

ELLEN WHITE, WOMEN IN MINISTRY, AND THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN

That Ellen White supported the involvement of women in various forms of ministry is well known and is not something that is debated among Seventh-day Adventists. Many publications, in particular *Daughters of God* and some sections of *Evangelism*,¹ have helped Adventists be more conscious of her thoughts on this subject. And today women are involved in all forms of ministry in the Seventh-day Adventist church. Questions arise, however, as to the level of affirmation and recognition the church should give to these women in ministry. Should it be the same recognition as given to men involved in the same forms of ministry?

There are not many passages to turn to in Ellen White's writings to build a case for or against the ordination of women in the Seventh-day Adventist church—there is no precise “proof text” that says a woman can be ordained to become the senior pastor of a church or a conference president. Hence, many other issues and concepts are brought in, discussed and argued over to support the various perspectives on this issue. Furthermore, so many publications have been written on this subject during the last 40 years that I'm not sure any new thought or argument is now possible. But for the sake of those on this Study Committee who may not have read all the books and articles for and against women's ordination I offer the following thoughts and ideas.

What I would like to offer in this paper is that a careful consideration of Ellen White's thought

on the role of women in the church, taken in its nineteenth-century context, her understanding of the mission of the Seventh-day Adventist church, her counsels regarding ministry and its many functions taken in historical context, and her non-sacramental understanding of ordination and early Seventh-day Adventist practice of ordination, can support the case for allowing the ordination of women today. Ellen White supported the involvement of women in ministry but what is less known is the historical and social contexts in which she made these comments and why. Read in context, what she advocated takes on a new perspective that helps us understand that she was ahead of her time in many ways but also in sync with other movements that advocated giving women a more prominent role in society and in the church. The perspective I draw from Ellen White's writings encourages us to move ahead and stretch out the boundaries of our understanding of ministry and ordination, to step out in faith and to respond to God's leading in the involvement of women in ministry because we have a mission to finish.

1. ELLEN WHITE'S SUPPORT FOR WOMEN IN MINISTRY

The Social Context

During her prophetic ministry, Ellen White not only addressed issues of doctrines and behavior to help prepare God's people for Jesus' second coming,

she also addressed issues of intrinsic evil in society. In her own ways she was an advocate of reforms, a social reformer, and at times she became insistent on these reforms. She readily espoused abolitionism and even advocated social disobedience in response to the federal government's *Fugitive Slave Act* of 1850.² She advocated temperance, the closing of saloons and taverns, and urged women to take a strong stand against the evils of alcohol in their homes and towns.³ She advocated for health reform⁴ and education reform.⁵ Today, we benefit greatly from these reforms and we seldom think about the influence women like Ellen White had in making our society and church what it has become. To a large extent we have forgotten the social conditions in which our ancestors lived.

Early Adventists understood Paul's prophetic words in Galatians 3:28 that "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free man, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ" as the seed of many reforms that led to the abolition of social evils like slavery, class distinctions based on birth rights, and gender exclusion in society and church. Early Adventists were thus abolitionists, social democrats and republicans in government. Given this historical and social context, we can say that to a large extent Ellen White was ahead of her time in advocating some of these reforms. But on the other hand, she was in step with her time and advocated reforms that many other

Christian groups also advocated.

Also in this context is the role of women in society. In general, women had little influence in American society in the nineteenth century. Women could not vote. In many places they could not own property and their wellbeing often depended on a faithful husband or family relations. Few received an education beyond elementary school, and a very small number had a lifelong professional career. Social evils were particularly hard on women. Physical and sexual abuse was rampant, particularly in homes where alcoholism was a factor. Lack of adequate healthcare and poor hygiene deprived women of a good life and frequently caused the death of the mother and/or child in childbirth.

On the other hand, Ellen White was fortunate and blessed to have been raised in a good Christian home, with a devoted believing father who did not drink alcohol, and a mother who cared deeply for her family's spiritual and physical needs and provided them with an education. She knew first-hand the blessings to the parents, children, and by extension to the community, that such a home brings. In her own home, she replicated what she saw her parents do when she was a little girl. Ellen White understood the important role a godly woman could have in the home, in the community, and in the church.

Knowing the context of Ellen White's statements regarding the roles of women in society and in the church helps us also to define a clearer portrait of

Ellen White and her influence, and why she advocated these ideas. Today we have become familiar with many aspects of the roles of women in society and in the church, and we don't think about what life was like a hundred and fifty years ago. We read Ellen White's statements about women in ministry and we give an affirmative nod not realizing that when she stated these ideas she was perceived as pushing the boundaries of normalcy and even the boundaries of decency and propriety. Many men were not happy with her promotion of these ideas and many turned to the Bible to find arguments against the involvement of women. If today we have women in ministry as teachers, evangelists, pastors, administrators, treasurers, and chaplains, it is in part because Ellen White advocated for these roles in the church. And as a church we have followed her lead for over 130 years. Shall we go back on that history and undo this encouragement to women in ministry?

Women Speaking in Religious Meetings

As I've mentioned, a century ago women were not as involved in social or religious public life as they are today. In fact, it was sometimes an inappropriate novelty to see a woman speak in an assembly. Let's remember that Ellen White's first attempts in 1845 and 1846 at communicating the content of her first visions to groups of former Millerites were met with worrisome displeasure from her family. A single woman was not supposed to travel in those years, and even less speak in religious assemblies, unless she was accompanied by a family relation. It was felt unbecoming of her to do this and her behavior caused her family to be concerned about her reputation.⁶

Later in her life, Ellen White became very involved in the temperance movement in the United States. She became known as a good speaker at temperance rallies and drew large crowds of curious

people who, in part, wanted to hear a woman speak. By the end of the nineteenth century it was still a novelty to hear a woman speak in public.⁷ Many people objected to see women speak at religious meetings on the basis of Paul's two admonitions in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 and 1 Timothy 2:12.

Two interesting anecdotes from Ellen White's ministry illustrate a few aspects of this context of women speaking in public and how she personally surmounted the resistance to her public ministry. In October 1870, during a tour of churches in the Midwest, James and Ellen White stopped at a gathering in Tipton, Indiana. In letters to her sons, Willie and Edson, she recounted her meeting with two Methodist women who came to hear her.

Tuesday afternoon [October 11] we left the encampment at Tipton. At the depot we were accosted by two ladies, members of the Methodist church, who had come for the purpose of speaking with me. One had been brought up a Friend, and still retained her "thee" and "thou." Both seemed to have had an experience in the things of religion. They were much pleased with my discourse Sunday afternoon. They, with other Christian women in the place, believed that woman can exert a powerful influence by public labor in the cause of God; but a large class, including the ministers of the several denominations, held that she was entirely out of her place in the desk.

On learning that I was to speak at the campground, both parties determined to go and hear me, agreeing that if I proved myself able to expound the Scriptures to the edification of my hearers, the ministers should cease their opposition to woman's speaking, and, on the other hand, if my remarks failed to be edifying, the ladies would accept the ministers' views upon the point.

*These two ladies came to the meeting feeling that much was at stake. Said they, "We prayed earnestly that God would give you freedom and the power of His grace; and our expectations were more than realized. God helped you to speak. Such an impression was made on this community as was never known before. You have told us truths of which many were ignorant. All will have matter for serious thought. Prejudice against woman's speaking is gone. If the people had known that you would speak to the public, any of the churches in the place would gladly have opened their doors to you." These Christian women then urged us to stay and speak again, but we told them it was impossible. They also invited us to come to the Methodist camp meeting next year, promising us a good hearing. They then bade me Godspeed, and we parted.*⁸

Ten years later, in a letter to her husband James, Ellen White recounted some of the activities she and other colleagues had been involved in near Oakland, California. Among many things, she told James the following.

Elder Haskell talked in the afternoon and his labors were well received. I had in the evening, it was stated, the largest congregation that had ever assembled at Arbuckle. The house was full. Many came from five to ten and twelve miles. The Lord gave me special power in speaking. The congregation listened as if spell-bound. Not one left the house although I talked above one hour. Before I commenced talking, Elder Haskell had a bit [piece] of paper that was handed (him) in quoting [a] certain text prohibiting women speaking in public. He took up the matter in a brief manner and very clearly expressed the meaning of the apostle's words. I understand it was a Cambelite

*[sic] who wrote the objection and it had been well circulated [among the audience] before it reached the desk; but Elder Haskell made it all plain before the people.*⁹

These anecdotes illustrate a few important concepts for our discussion of women in ministry. First, it was a novelty in both Indiana and California to see a woman speak on religious matters and many people felt it was inappropriate. Yet, Ellen White noted that the attendance at both meetings was good, and in California the house was full and no one left the meeting even though she spoke for a long time. We should note as well that she did not see it as her task to argue with people who felt otherwise. She left the responsibility of defending her public ministry to others.

In both anecdotes, Ellen White refers to the opposition against having a woman speak and suggests that this opposition was at times biblically based. At the California meeting, she referred to a note being circulated in the congregation from a "Cambelite," that is a member from the Church of Christ of the restorationist Stone-Campbell movement, who quoted a certain text of scripture about women being prohibited from speaking in public. We are not told what that text was but we can guess that it was either 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 or 1 Timothy 2:12. Christians in the Stone-Campbell movement viewed these two texts as straightforward facts about women, without any need to interpret or understand Paul's context. They viewed Paul's admonition "let your women be silent" as a fact to be obeyed at all times and in all places. Two basic rules of interpretation that guided their study of the Bible—doing only what is specifically commanded or practiced in the New Testament, and paying attention to concrete words, not abstract principles or ideas—prevented the founder of their

movement, Alexander Campbell, from condemning slavery during the American Civil War (because the New Testament says nothing against slavery), but caused him to condemn women preachers (because the New Testament says women should be silent). In contrast, Adventists condemned slavery and encouraged women preachers.¹⁰

Ellen White mentioned to James that Stephen Haskell responded briefly to this “Cambelite” objection before she spoke and “very clearly expressed the meaning of the apostle’s words.” And it is obvious from the context that Ellen White concurred with this explanation.

