

Did Ellen G. White Change from Non-Trinitarian to Trinitarian?

By Blair Andrew

As Seventh-day Adventists, we have long regarded ourselves as the "people of the Book." However, when doctrinal differences arise within our ranks, what do we do? Often, when agreement cannot be found using scripture alone, quotations from the Spirit of Prophecy are resorted to in an attempt to resolve the issue. Both sides of the argument usually end up at a loss to know why their point of view is not as clear to the other party as it is to them!

This statement affirming the teachings established by our church pioneers is quite clear. God led the Great Second Advent Movement, and He has remained consistent in all His teaching in our past history. It is miraculous that God has preserved the truth through thousands of years, without contradiction. Truth has shone down through the ages, from Eden to Abraham, on to the Israelites, clarified further by Christ Himself,

If we as a people are to be used by God to restore the Gospel to its original purity and share it with a world who is dying to hear it, we are faced with a decision.... It will take prayer and study on the part of all believers, to re-discover the truth as originally given, that we may be prepared for the *true* outpouring of the Latter Rain, and not the false.

We forget Ellen White's words when she said: "The spirit in which you come to the investigation of the Scriptures *will determine the character of the assistant at your side.* Angels from the world of light will be with those who in humility of heart seek for divine guidance....But if the heart is filled with prejudice, Satan is beside you, *and he will set the plain statements of God's Word in a perverted light.*" *Testimonies to Ministers*, p.108. Emphasis supplied.

How careful we need to be, then, in light of the ongoing controversy surrounding the trinity! The spirit in which we investigate the doctrinal change from non-trinitarianism to Trinitarianism is one issue we need to consider carefully and prayerfully. There have been many controversies in Adventism during its brief history. Perhaps the current debate over the trinity is the most far reaching of them all. Obviously, *who* we worship, is more important than *when* and *how* we worship. This whole issue of worship will continue to shake our church, whether we like it or not; and we know it will eventually shake the whole world.

Whenever something like this arises which involves church history, I am reminded of another Ellen White statement we all know so well, "We have nothing to fear for the future, except as we shall forget the way the Lord has led us, *and His teaching in our past history.*" *Life Sketches*, p.196. Emphasis supplied.

and right through to the Advent Movement. Now we find ourselves in a church which advocates teachings which appear to contradict the past history. Is it new light - commonly termed "progressive revelation" - as many claim? Or is it *error*, as others suggest?

DOCTRINAL CHANGE? WHEN & HOW?

It is a well-documented fact that the early Seventh-day Adventist Pioneers were categorically non-trinitarian, and the modern Seventh-day Adventist church today is clearly a trinitarian church. The *current* understanding of our church's history is basically as follows:

The Adventist Pioneers were wrong in their non-trinitarian beliefs and teachings. As God has revealed more light to us as a people, (what might be termed progressive revelation) modern Adventism has grown and advanced, walking in the light, desiring to spiritually move forward in harmony with God's truth. We now have more truth than ever before, and are faithfully preparing the world for the coming of Christ, and His people for translation.

This sounds good, but a question that has not been well addressed nor adequately answered is this: "When and how did this major doctrinal change come about?"

The vast majority of Seventh-day Adventist scholars and theologians attribute the doctrinal change from non-trinitarianism to trinitarianism to the writings of Ellen G. White (i.e., specifically in a book prepared for the non-Adventist market, "The Desire of Ages").

William Johnson in the *Review* put the explanation for change in these words:

Adventist beliefs have changed over the years under the impact of "present truth." Most startling is the teaching regarding Jesus Christ, our Savior and Lord. Many of the pioneers, including James White, J.N. Andrews, Uriah Smith, and J. H. Waggoner, held to an Arian or semi-Arian view - that is, the Son at some point in time before the Creation of our world was generated by the Father. Only gradually did this false doctrine give way to the biblical truth, and largely under the impact of Ellen White's writings in statements such as: "In Christ is life, original, unborrowed, underived" (The Desire of Ages, p. 530). W.G. Johnson, Adventist Review, Jan. 6, 1994, p. 10.

