas on the sanctuary, and the theology of the holy flesh movement in Indiana were some prominent examples. See Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, 1:200, 2:31; idem, *Manuscript Release No. 760: The Integrity of the Sanctuary Truth* (Washington, D.C.: Ellen G. White Estate, 1981), 4, 10, 19; cf. "The Role of the Ellen G. White Writings in Doctrinal Matters," *Ministry* 53, no. 10 (1980): 57.

<sup>86</sup>She had an impact on the church's understanding of Christ's eternal, self-existent, and underived nature, the biblical understanding of the divine Trinity. She further confirmed and made contributions to the Adventist sanctuary doctrine, the Sabbath as the seal of God, etc. See LeRoy Edwin Froom, "The Priestly Application of the Atoning Act," *Ministry* 30, no. 2 (1957), 11; 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, 1962); "The Role of the Ellen G. White Writings in Doctrinal Matters," 57; Roy E. Graham, *Ellen G. White: Co-Founder of the Seventh-day*

*Adventist Church*, American University Studies, Series 7: Theology and Religion, vol. 12 (New York: Peter Lang, 1985), 415; Roy Adams, *The Sanctuary: Understanding the Heart of Adventist Theology* (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 1993), 107-109, 154; Woodrow W. Whidden, Jerry Moon and John W. Reeve, *The Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships* (Hagerstown, Md.: Review and Herald, 2002), 190-220; Jerry Moon, "The Adventist Trinity Debate, Part 2: The Role of Ellen G. White," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 41, no. 2 (2003): 275-293; Merlin D. Burt, "History of the Seventh-day Adventist Views on the Trinity," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 17, no. 1 (2006): 125-139; Denis Fortin, "God, the Trinity, and Adventism: An Introduction to the Issues," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 17, no. 1 (2006): 4-10. For confirmatory visions during the early years of the Advent movement see Ellen G. White, *Spiritual Gifts* (Battle Creek, Mich.: James White, 1860), 2:47-49; idem, *Testimonies for the Church* (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2002), 75-87; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:206, 207; idem, *Testimonies to Ministers and Gospel Workers* (Boise, Idaho: Pacific Press, 2003), 24-26.

<sup>87</sup>Robert W. Olson, 45.

<sup>88</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224, 9:106; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:159; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164.

<sup>89</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106, 10:334.

<sup>90</sup>Ellen G. White, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:159; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164.

<sup>91</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:225.

<sup>92</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223-225, 9:107; idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:21, 22.

<sup>93</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223-225. Although Daniells had pledged to lay large plans for evangelism at the 1909 General Conference Session, he spent most of the time in defending the new interpretation of the "daily." See Lyndon de Witt, "Preach, Preacher, Preach," *Ministry*, June 1976, 10.

<sup>94</sup>Ellen G. White, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:159; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:165.

<sup>95</sup>Ellen G. White, "Pamphlet 20," 11, 12; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168.

<sup>96</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106, 107, 20:21; idem, "Pamphlet 20," 12; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:168.

<sup>97</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224.

<sup>98</sup>Ellen G. White, "Pamphlet 20," 6, 7; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:159; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164, 165.

<sup>99</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223-225.

<sup>100</sup>Ellen G. White, "Pamphlet 20," 11; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:160, 161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167.

<sup>101</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:223, 9:105, 106; idem, "Pamphlet 20," 11, 12; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:160, 161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168.

<sup>102</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224, 225.

<sup>103</sup>Ellen G. White, "Pamphlet 20," 11, 12; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168.

<sup>104</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:223.

<sup>105</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106.

<sup>106</sup>Ellen G. White, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:223; idem, "Pamphlet 20," 12; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:168.

<sup>107</sup>Ellen G. White, "Pamphlet 20," 11; idem, *Notebook Leaflets*, 2:161; idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167; idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:225; idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106.