What did Stephen Haskell say to this audience? What was his belief on this subject of women speaking in church or in public, of women doing ministry? What was his explanation that Ellen White agreed with? Through the 1860s and 1870s, a number of articles appeared in Adventist church publications, the *Review and Herald* and *Signs of the Times*, on this topic of women speaking in religious meetings. Having a woman prophet who spoke regularly in church assemblies and in public meetings was bound to raise some questions in regards to these two key texts of the New Testament, particularly also in the context that the Adventist and Stone-Campbell movements were in constant interactions in the Midwest in the nineteenth century. Three articles on this subject were published in 1879, during the year before this anecdote took place in Ellen White’s ministry.

In January 1879, J. N. Andrews published a short article on women speaking in church in the *Review and Herald*. In this article, Andrews seeks to explain the two main texts used to prohibit women from speaking in church. His purpose is to show that a careful study of these texts cannot support this conclusion. In reference to 1 Corinthians 14:34–35, he explained that Paul’s intent was to avoid confusion

in the church and to urge women to stop chatting between themselves during the worship service. Hence, “what the apostle says to women in such a church as this, and in such a state of things, *is not to be taken as directions to all Christian women in other churches and in other times*, when and where such disorders do not exist.” In regards to 1 Timothy 2:12, Andrews understands “this text to give Paul’s general rule with regard to women as public teachers. But there are some exceptions to this general rule to be drawn even from Paul’s writings, and from other scriptures.” In fact, the evidence Andrews goes on to give indicates that this general rule is rather the exception and that women are free to labor in ministry.¹¹

A few months later that same year, Andrews again published a brief article on this subject, this time in *Signs of the Times*. In response to an article he had read in another paper, which stated that women were not allowed to speak in early Christian churches, he explained that such a position did not concur with the testimony of the Old and New Testaments, and that Paul’s remark in Galatians 3:28 was responsible for the “diffusive benevolence of Christianity” to counter the degradation that women had been subjected to in non-Christian societies. “The number of women of whom honorable mention is made for their labors in the gospel is not small. Now, in view of these facts, how can any man in this age of Bibles say that the Bible does not notice women, or give them a place in the work of God? The Lord chooses his own workers, and he does not judge as man judges. Man looks at the appearance; God judges the heart, and he never makes mistakes.”¹²

One other article published before Ellen White’s anecdotal event in California is an article published by her husband in the *Review and Herald*. While explaining the text in 1 Corinthians 14, James White

conceded that Paul may have referred to women participating in church business meetings but he took the firm position that this text did not refer to a prohibition for women to participate in worship services. Rather “Paul...places men and women side by side in the position and work of teaching and praying in the church of Christ.” White also gave numerous examples of women who ministered for God in the Old and New Testaments to show that there is no such prohibition for women to labor for the gospel or to speak in church assemblies.¹³

The articles published in Adventist papers in this period took the position that what Paul referred to in 1 Corinthians 14 and 1 Timothy 2 had to do with particular situations in the local churches of his time. Paul’s counsel regarding these situations was not applicable to all church congregations. Adventist pioneers did not understand Paul to be enouncing a general and universal ban on women speaking in religious meetings. Many of these articles also referred to many of Paul’s female co-workers to state the obvious conclusion that Paul was therefore not speaking against women in ministry. Furthermore, none of these articles used the argument that a woman prophet (i.e. Ellen White) has a special dispensation from God to speak in church—an argument that is repeatedly used today to circumvent the misunderstood prohibition and to argue that women without a prophetic call from God should not be engaged in public speaking in religious meetings.

Somehow the history of our interpretation of these passages has been forgotten: one of our church founders was a woman and she spoke extensively in congregations. If this was the position taken by our church leaders 130 years ago in an era when women did not have social equality, I believe they would certainly favor women in ministry today and would see no reason to not include women in pastoral and other forms of church ministry. It is in

White also gave numerous examples of women who ministered for God in the Old and New Testaments to show that there is no such prohibition for women to labor for the gospel or to speak in church assemblies.

this context that Ellen White encouraged women to be involved in many aspects of ministry because she genuinely believed that God calls women to ministry just as much as He calls men.

I also find it interesting that in her 70 years of ministry Ellen White never referred to or commented on 1 Corinthians 14:34–35 or 1 Timothy 2:12 to limit the ministry women can do in the church or society. Perhaps her silence speaks volumes as to the importance we should give to these two passages.

2. THE MEANING AND EXTENT OF MINISTRY

Another area of discussion is the level of involvement of women in church work and ministry. Can a woman do all the same activities or functions a man can do? Are there prohibitions, like the concept of male headship¹⁴ and Paul’s admonitions in his epistles, to the extent a woman can work for God in connection with church ministry? That leads us to ponder what Ellen White meant by ministry and a number of statements she penned while she lived in Australia in the 1890s are very instructive.

In 1898, Ellen White spoke quite forcibly about the need to remunerate fairly the spouses of pastors who do team ministry. Even if some men may not have felt comfortable with women doing ministry in partnership with their husbands and be remunerated for it, she argued, “this question is not for men to settle. The Lord has settled it.” She went on to say that God is calling women to engage in ministry

In October 1899, Ellen White restated her conviction that women engaged in ministry should be paid adequately for their work.

and in some instances they will “do more good than the ministers who neglect to visit the flock of God.” Emphatically she stated, “There are women who should labor in the gospel ministry.”¹⁵

This statement immediately raises a question: what did Ellen White mean by “ministry”? Some argue that when she uses the word ministry in reference to men it refers to the gospel ministry of an ordained minister, and when she uses the word in reference to women it refers to other kinds of supportive ministry, like personal evangelism, visiting homes of the poor, teaching the Bible, or canvassing. I personally don’t think such a clear distinction is entirely justified because the meaning of ministry changed in the first decades of the Adventist church and so did the practice of ordination and who received ordination. In the early decades of Adventist work, only the itinerant preacher, or evangelist, was ordained, and he was referred to as an ordained minister or “gospel minister.” Ministry in that time period was focused on the work of the evangelist. With time, however, other kinds of tasks or functions became part of what ministry consists of. The work of Bible workers, literature evangelists, educators, publishing house editors and workers, and other administrators began to be included in the work of ministry for the church. And men in these functions, who at first were not ordained, started to be ordained. These changes and developments need to be part of our understanding of the context in which Ellen White wrote her words

of encouragement to women in ministry.¹⁶ Her encouragements to women help us see this change in the Adventist understanding of ministry, from a narrow meaning to a broad inclusion of many functions, and she consistently encourages women to join in all aspects of ministry. Her encouragements are inclusive and broad.

In 1879, Ellen White addressed a difficult situation at the South Lancaster church in Massachusetts. She felt the ministers working in that church or in the area had not been good leaders. One pastor had “a disposition to dictate and control matters.” Knowing there were “humble, devoted women” in that congregation who had been sneered at by these ministers, she made this comment: “It is not always men who are best adapted to *the successful management of a church*. If faithful women have more deep piety and true devotion than men, *they could indeed by their prayers and their labors do more than men who are unconsecrated in heart and in life.*”¹⁷ In this early statement the ministry ordained ministers do includes management of a church and, in her opinion, women can have that ministry and be just as effective at it as men. Obviously, this statement does not call for the ordination of women but it is the beginning of a pattern in Ellen White’s writings where we see her responding to some situations by inviting the leaders of the church to consider asking women do the work, or part of it, that ordained men do. This division of labor is for Ellen White conducive to facilitating the mission of the church.

Always close to Ellen White’s heart was the work of literature evangelists, selling books filled with truth to those who were not acquainted with the three angels’ messages. In 1880 she stated that literature evangelism was a good preparation for the work of ministers. “If there is one work more important than another, it is that of getting our

publications before the public, thus leading them to search the Scriptures. Missionary work—introducing our publications into families, conversing, and praying with and for them—is a good work and one which will *educate men and women to do pastoral labor*.¹⁸ In this context, she refers to ministry as “pastoral labor” and both men and women can prepare for it through literature evangelism.

Another similar inclusive encouragement to prepare for ministry through literature evangelism comes twenty years later. “All who desire an opportunity for true ministry, and who will give themselves unreservedly to God, will find in the canvassing work opportunities to speak upon many things pertaining to the future, immortal life. The experience thus gained will be of the greatest value to those who are fitting themselves for the *ministry*. It is the accompaniment of *the Holy Spirit of God that prepares workers, both men and women, to become pastors to the flock of God*.”¹⁹ This statement encourages both men and women to prepare themselves for ministry as pastors of churches.

One more statement from 1903.

*The Lord calls upon those connected with our sanitariums, publishing houses, and schools to teach the youth to do evangelistic work.... Young men and young women who should be engaged in the ministry, in Bible work, and in the canvassing work should not be bound down to mechanical employment.... Some will be trained to enter the field as missionary nurses, some as canvassers, and some as gospel ministers.*²⁰

In the last three statements, Ellen White particularly encourages young people to prepare themselves for ministry. Although she may have been aware that there would be limitations to what young women could do or be employed for by the

church, she did not limit the options available to them. If somehow Ellen White believed that the concept of male headship restricts the ministry positions available for women, she had plenty of opportunities to clarify her thought. She never did. Instead, her encouragements to young women are consistently open-ended and inclusive as in this next statement in 1887.

While discussing the need to provide good, solid education to Adventist youth in our schools, she exhorted ministers, Sabbath School teachers and college teachers to do their best to “unite heart and soul and purpose in the work of saving our youth from ruin.” The standard of education should not be lowered because “when suitable men are wanted to fill various positions of trust, they are rare; when women are wanted with well-balanced minds, with not a cheap style of education, but with an education fitting them *for any position of trust*, they are not easily found.”²¹

A careful reflection of Ellen White’s writings reveals another pattern in her counsels regarding the involvement of women in ministry: her counsels are also directed at women of all age groups over an entire lifespan. As we have just seen some of her counsels are addressed to young women and invite them to prepare themselves for ministry through good education and practical experience as in literature evangelism. Some counsels are addressed to mothers and earnestly entreats them to regard their homes as the greatest missionary field.²² Other counsels are addressed to older men and women inviting them to even consider doing missionary work in areas where the gospel has not been preached.²³ And some counsels are directed at married women and spouses of ordained ministers.²⁴ While the home of a married couple can be blessed with children, sometimes the arrival of children may not be what is most desirable for that couple or for their ministry.²⁵

For some women, Ellen White went so far as to recommend they postpone having children in order to allow them many years of useful gospel ministry as she favored ministerial and missionary teams of husband and wife. We will see the example of one such couple below in the last section of this paper.

In October 1899, Ellen White restated her conviction that women engaged in ministry should be paid adequately for their work. In this document it is not clear whether she is referring also to the spouses of ordained men, as she did in 1898, but her statement is nonetheless emphatic.

Women, as well as men, are needed in the work that must be done. Those women who give themselves to the service of the Lord, who labor for the salvation of others by doing house-to-house work, which is as taxing as, and more taxing than standing before a congregation, should receive payment for their labor. If a man is worthy of his hire, so also is a woman.... The tithe should go to those who *labor in word and doctrine*, be they men or women.²⁶

In this statement Ellen White distinguishes the work of the ordained minister who stands before a congregation and that of a woman who gives Bible studies in homes, but she also equalizes the value of both works by stating they are equally “taxing.” Note also that she uses the words of Paul in 1 Timothy 5:17 to refer to the work of elders who “labor in word and doctrine” and uses them to refer to the ministry of women. Is this a clear hint on her part that the ministry of women is as important as that of men? In any case, although men and women do a different kind of ministry, they are equal in value, deserving of tithe support, and constitutive of the work of biblical elders.

3. THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH AND ORDINATION

This last statement leads us to discuss the rite of

ordination in the Adventist church and in the writings of Ellen White. If, guided by the Holy Spirit, further developments and changes were to come along in the Adventist church, would it be possible for women to be ordained to perform these functions of an elder and all these other functions of ministry men are ordained for and that Ellen White encourages women to do? Is there any indication that Ellen White favored their ordination to ministry? Did Ellen White state that ordinations should be limited to biblical precedents?

As already mentioned, in the 1890s and early 1900s, for the most part while laboring in Australia at a time when the needs for church workers were so large and opportunities for ministry so numerous, Ellen White wrote a few remarkable and significant statements regarding ministry and ordination. While she supported the traditional roles of pastor, elder and deacon, it is important to realize that she also recommended for ordination by the laying on of hands people serving in other forms of church ministry, since by then the concept of ministry had broadened to include a variety of activities. These areas of ministry for which she recommended ordination include women involved in personal ministry and other forms of ministry that are known today as chaplaincy, social work, counseling, and medicine.²⁷ Her understanding of ordination and the rite of laying on of hands was grounded upon her beliefs that the dual purpose of the church is to spread the gospel and to prepare the world for the coming of Jesus Christ; therefore, forms of Christian ministry should be adaptable to the current needs, while remaining grounded on biblical principles, and include all Christians in active service. Understanding what Ellen White identified to be the purpose for the church and the meaning of the rite of laying on of hands is important for our discussion.

The Mission of the Church

One of Ellen White's basic ideas regarding the church is that it is the representative of God on earth.²⁸ Within the context of the great controversy theme, she believed that Christians are the instruments that God uses to witness to the universe that He is a God of love, mercy, and justice.²⁹ "God has made His church on the earth a channel of light, and through it He communicates His purposes and His will."³⁰ In this context, her comments about the church emphasize the pragmatic functions of the church, its role and purpose. Although ordained ministers, as servants of God and of the church, are no doubt to act as God's representatives on earth,³¹ they are not the only ones. Every Christian has a role to play within the great controversy at the end of time and is a representative of Christ.³² Indicative of her thoughts on this is the following passage written in 1904:

Brethren and sisters, how much work have you done for God during the past year? Do you think that it is those men only who have been ordained as gospel ministers that are to work for the uplifting of humanity? — No, no! Every one who names the name of Christ is expected by God to engage in this work. The hands of ordination may not have been laid upon you, but you are none the less God's messengers. If you have tasted that the Lord is gracious, if you know his saving power, you can no more keep from telling this to some one else than you can keep the wind from blowing. You will have a word in season for him that is weary. You will guide the feet of the straying back to the fold. Your efforts to help others will be untiring, because God's Spirit is working in you.

While in the Old Testament only certain men ordained to the priesthood could minister within

the earthly sanctuary,³² Ellen White believed that no one is ever restricted from serving God even though one is not an ordained minister. All Christians, regardless of their vocations, are servants of God and in a very broad sense all Christians have a ministry. Even though she never mentioned it as such, she nonetheless affirmed the Protestant concept of the priesthood of all believers. Two passages of Scripture are foremost in her understanding of this concept. The first is 1 Peter 2:9, "But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, that you may declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light" (RSV).³⁴ The second is John 15:16, "Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in My name, He may give it you." Many times she referred to or quoted parts of these passages in support of dedicated Christian service and to insist that all Christians are called, commissioned or ordained by God to serve Him.³⁵

This concept of the priesthood of all believers underlies her understanding of both Christian service and ordination. Throughout her ministry, Ellen White made repeated appeals to church members to engage in wholehearted Christian service. According to her, it is a fatal mistake to believe that only ordained ministers are workers for God and to rely solely on them to accomplish the mission of the church.³⁶ "All who are ordained [i.e. baptized] unto the life of Christ are ordained [i.e. called] to work for the salvation of their fellow-men."³⁷ "Those who stand as leaders in the church of God are to realize that the Saviour's commission is given to all who believe in His name. God will send forth into His vineyard many who have not been dedicated to the ministry by the laying on of hands."³⁸ In a very real

sense, every Christian is thus a minister for God.³⁸

Consequently, Christ calls and spiritually ordains every Christian for ministry. Emphatically, Ellen White asked, “Have you tasted of the powers of the world to come? Have you been eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of God? Then, although ministerial hands may not have been laid upon you in ordination, Christ has laid His hands upon you and has said: ‘Ye are My witnesses.’”⁴⁰ Thus, she could state, “many souls will be saved through the labors of men who have looked to Jesus for their ordination and orders.”⁴¹ Church ordination, therefore, is not a prerequisite to serve God because it is first the Holy Spirit who gives fitness for service to Christians who in faith are willing to serve.⁴²

I believe this is how she also understood her own call to ministry. Although she was never ordained as a minister by the Seventh-day Adventist church, she believed that God himself had ordained her to her prophetic ministry, a spiritual ordination that was by far superior to any forms of human ordination. In her later years, while recalling her experience in the Millerite movement and her first vision, she stated, “In the city of Portland, the Lord ordained me as His messenger, and here my first labors were given to the cause of present truth.”⁴³

From these passages we can draw two initial conclusions concerning Ellen White’s underlying thoughts on ordination. First, Ellen White’s concept of the priesthood of all believers is the fundamental qualification for Christian service; every Christian is intrinsically a servant of God. Second, in a spiritual sense, God ordains every Christian to service.

The Ordination of Paul and Barnabas

A number of passages in Ellen White’s writings give us significant thoughts on the meaning of ordination and in all of them the primary focus of the discussion is the role ordination plays in furthering the

evangelistic mission of the church. These passages include her commentary on the ordination of Paul and Barnabas in Acts 13.

God foresaw the difficulties that His servants would be called to meet, and, in order that their work should be above challenge, He instructed the church by revelation to set them apart publicly to the work of the ministry. Their ordination was a public recognition of their divine appointment to bear to the Gentiles the glad tidings of the gospel.

Both Paul and Barnabas had already received their commission from God Himself, and the ceremony of the laying on of hands added no new grace or virtual qualification. It was an acknowledged form of designation to an appointed office and a recognition of one’s authority in that office. By it the seal of the church was set upon the work of God.

To the Jew this form was a significant one. When a Jewish father blessed his children, he laid his hands reverently upon their heads. When an animal was devoted to sacrifice, the hand of the one invested with priestly authority was laid upon the head of the victim. And when the ministers of the church of believers in Antioch laid their hands upon Paul and Barnabas, they, by that action, asked God to bestow His blessing upon the chosen apostles in their devotion to the specific work to which they had been appointed.

At a later date the rite of ordination by the laying on of hands was greatly abused; unwarrantable importance was attached to the act, as if a power came at once upon those who received such ordination, which immediately qualified them for any and all ministerial work. But in the setting apart of these two apostles, there is no record indicating that any virtue was imparted by the mere act of laying on of hands. There is only the simple record of their ordination and of the bearing that it had on their future work.⁴⁴

Some significant insights about ordination appear in this story. First, Ellen White acknowledged that there is a calling and spiritual appointment before the church ordains someone, and ordination is a public recognition of this prior divine appointment. This, we have already seen, concurs

with her understanding of the spiritual ordination of all believers. Second, she also stated that the rite of ordination does not in itself qualify someone for an office or task, this qualifying has already happened through the work of the Holy Spirit in one's life and ministry; rather, ordination is to be understood as a form of appointment to an office and a recognition that this person is given the authority to perform that office. Third, ordination is also a rite during which the congregation asks "God to bestow *His blessing* upon the chosen apostles". Fourth, ordination is for a *specific work* and is not meant to "immediately" qualify someone "for any and all ministerial work."⁴⁵ This implies there is room for various kinds of laying on of hands, for various kinds of work, ministry, functions or offices, each with specific responsibilities and, therefore, attending authority.

In this context, as we will see below, it is now possible to understand why Ellen White allowed for the church to decide whether some people, other than gospel ministers or itinerant preachers, could be ordained by the laying on of hands for other ministries. If one allows for a missionary understanding of the role of the church, then ordination is also a functional rite to affirm and commission individuals for various ministries and responsibilities that further the mission of the church. There is a world to be warned and a people to be prepared for the second coming of Christ, and those who are thus spiritually qualified should be entrusted with their

There is a world to be warned and a people to be prepared for the second coming of Christ, and those who are thus spiritually qualified should be entrusted with their mission, affirmed, and blessed by the church's laying on of hands.

mission, affirmed, and blessed by the church's laying on of hands.

Ordination of Early Adventist Ministers

Very early in Seventh-day Adventist history, the leading pioneers of the movement felt concerned about the confusion and false teachings that were manifested sometimes among the small group of Sabbatarian Adventist believers. Following the example of New Testament apostles who had set apart elders to oversee local congregations against false teachings and to administer the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper, these early Adventist leaders selected promising men and set them apart with prayer and laying on of hands. The criterion for their ordination was the "full proof" evidence "that they have received their commission from God."

By ordaining them the group of believers "would show the sanction of the church to their going forth as messengers to carry the most solemn message ever given to men."⁴⁶ The ordination of these early Adventist itinerant preachers served as a rite to authorize them to speak on behalf of the church and to preserve order in the emerging church.

Ordination to Other Forms of Ministry

Ellen White earnestly believed that the ordained pastoral ministry alone was not sufficient to fulfill God's commission, that God is calling Christians of all professions to dedicate their lives to his service.⁴⁶

Since the church can acknowledge different kinds of spiritual gifts and ministries beyond those of pastor, elder and deacon to meet the needs of the people, she favored the setting apart of trained professionals, including medical missionaries and those who today would be referred to as chaplains and social workers, by the laying on of hands. Among these groups of ministers, and given a broader definition of what ministry is, would be women who are engaged in personal evangelism. Strictly speaking, these two recommendations do not have biblical precedents but they are possible given her understanding of ministry and ordination.

In 1908, in a manuscript to encourage the mission of Adventist medical institutions, Ellen White wrote about the need for cooperation between gospel workers and medical doctors in Adventist medical institutions. Her desire was to see the medical work of the church as the right arm of the church's evangelistic efforts, and she understood that pastors and medical workers were both essential to this work. She considered the work of the medical profession as a great means for proclaiming the gospel and, for this reason she believed medical missionaries ought to be set apart for God's service. In respect to this, she wrote:

*The work of the true medical missionary is largely a spiritual work. It includes prayer and the laying on of hands; he therefore should be as sacredly set apart for his work as is the minister of the gospel. Those who are selected to act the part of missionary physicians, are to be set apart as such. This will strengthen them against the temptation to withdraw from the sanitarium work to engage in private practice.*⁴⁸

Ellen White believed that the work of the medical profession is a ministry for proclaiming the gospel.

She saw a correlation between the setting apart of the medical missionary and the minister of the gospel and viewed the ceremony of the laying on of hands upon medical missionaries to be a form of ordination. In this ceremony, as with ordination to the more traditional offices of the church, the church acknowledges the blessings of God upon the medical profession and its practitioners, and this recognition by the church serves to strengthen the dedication of the worker in his or her service for God.

In a similar context, in 1895, Ellen White wrote a long article about the work of lay people in local churches. She urged ministers to let lay people work for the church and train them to do so. And she favored that women serving in local ministry also be set apart for the evangelism they do, a work that today would be identified with Bible workers, chaplains and social workers. She counseled:

*Women who are willing to consecrate some of their time to the service of the Lord should be appointed to visit the sick, look after the young, and minister to the necessities of the poor. They should be set apart to this work by prayer and laying on of hands. In some cases they will need to counsel with the church officers or the minister; but if they are devoted women, maintaining a vital connection with God, they will be a power for good in the church. This is another means of strengthening and building up the church. We need to branch out more in our methods of labor.*⁴⁹

Here Ellen White counseled that God is leading the church in setting apart women for these various forms of ministry. It is God's will for the church to branch out, be strengthened and built up by ordaining women and men to serve in the various

forms of gospel ministry and to provide care for the mental, physical and spiritual needs of others. Her understanding of ministry is broad as is her understanding of ordination. Ordination in this context is both asking God's blessing on the individuals and affirming their ministry for the church.

Some have argued that since Ellen White does not use the word ordination in these two examples it should not be implied that she is referring to ordination to ministry, but that she refers only to a kind of spiritual affirmation of some lower types of ministry, like the work of deaconesses in local churches. While this may have been the case in her day, today in most Adventist churches these three types of ministry she mentions are usually done by ordained male pastors or elders, depending on the size of the congregation.

In both examples, Ellen White uses the same words Luke used in Acts 13 to describe Paul and Barnabas' ordination: they were set apart with prayer and laying on of hands. (By the way, Luke does not use the word ordination either.) In her reflection on the ordination of the first Sabbatarian Adventist ministers, she does not use the word ordination but refers to setting apart and commission; yet, we naturally accept that she is referring to ordination. If Ellen White can describe these events as ordinations, we can certainly say her reference to medical missionaries and women being set apart with prayer and laying on of hands are also referring to ordination. What matters here is not whether one event is an ordination and the other is not, on the basis of the presence or absence of the word ordination in her writings; they all refer to the same rite of laying on of hands. Instead of limiting our understanding of what ordination is and for whom it is valid, we need to broaden our understanding to include a variety of meanings and circumstances as Ellen White invited us to do. And, furthermore,

her comment regarding the ordination of medical missionaries is obviously stating that in her mind there is only one kind of laying on of hands: "he [the medical missionary] therefore should be as sacredly set apart for his work *as is the minister of the gospel.*" All these comments give us the picture that Ellen White that her non-sacramental and functional use of the word ordination is better described by the words affirmation and commissioning than by the sacramentally loaded word ordination. Thus, with this context and meaning in mind, her view of the laying on of hands can be and is gender inclusive.

These two statements also support what we saw earlier, that for Ellen White ministry is to be understood in broad terms and cannot be limited only to the work of an itinerant preacher or church pastor. Earlier, in our discussion of her comments about the need to have more women join ministry with their husbands and her invitation to women to be educated for ministry, her statements are clear that whether one is preaching a series of evangelistic meetings or giving a sermon on Sabbath morning, giving Bible studies in homes, or visiting families in need, all these activities are qualified as gospel or pastoral ministry. She invited and urged both men and women to be involved in ministry. She understood that these women "are recognized by God as being as necessary to the work of ministry as their husbands."⁵⁰ Consequently, she approved of their labor in the gospel ministry, noting: "Again and again the Lord has shown me that women teachers are just as greatly needed to do the work to which He has appointed them as are men."⁵¹ Ellen White urged the church to recognize God's call to women by the laying on of hands so that the ministry of the church might be more diversified and complete in both its message and its mission. This picture is also framed in the context of mission. She was passionate about the salvation of the lost and she

felt strongly that all Adventist men and women be active in all facets of ministry. While her concern was missiological (accomplishing the mission of the church), ours has become ecclesiological (determining who has authority in the church).

Some may consider these thoughts somewhat radical and a rupture with the New Testament teaching on the ordination of deacons, elders, and pastors. However, what allowed Ellen White to see the laying on of hands in this broader sense is her non-sacramental, functional view of ordination. Although it symbolizes the giving of church authority, ordination is not primarily for the purpose of granting authority—in our denomination, church assemblies, committees, and boards do this. Ordination affirms the spiritual gifts God has given to a person and invites God’s blessings on this person’s ministry. Such an affirmation is in her view inclusive of males and females and is not to be limited to the ministries of deacons, elders, and pastors. The organization of the church is to be adaptable to the needs of the church wherever it is located in the world so that all may hear the message of God’s salvation in his or her own language and culture. Ordination and the laying on of hands is a means to bless people in ministry and to encourage them to do their ministry with the church’s affirmation. She did not view ordination as a sacrament to be given to only to a few men in the church, who form a cohort or caste of spiritually endowed ministers, and who have sole authority to lead the church.

One more anecdote further illustrates Ellen White’s non-sacramental view of ordination. In 1873, John Tay joined the Seventh-day Adventist church and soon felt called by God to volunteer his time as a missionary in the South Pacific. In 1886, he landed on the island of Pitcairn and succeeded by God’s grace in converting the entire population. But not being an ordained minister, he was not

authorized to baptize the people on the island who accepted the three angels’ messages.⁵¹ Ten years later, Ellen White commented on this event and had this to say.

Another thing I want to tell you that I know from the light as given me: it has been a great mistake that men go out, knowing they are children of God, like Brother Tay, [who] went to Pitcairn as a missionary to do work, [but] that man did not feel at liberty to baptize because he had not been ordained. That is not any of God’s arrangements; it is man’s fixing. When men go out with the burden of the work and to bring souls into the truth, those men are ordained of God, [even] if [they] never have a touch of ceremony of ordination. To say [they] shall not baptize when there is nobody else, [is wrong]. If there is a minister in reach, all right, then they should seek for the ordained minister to do the baptizing, but when the Lord works with a man to bring out a soul here and there, and they know not when the opportunity will come that these precious souls can be baptized, why he should not question about the matter, he should baptize these souls.⁵³

It is an interesting comment for Ellen White to say that the idea that only an ordained minister can perform baptism, even in special circumstances, “is not any of God’s arrangement; it is man’s fixing.” Perhaps she overstated her response to what happened. But nonetheless, there is something in her understanding of ministry and ordination that leads her to say this. In this case, ministry is viewed as non-hierarchical and ordination is viewed as an affirmation of God’s prior spiritual ordination. Her passion for saving the lost is strong and human church limitations on what a layperson can do should not hinder the salvation of souls. If there are

such limitations, even as to prevent baptism in the absence of an ordained minister, they are “man’s fixing.”

Admittedly, and to be fair, she did support the broader principle of unity and church order and agreed that ordination functions as a rite to show that ministers receive authority to work for the church. But if ordination is seen as a way to establish some hierarchy to keep lay people in their lower places, it is obvious here that she did not support such a view. She objected to the idea that *only* ordained ministers can represent the church as their exclusive rights and function. Clearly, in her mind, the link between ordination and granting church authority is somewhat fluid and ordination is more akin to a commissioning to do God’s service for the church.

4. CONTEXT AND HERMENEUTICS

The question of the ordination of women is also a question of hermeneutics and how we understand the relevance and authoritative nature of the writings of Ellen White on this issue. I have attempted so far to present her broad understanding of ministry with multi-faceted functions and tasks, and her broad understanding of ordination as a function of the church to affirm and commission men and women to various forms of ministries and responsibilities. These views of ministry and ordination open avenues that the traditional Catholic sacrament of ordination cannot allow.

It is true that Ellen White did not specifically say that women could be ordained to become senior pastors of churches or conference presidents. But the interpretation of her writings must be done within the circumstances and times she wrote. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, women in general did not occupy leadership functions in churches and society. However, she

encouraged women to be active in a multitude of functions and ministries, and believed that with the proper education, women could occupy “any position of trust.”⁵⁴ Therefore, to limit our current practices to only what the church allowed in her day is not automatically in agreement with her thought.

The interpretation of Ellen White’s testimonies and writings cannot be static because we must understand the times and circumstances that led her to say what she did, and learn from them principles to guide our thinking and actions today. A statement written many years ago may not necessarily have the same force and relevance today as it did then. Attempting to explain how to use her writings, she stated in 1911 that the context of her thought is very important: “Regarding the testimonies, nothing is ignored; nothing is cast aside; but time and place must be considered.”⁵⁵

An example of this is the question of the proper age for school entrance—an idea debated among Adventists a hundred years ago. In 1872, Ellen White had written that “parents should be the only teachers of their children until they have reached eight or ten years of age.”⁵⁶ Many Adventists took this statement as an unvarying rule for the age of entrance into Seventh-day Adventist schools and when in 1904, upon their return to the United States, her son W. C. White and his wife Ethel wished to enter their young children in the newly established school in St. Helena, California, the school administration refused to take their children on the basis of Ellen White’s statement. When she was asked about this, however, she explained that when this counsel was given there were no Adventist schools yet and her counsel had specific reference to the “common” [public] schools. Children younger than 9 or 10 were not prepared to discern and resist the temptations they would meet in the public schools. As the Adventist school system became more extensive,

Rather than limiting ordination to men only, her comments open the door to women being ordained as well.

she advised students of all ages to attend Adventist schools wherever they were available.⁵⁷ She advised using “common sense” in this regard and not to make her comments on entrance age an unbending rule and thus miss the underlying principle.⁵⁸

The Ordination of Some of Our Pioneers

This anecdote illustrates that we must take carefully into consideration the historical context of Ellen White’s writings before coming to any conclusions. One very human tendency is to superimpose our current understanding of issues on prior statements in the writings of Ellen White. Let me illustrate one major problem I see happening today: through the years we have changed our practice regarding the ordination of men but we have not been willing to do the same for women.

George I. Butler became president of the Iowa Conference in June 1865 even though he had “no experience as a preacher.” It was not until June 1867, that he received a ministerial license, and then ordained later that year in September. “Interestingly,” notes Denis Kaiser, “even after he had been elected conference president, the church saw no need to hurry his ordination, as they apparently did not see it as necessary prior to him beginning his service as president.”⁵⁹ Similarly, Uriah Smith became editor of the *Review and Herald* in 1855, secretary of the General Conference in 1863, and president of the Michigan Conference also in 1863, a position he served in intermittently until 1872. He was not ordained until 1874.

Early Seventh-day Adventists ordained only the

ministers among them who had given evidence that they were good evangelists or itinerant preachers. Ordination was a recognition of their gifts and that the church authorized them to be spokesmen for the truth. Those who were not itinerant preachers were not ordained even if they served the church in some capacity. As we grew in numbers and diversified our ministries, the role of ministers changed and those who had responsibilities in the church were also ordained, irrespective of whether they had been itinerant preachers. So our practice of male ordination has evolved since the time of Ellen White to be more inclusive of other male forms of ministry.

The ordination of W. W. Prescott in 1889 is an illustration of that development. Prescott had never worked as a pastor or evangelist, yet during his service as president of Battle Creek College and education secretary of the General Conference, church leaders noticed the fruits of his educational work and his powerful preaching abilities. They were convinced of his divine calling and decided to ordain him in 1889. He counseled with Ellen White about his doubts and whether he should accept ordination. “If he could serve the cause of God any better in receiving ordination and credentials,” she surmised, “it would be best” for him to be ordained.⁶⁰

We should note that the elections of Butler and Smith to their functions would likely not be allowed today with our current church policies. But, in all honesty, that is not an entirely fair historical judgment or interpretation. If Elders Butler and Smith were working for the church today, they would have been ordained by the time they were asked to serve in their functions or would be ordained immediately upon being voted into a function. Our times and practices are different from those of our pioneers and we cannot make direct comparisons and links. We can learn from the past but our present

is different. Who receives ordination today is based on our current understanding of ministry and it is different from what our pioneers understood ministry to be and thus who can be ordained. This also indicates that as we age we are following in the footsteps of many other denominations, and we are giving more and more attention to church structures and ecclesiastical roles, to who has authority within a hierarchy. Our pioneers did not have this preoccupation at first.

If this is what has happened with the development of the practice of ordination for men in ministry, how about the development of the practice of ordination for women in ministry? Why should such a development remain stagnant? In 1895, Ellen White recommended the ordination of women who were involved in visiting the sick, looking after the young, and ministering to the necessities of the poor. Even though some have argued that this ordination referred to the limited role of a deaconess in Ellen White's day, men who do the same functions today are now ordained as ministers or elders. In the 1860s and 1870s, men who did these same activities in local churches would also have been ordained as deacons. But now they are ordained as elders and ministers. Should we not ordain women as ministers or elders as well if they do the same functions as their male counterparts? If it is possible to allow for the development of the practice of ordination for men, why not allow the same for women? These are serious questions that must take into consideration the historical context of Ellen White's writings and our own current context.

If Ellen White was so willing to encourage women in various forms of ministry in the 1890s and 1900s, in a society and context in which women were not encouraged to do so, it is because she believed in a broad gender inclusive ministry to warn a dying world of Christ's soon coming. While

she was not concerned with the women's rights movement of her day, she was concerned about all Seventh-day Adventists joining together to spread the gospel. And today to limit what women can do in the church on the basis of only what the church allowed women to do in her day or on the basis of the limited options for ministry she offered women in those years is taking her comments out of context, a context in which she encouraged progressive and innovative approaches to ministry. Rather than limiting ordination to men only, her comments open the door to women being ordained as well.

C. C. Crisler's Interpretation

In March 1916, a few months after Ellen White died, her secretary C. C. Crisler received a letter from a sister Cox in Texas asking him for Ellen White's opinion and counsel regarding the ordination of women as referred to in the *Review and Herald* article of July 1895.⁶¹ Although he did not presume to interpret what Ellen White meant, he ventured to say that "this article published in the *Review* does not refer to the ordination of women as ministers of the gospel, but rather touches upon the question of setting apart, for special duties in local churches, God-fearing women [as deaconesses] in such churches where circumstances call for such action." He added that "Sister White, personally, was very careful about expressing herself in any wise as to the advisability of ordaining women as gospel ministers. She has often spoken of the perils that such general practice would expose the church to by a gainsaying world;...This is not suggesting, much less saying, that no women are fitted for such public labor, and that none should ever be ordained; it is simply saying that so far as my knowledge extends, Sister White never encouraged church officials to depart from the general customs of the church in those matters."⁶²

Crisler's comments are interesting in a number of ways. First, he refrains from using the word ordination to refer to this action, calling it simply, as Ellen White did, a setting apart and thus attributes much to the absence of the word ordination in this counsel. He also describes these women as doing the work of deaconesses in some local churches where they would be set apart. This in itself would show that these women were undertaking a new kind of ministry not performed heretofore by the average deaconess. Another comment that stands out is Crisler's opinion that Ellen White did not encourage church officials to depart from the church's general customs on this practice and that she was concerned about what people would say regarding such an uncommon practice. Ellen White was careful that the church not expose itself to "a gainsaying world." Although he may have been privy to some information we no longer have, there is no evidence that Ellen White counseled church leaders not to ordain women ministers. Also Crisler believed that the ordination of women to ministry had not been on Ellen White's agenda because she was afraid of what the world would say or that some churches would use this new practice as a way of disparaging the Seventh-day Adventist message.

Crisler's depiction of Ellen White's hesitant role or soft advocacy in some issues is accurate. While she was an uncompromising reformer on some social issues (e.g. temperance and education), in some other areas, she was soft spoken, not willing to raise opposition for the sake of it. When advocating a particular style of reform dress in the 1850s, she encountered some opposition and ridicule that made her back away from her advocacy. On this issue she was careful and measured, and did not wish the health reform message be hijacked by a secondary issue. Her funny-looking reform dress was finally discarded not because it was not a good

idea, but because it was too radical for some people. People made fun of it and discarded her counsels. What mattered was for women to be better dressed; the style and shape of the dress was secondary. The same can be said of her advocacy for the involvement of women in ministry. She was not interested in displacing men from the traditional roles they have had in the family, church and society. Her thought naturally implies that because of their family and social roles, husbands/fathers will tend predominantly to work outside the home and will be more numerous in leadership roles, while wives/mothers will tend to care for the home and children, and have less involvement in church and society. However, this traditional arrangement did not prevent some women from occupying various positions of ministry, even administrative positions, during Ellen White's time.⁶³

Given the social and family constraints of her time, it is still remarkable that Ellen White was able to recommend that more women be involved in active ministry and in spreading the gospel. If there was ever an ideal social and family structure it is likely the one we see in her writings. But times have changed tremendously. Today, in the United States, the ideal family model of a father working outside the home to supply his family's needs while the mother stays home to care for the children is becoming very rare. One-income families have a hard time to survive in our economic conditions and lifestyle expectations. What we find instead in our churches are more and more family units of single parents, multi-generational families, and blended families. Single women (never married, divorced or widowed) form a large segment of our congregations. In our context, Ellen White's appeals for the involvement of more women in all forms of ministry are even more relevant and significant. Our context begs for more women in ministry.

The fact that Ellen White was able to recommend the setting apart of medical missionaries and women involved in ministry indicates that the church should be open to more women in ministry. The ordination of women in the Adventist church is thus possible because she understood ordination as a prayer of divine blessing, as a form of affirmation of one's spiritual gifts, and as a commissioning. In fact, we have already been ordaining women to ministry: we call it commissioning. Based on Ellen White's understanding of ordination we can conclude there is no difference between the two rites, they are one and the same. The setting apart by laying on of hands and prayer is a means to commission someone to ministry. The church decides what authority comes along with that ministry, what the ministry is, and the person's qualification to perform it. It is not the rite of ordination that determines these factors.

5. ALLOWANCE FOR DIVERSITY

One last area of theological reflection on Ellen White's writings I'd like to offer is regarding the allowance for diversity of thoughts, opinions and practices she advocated in her life and ministry. We have a history of allowance for diversity within the Seventh-day Adventist church.

This year marks the 125th anniversary of the 1888 General Conference session in Minneapolis, Minnesota. What we remember most about this session is the acrimonious debates before and during this session. Two "major" issues were argued over: the identity of the law Paul referred to in Galatians 3:24 and the identity of the ten northern European tribes that fulfilled the end of the prophecy of Daniel 7. Some leaders and pioneers of our church felt the Seventh-day Adventist church could not change its teachings on these. Others felt it behooved Adventists to be faithful to Scripture and

history and provide more accurate interpretations of these two passages.

Both sides of these controversies wished for Ellen White to provide the definitive interpretation and thus close the debates. But she refused to do so and she objected to such a use of her writings. Instead she pleaded with the delegates to study their Bibles and to come to some conclusions by themselves. In the end she commented that these two issues were not key, "landmark" doctrines of the Seventh-day Adventist church and diversity of opinions was possible. What mattered most for her was the exhibition of a proper, cordial and gentle spirit among the delegates and unity in the mission of the church.⁶³

Another such argument occurred around 1910 regarding the interpretation of the word "daily" in the prophecy of Daniel 8:11-13. Again, people appealed to Ellen White's writings to settle the issue and again she refused to do so. She did not believe this issue was a "test question" and did not think her writings provided an exegetical interpretation of the passage. Like the other controversies in 1888, her main concern was directed toward the disunity, the rancor, the time spent in debate, and the distraction from evangelism.⁶⁵

I find these two controversies give us a paradigm for the use of Ellen White's writings in the interpretation of Scripture and they also show that her concern was primarily with church unity and mission rather than focusing on dividing, secondary issues. I cannot but muse about what she would say today regarding our use of her writings to muster support for one or the other side of our ordination debate. In the end, I learn also from these discussions that Ellen White allowed for diversity of thought for questions that she felt were secondary and not key doctrinal beliefs of our church.

Many other examples of allowance for diversity could be given. We could reflect on the church's

But an organization must look carefully at its past and not idolize it or fossilize it if the organization is to continue to be relevant in its constantly changing context.

teaching on vegetarianism and the importance Ellen White gave it, even that eating of meat must ultimately be discarded at the end of time, yet allowed for flexibility and personal choices.⁶⁶ I have already alluded to the age of school entrance and who can perform baptisms in special circumstances. We could talk about the crucial role of a mother in the

home in raising and caring for her children,⁶⁷ yet she herself allowed for exceptions and, for five years, gave the responsibility of raising her first son Henry to a trusted family while she and her husband preached the three angels' messages. She did not feel good about this, but understood God called her to make this sacrifice.⁶⁸ To some extent, personal circumstances and contexts allowed for exceptions and differences of opinions and practices.

I understand that allowing for exceptions may not be considered a good thing because there's a strong tendency among Adventists to call for uniformity of beliefs and practices. Sometimes we tend to do this when it comes to secondary issues and beliefs. At the same time it is difficult to pigeonhole Ellen White when it comes to the behavior of others. There seems to be exceptions to hard-core rules: goals, values, and ideals are taught, but often displaced by or accommodated to the realities of life.

When it comes to the assigned ideal role of women in family, church and society, there are ideals that she taught, and then sometimes there is the reality of a particular circumstance and context. One of Ellen White's most prominent teachings, as we have seen, is her insistence that both men and women be involved in evangelistic ministry, but children in the home can interfere with the woman's

ministry. One such example is the case of Isaac and Adelia Van Horn who were married by James White in 1865. Soon after their marriage they went as a pioneer missionary couple to Washington and Oregon. Ellen White was disappointed when they began to have children for this interfered with their joint ministry.⁶⁹ Many years later, she reminded them of James's words at their wedding:

I remember the words of my husband when you were sent into this new field. They were these: "Isaac and Adelia, God would have you enter this new field together unitedly in the work. I would not trust you, Isaac, alone where you might lack in the financial working of the cause. Adelia will help you out with her business tact where you would be more inclined to be easy and not thorough in the work. Adelia will be your good [partner] to spur you up to energy. Both of you will make a perfect whole. God would have Adelia in the field. He would have you work side by side together, for this, the Lord has shown, was His will. We can afford to pay you better wages, with Adelia to help you, than for your labors alone. The Lord will bless you together."⁷¹

Ellen White then continued, writing to Isaac, "God did not ordain that you should take Adelia out of the field. God did not ordain that you should accumulate family cares to take yourself out of the field." However we interpret this situation, Ellen White desired for both Isaac and Adelia to be involved in ministry, and Adelia's talents were particularly needed in this missionary context. Ellen White felt the Van Horns had not been true to their calling by having children so soon after they entered ministry together. Exceptions to the ideals of a family home are sometimes needed.

Some people build intricate schemes of interpretation of the writings of Ellen White to categorize the goals, ideals and values that she espoused regarding women in general and to impose a limit on what women can do in the church today. There are those who advocate that families, church life and society today should be following the same arrangements that Ellen White experienced in her day, or witnessed in her visions and wrote about in her writings. This grand scheme and ideal is sometimes based on an understanding of the relationship between the persons of the Godhead, that Jesus was submitted to the Father and thus implying there is an intrinsic value for some people in church and society to be submitted to others. The same goes with the ranking and hierarchy of angels in heaven.⁷¹

Ellen White saw all these beautiful and inspiring scenes of angels in her visions. She wrote about the order and harmony she saw in heaven which gave her reasons for advocating order and harmony in the early Seventh-day Adventist church organization.⁷² Yet she urged the involvement of all people in church life, rebuked those elected and ordained to work for the church who used a form of kingly power to get what they wanted and to displace others from participating in the life of the church. She decried the use of power and authority on the basis of one's hierarchical standing in the church; no one has an intrinsic rank or importance that positions him as superior to others. While she affirmed leadership positions to facilitate the good and proper operations of the church, and to avoid anarchy, confusion, and false teachings, a form of hierarchicalism that displaces, supplants or controls others is not condoned in her writings. And she never used any of these concepts to limit what women can do in the church.

In any social organization, including churches, there is a conservative element that prevents developments that appear to remove traditional ways of

doing things. For many, it is fine to leave things as they are. But there is also a progressive element that wishes to see things change in order to see progress when things begin to stagnate. So there's a tension between traditionalist tendencies and progressive tendencies. Neither is bad. But an organization must look carefully at its past and not idolize it or fossilize it if the organization is to continue to be relevant in its constantly-changing context.

As I see it, the mission of our church has been for over 150 years to preach the three angels' message to the world and to prepare a people for Christ's soon return. To that end and for that purpose, Ellen White understood that all Seventh-day Adventists must be involved in this mission, both men and women, lay people and ordained pastors, young and old—all have a role to play in this grand mission. Throughout her ministry she encouraged and urged men and women to be involved.

As I see it also, the inclusion of women in ministry will only facilitate the completion of our mission. To think that only ordained men can do some of this work, or that only men can have a place or role to play in the accomplishment of some parts of this mission, is to me a traditionalist approach to our mission that will only hinder what we are about. I don't think Ellen White would approve of this in this day and age in many parts of the world. Maybe she would say we are hindering the role and ministry of women by refusing them to be ordained, and that it is unfair to have them do all the work and not have the blessing of the church to do so. She said the same thing about the unfairness of the pay scale for women while she lived in Australia. Her own life and ministry allowed for diversity of opinions on many questions and issues. She allowed for exceptions to some rules or ideals when the context demanded them.

In 1892, she stated, "We cannot then take a

position that the unity of the church consists in viewing every text of Scripture in the very same light. The church may pass resolution upon resolution to put down all disagreement of opinions, but we cannot force the mind and will, and thus root out disagreement. These resolutions may conceal the discord, but they cannot quench it and establish perfect agreement.”⁷³

CONCLUSION

In this paper I have attempted to build from Ellen White’s writings and her context a theological framework to understand first what ministry and ordination are and then how it can allow for the ordination of women. This framework is built on what she believed to be the role and mission of the church, that all Christians have a role to play in fulfilling this mission, and that women have an essential role in the church.

We find many insights in her writings regarding what she understood ordination to mean. First, all believers are spiritually ordained by God to participate in the mission of the church. This is the fundamental qualification for Christian service; every Christian is intrinsically a servant of God. This does not supersede the specific roles of church officers and pastors, but it indicates that ministry is inclusive. This spiritual ordination goes so far as to allow any Christian to baptize someone when special circumstances demand it.

Significant insights about ordination appear in Ellen White’s commentary on the story of the ordination of Paul and Barnabas in Acts 13. First, she acknowledged that there is a calling and spiritual appointment before the church ordains someone, and ordination is a public recognition of this prior divine appointment. Second, she also stated that the rite of ordination does not in itself qualify someone for an office or task, this qualifying has

already happened through the work of the Holy Spirit in one’s life and ministry, and through a good education; rather, ordination is to be understood as a form of appointment to an office or a task and a recognition that this person has the authority to perform that task. Third, ordination is also a rite during which the congregation asks God to bestow His blessing upon the chosen person. Fourth, ordination is for a specific work and is not meant to “immediately” qualify someone “for any and all ministerial work.” This implies there is room for various kinds of laying on of hands, for various kinds of work, ministry, functions or offices, each with specific responsibilities and, therefore, attending authority.

Ellen White’s recommendation that there be an ordination for medical missionaries and women in ministry is based on her understanding that gospel ministry is a broad activity and not limited to what pastors do for the church. In these recommendations, which do not find their precedent in Scripture, she invites the church to broaden its understanding of ministry and compares the ordination of medical missionaries to that of a pastor. In this context, Ellen White understood ordination as a form of affirmation or commissioning. Thus, with this context and meaning in mind, her view of the laying on of hands can be and is gender inclusive. All these insights lead us to see that Ellen White understood ordination as an ordinance at the service of the church to commission people in various kinds of ministry and responsibilities, and to ask God’s blessing on their ministry. There is no indication in her writings that the rite of ordination should be limited only to men or that it should be used to establish some kind of church hierarchy. She never referred to some key texts like 1 Corinthians 14:33–35 or 1 Timothy 2:12 to limit the ministry of women in the church. Theological concepts like male headship

in the church, the subordination of Jesus to the Father or the hierarchy of angels in heaven are never used in her writings to prevent women from some forms of ministry that would be only accessible for men. She emphatically encouraged the involvement of women in all forms of ministry.

Ellen White allowed for diversity of thought and practice in many areas of personal and church life, in beliefs and behavior. I think we are all in agreement that ordination is not a key, fundamental belief of the Seventh-day Adventist church. In that case, we can allow for differences of opinions and practices. Instead of dividing ourselves over this issue, we should go forward with the mission of our church.

It seems to me that the core of our current discussion is whether women in ministry should have the same authority as men have. In many functions,

they already do and we commission (ordain) them to do so. Based on Ellen White's writings, interpreted within her context, we have followed her lead and, according to our various cultural and national circumstances, have given women the opportunities to serve in a multitude of ministry functions. The question now is whether these women could be given the authority to perform a few more tasks (ordain church elders, organize or disband churches, serve as conference presidents). My reading of Ellen White's writings leads me to ask a simple question: why not? Why should we not give women in ministry the authority to do these other tasks? Why can we not trust women to be as competent in these other functions? I think Ellen White would still say that competent women can be given "any position of trust" and be set apart for them. ■



Denis Fortin, Ph.D.

Denis Fortin is a professor of theology at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. He holds a doctorate degree in historical theology from Université Laval, Canada. Fortin is author of *Adventism in Quebec: The Dynamics of Rural Church Growth* (Andrews University Press, 2004) and co-editor of the *Ellen G. White Encyclopedia* (Review and Herald, 2013).

- 1 *Evangelism*, 456–495.
- 2 This act created much division among the population and set the stage for civil disobedience among abolitionists and Sabbatarian Adventists. The Fugitive Slave Act imposed heavy penalties on those who refused to help government slave catchers or who obstructed the recapture of a fugitive slave. Northerners were held directly responsible for helping recapture slaves who fled to the north. Ellen White stood firmly against slavery and saw it as a moral evil. She straightforwardly advocated civil disobedience in regard to the Fugitive Slave Act. “I was shown that we have men placed over us for rulers, and laws to govern the people. Were it not for these laws, the world would be in a worse condition than it is now. Some of these laws are good, and some bad. The bad have been increasing, and we are yet to be brought into straight places. But God will sustain his people in being firm, and living up to the principles of his word. Where the laws of men conflict with God’s word and law, we are to obey the word and law of God, whatever the consequences may be. The laws of our land requiring us to deliver a slave to his master, we are not to obey, and we must abide the consequences of the violation of this law. This slave is not the property of any man. God is his rightful Master, and man has no right to take God’s workmanship into his hands, and claim his as his own” (*Testimonies for the Church*, 1:201–202).
- 3 See *Gospel Workers*, 384–388 and her book *Temperance*.
- 4 See, for example, her books *Ministry of Healing and Counsels on Health*.
- 5 See, for example, her books *Education and Counsels to Parents, Teachers and Students*.
- 6 *Spiritual Gifts*, 2:39; “Looking for that Blessed Hope,” *Signs of the Times*, June 24, 1889.
- 7 George R. Knight, *Ellen White’s World: A Fascinating Look at the Times in Which She Lived* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1998), 105–109.
- 8 Ellen G. White to Edson and Emma White, October 17 (Letter 16a), 1870; Ellen G. White to W. C. White, October 17 (Letter 16), 1870.
- 9 Ellen G. White to James White, April 1 (Letter 17a), 1880.
- 10 See Gerry Chudleigh, “The Campbellite and Mrs. White,” *Pacific Union Recorder*, (112:7) July 2012, 6. One of my doctoral students, Wendy Jackson, professor at Avondale College in Australia, is completing a dissertation comparing Alexander Campbell and Ellen White’s views of church unity. Her study is a fascinating comparison of their biblical hermeneutics and doctrine of the church.
- 11 J. N. Andrews, “May Women Speak in Meeting?” *Review and Herald*, January 2, 1879, p. 324 (emphasis added).
- 12 J. N. Andrews, “Women in the Bible,” *Signs of the Times*, October 30, 1879, p. 324.
- 13 James White, “Women in the Church,” *Review and Herald*, May 29, 1879, p. 172.
- 14 Ellen White spoke in favor of male headship in the home but did not transfer this concept to the church or society. Furthermore, she based her thoughts on male headship in the home on the result of the fall of Adam and Eve, and not on the order of the creation of Eve after Adam. See *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 58–59. *If the concept of male headship is rooted in the creation order before the fall, then it becomes a permanent status and invariably applies to all men and women in the church and society.*
- 15 “The Laborer Is Worthy of His Hire,” Manuscript 43a, 1898, in *Manuscript Releases*, 5:324–327.
- 16 I am grateful for insights I received from Denis Kaiser, a doctoral student at Andrews University, who has done recently a study of the development of rite of ordination and concept of ministry in the Seventh-day Adventist church from 1850 to 1920. His study was commissioned by the Inter-European Division of Seventh-day Adventists. Denis Kaiser, “Setting Apart for the Ministry: Theory and Practices in Seventh-day Adventism (1850–1920),” paper prepared for the Biblical Research Committee of the Inter-European Division, March 18, 2013; slightly revised May 13, 2013.
- 17 Ellen G. White to Brother Johnson, n.d. (Letter 33), 1879, in *Manuscript Releases*, 19:56 (emphasis added).
- 18 *Testimonies for the Church*, 4:390 (emphasis added).
- 19 *Testimonies for the Church*, 6:322 (emphasis added).
- 20 *Testimonies for the Church*, 8:229–230 (emphasis added).
- 21 *Review and Herald*, June 21, 1887, in *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, 117–118 (emphasis added).
- 22 *Adventist Home*, 35.
- 23 *Retirement Years*, 26.
- 24 “The Laborer Is Worthy of His Hire,” Manuscript 43a, 1898, in *Manuscript Releases*, 5:324–327.
- 25 In 1898, Ellen White had this to say regarding the adoption of children by ministers’ families. “Letters have come to me from several, asking my advice upon the question, Should ministers’ wives adopt infant children? Would I advise them to do this kind of work. To some who were regarding this matter favorably, I answered, No; God would have you help your husband in his work. The Lord has not given you children of your own; His wisdom is not to be questioned. He knows what is best. Consecrate your powers to God as a Christian worker. You can help your husband in many ways. You can support him in his work by working for him, by keeping your intellect improved. By using the ability God has given you, you can be a home-keeper. And more than this, you can help to give the message” (Manuscript 43a, 1898, in *Manuscript Releases*, 5:325).
- 26 “All Kinds of Workers Needed,” Manuscript 149, 1899, in *Manuscript Releases*, 18:66–67 (emphasis added).
- 27 I owe this insight to Leanne M. Sigvartsen, who has written on Ellen White’s counsels regarding women engaged in various forms of ministry while she lived in Australia. Sigvartsen’s essay, “The Role of Women in the Early Seventh-day Adventist Church,” will appear in the forthcoming revised edition of *Women in Ministry* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press).
- 28 *The Desire of Ages*, 290.
- 29 *Testimonies for the Church*, 6:12.
- 30 *The Acts of the Apostles*, 163. Two chapters, in particular, clearly present her understanding of the purpose of the church: “God’s Purpose in the Church,” *Testimonies for the Church*, 6:9–13, and “God’s purpose for His Church,” *The Acts of the Apostles*, 9–16.
- 31 One good example of this is the chapter “A Consecrated Ministry” in *The Acts of the Apostles*, 359–371.
- 32 “A Preparation for the Coming of the Lord,” *Review and Herald*, November 24, 1904 (emphasis added).
- 33 See Ellen White’s comments in connection with the rebellion of Korah in *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 398–399.
- 34 Three centuries before Ellen White, Martin Luther also appealed to 1 Peter 2:9 to express his belief that every Christian is a priest for God. In a 1520 treatise, in which he invited the German princes to reform the church, he wrote, “The fact is that our baptism consecrates us all without exception, and makes us all priests” (An appeal to the ruling class of German nationality as to the amelioration of the state of Christendom in John Dillenberger, ed., *Martin Luther: Selections from his writings* (New York: Doubleday, 1962), 408).
- 35 Concerning 1 Peter 2:9 see, for example, *Testimonies to Ministers*, 422, 441; *Testimonies for the Church*, 2:169; 6:123, 274. For John 15:16 see, *Testimonies to Ministers*, 212–213.
- 36 “The Great Commission; a Call to Service,” *Review and Herald*, March 24, 1910.
- 37 “Our Work,” *Signs of the Times*, August 25, 1898.

- 38 *The Acts of the Apostles*, 110.
- 39 "A Preparation for the Coming of the Lord," *Review and Herald*, November 24, 1904.
- 40 *Testimonies for the Church*, 6:444 (emphasis added).
- 41 "Words to Our Workers," *Review and Herald*, April 21, 1903.
- 42 *The Acts of the Apostles*, 40.
- 43 Ellen G. White to "Dear Brethren and Sisters," October 19 (Letter 138), 1909, quoted in Arthur L. White, *Ellen G. White: The Later Elmshaven Years, 1905–1915*, 211 (emphasis added).
- 44 *The Acts of the Apostles*, 161–162 (emphasis added).
- 45 There is much confusion regarding the meaning of an office in Scripture and the writings of Ellen White. This passage indicates that an office, like that of the apostles Paul and Barnabas, is related to a function, task or work. The office of apostle is for a specific work in the church, and in the case of Paul and Barnabas it was to preach the gospel to Gentiles. Her comment, "At a later date the rite of ordination by the laying on of hands was greatly abused; unwarrantable importance was attached to the act, as if a power came at once upon those who received such ordination, which immediately qualified them for any and all ministerial work", seems to indicate again that someone's ordination should not be understood as necessarily qualifying this person for other future tasks he may be asked to perform. Rather, ordination is for a specific task. This comment invites some reflection on the Seventh-day Adventist practice of ordaining someone for life for any and all ministerial functions someone may be asked to perform thereafter. Traditionally, one's ordination to Seventh-day Adventist ministry has served as an initiation rite that qualifies one to perform all future tasks of ministry, including pastoral ministry, evangelism, teaching, leadership and administration. This ordination also remains valid in retirement even if the minister no longer functions in a ministry role.
- 46 *Early Writings*, 100–101. It is interesting to note that in this passage Ellen White does not use the word ordination, but rather refers to this rite as a setting apart and a commission. This indicates that she uses these words and concepts synonymously.
- 47 *Medical Ministry*, 248–249.
- 48 Manuscript 5, 1908, in *Evangelism*, 546 (emphasis added).
- 49 "The Duty of the Minister and the People," *Review and Herald*, July 9, 1895, (emphasis added).
- 50 Manuscript 43a, 1898, in *Manuscript Releases*, 5:323.
- 51 *Ibid.*, 5:325.
- 52 In 1879, the General Conference voted that "none but those who are Scripturally ordained are properly qualified to administer baptism and the other ordinances." G. I. Butler, "Eighteenth Annual Session, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists: Twelfth Meeting, November 24, 1879, 7 p.m.," Battle Creek, Mich., General Conferences Archives.
- 53 "Remarks Concerning the Foreign Mission Work," Manuscript 75, 1896 (emphasis added).
- 54 *Fundamentals of Christian Education*, 117, 118.
- 55 "Regarding the Testimonies," Manuscript 23, 1911, in *Selected Messages*, 1:57.
- 56 *Testimonies for the Church*, 3:137.
- 57 *Medical Ministry*, 57, 58.
- 58 An interview with Ellen White, "Counsel on Age of School Entrance," Manuscript 7, 1904, in *Selected Messages*, 3:214–226.
- 59 Kaiser, 33.
- 60 Manuscript 23, 1889, in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:57; Gilbert M. Valentine, W.W. Prescott: *Forgotten Giant of Adventism's Second Generation*, *Adventist Pioneer Series* (Hagerstown, Md.: *Review and Herald*, 2005), 80–81.
- 61 See our discussion of this article on pp. 18–19 above.
- 62 C. C. Crisler to Mrs. L. E. Cox, March 12 and 22, 1916, in *Daughters of God*, 253–255.
- 63 Many studies have shown the involvement of women in various forms of ministry during Ellen White's time. Beverly Beem and Ginger Hanks Harwood, "Your Daughters Shall Prophecy": James White, Uriah Smith, and the "Triumphant Vindication of the Right of the Sisters to Preach," *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 43:1 (2005), 41–58.
- 64 Ellen G. White to "Brethren," August 5 (Letter 20), 1888, in 1888 *Materials*, 38–46. A short summary of the issues discussed at the session is A. V. Wallenkampf, *What Every Adventist Should Know About 1888* (Washington, DC: *Review and Herald*, 1988).
- 65 Ellen G. White to "My Brethren in the Ministry," August 3 (Letter 62), 1910, in *Paulson Collection*, 42–44.
- 66 *Counsels on Diet and Foods*, 380–381. See the entire chapter, 373–416.
- 67 *Child Guidance*, 21–22.
- 68 *Spiritual Gifts*, 2:iii.
- 69 Ellen G. White to Isaac and Adelia Van Horn, (Letter 48) 1876, in *Daughters of God*, 138–140.
- 70 Ellen G. White to Isaac Van Horn, February 26 (Letter 8), 1884.
- 71 Such a scheme leads most readily to an Arian view of the divinity of Christ. Ellen White believed in the eternal equality of all three persons of the Godhead. Here's a sample of her thoughts: "This Saviour was the brightness of His Father's glory and the express image of His person. He possessed divine majesty, perfection, and excellence. He was equal with God" (1869; *Testimonies for the Church*, 2:200). "Before the entrance of evil, there was peace and joy throughout the universe. . . . Christ the Word, the only begotten of God, was one with the eternal Father,—one in nature, in character, and in purpose,—the only being in all the universe that could enter into all the counsels and purposes of God. By Christ, the Father wrought in the creation of all heavenly beings. . . . and to Christ, equally with the Father, all Heaven gave allegiance" (1888; *The Great Controversy*, 1888 ed., 493). "He [Christ] 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. He was the surpassing glory of heaven. He was the commander of the heavenly intelligences, and the adoring homage of the angels was received by Him as His right" (1906; *Review and Herald*, April 5, 1906).
- 72 *Early Writings*, 97.
- 73 "Love, the Need of the Church," Manuscript 24, 1892, in *Manuscript Releases*, 11:266.