Gilbert Valentine stated it this way:

When did the change to Trinitarianism occur? As Jerry Moon points out, "an irreversible paradigm shift" occurred in the Adventist Church in the 1890's, spurred along by the church's publication of Ellen White's The Desire of Ages in 1898. This influential book on the life of Christ reflected Mrs. White's own developing understanding and called attention "to scriptures whose significance had been overlooked." Its publication contributed to a "complete reversal" of Adventist thinking on the Trinity, and it became a kind of "continental divide." Gilbert M. Valentine, Ministry Magazine, May 2005, p. 14. Article: "How Clear Views of Jesus Developed"

Erwin Gane in his summary on Antitrinitarianism, stated:

What changed the prevailing Seventh-day Adventist view from Arianism to Trinitarianism? The evidence would indicate that it was the publication of the Trinitarian declarations of Ellen G. White in the last decades of the nineteenth century that ini-

tiated the change. It would appear that she wrote little before the early 1890s which could have led to serious questioning of the prevailing Arian view. Most of her statements which appeared before 1890 could have been interpreted to agree with the Arian doctrine. But from the early 1890s on, Ellen G. White produced increasingly unequivocal Trinitarian statements. She did not contradict any position she had formerly taken. Erwin Gane, Anti-trinitarianism, Chapter XVI, Summary.

George Knight in *Ministry* magazine gave this explanation:

It was Ellen White whose writings led the way in the theological shift. Unlike her experience in the post-1844 period, during which she followed the lead of her husband and Bates in the formulation of the distinctive Adventist doctrines, in the 1890's she was at the forefront of the action, related to theological reformulation, through her major writings on Christ and His teachings. . . . it should be obvious to our readers that Adventism has experienced major theological change across the course of its history and that Ellen White had a role in that change. G. Knight, Ministry, Oct, 1993, pp. 10, 11. Article: "Adventists and Change."

This is the prevailing belief of most Adventists today. However, if the above argument is true, it needs careful consideration. Questions arise which need answers.

QUESTIONS THAT NEED ANSWERS

1. Why is there no record of a vision or dream from the Lord telling Ellen White to change her views and to correct the views of the denomination to accept the trinity doctrine?
2. As the prophetess to the last-days remnant church, wouldn't she have been duty-bound to go to the leaders of our denomination at the time, and explain to them their error? Why did she not call a meeting of the leaders and scholars of the church at the time and do this? There is no record of such a meeting.
3. Why didn't she write private "testimonies" to any of the leaders of the church, clarifying

the necessity to change to Trinitarianism? To allow people to continue to believe and teach error, and then just publish a book, and leave it to gradually change the mind of whoever might read it, without even saying to anybody "we were wrong on this matter" - was that Ellen White's way?

4. Why did she choose to publish her new views in an evangelistic book designed for the general public, as if she wanted the world to think we were Trinitarian? Wouldn't this be deceptive on her part, and against Gospel Order (Matt 18:15-17)? The method she chose to employ on this issue opened the whole church to public embarrassment, scandal, and controversy. But nothing came of it at the time. Why is this so?

5. It is a known fact that *The Desire of Ages* was largely compiled from her existing writings, put together by herself and her assistants. It was also a book which took some years to compile. There was no reaction when these so-called "Trinitarian statements" were first published in the years leading up to 1898.

In the history of the Advent Movement, no precedent exists of God using Ellen White to change the whole direction of the church on any given topic.

Why then, in more recent years, do scholars make such strong statements about the importance of the book in changing the direction of the whole denomination, and yet these statements made very little impact on the minds of leaders, scholars, and teachers within the denomination for very many years. Why is this so?

6. Why, in 1903, five years after the publication of *The Desire of Ages*, did Ellen White pen these words:

Many will depart from the faith and give heed to seducing spirits. Patriarchs and Prophets and The Great Controversy are books that are especially adapted to those who have newly come to the faith, that they may be established in the truth. The dangers are pointed out that should be avoided by the churches. Those who become thoroughly acquainted with the lessons in these books will see the dangers before them and will

be able to discern the plain, straight path marked out for them. They will be kept from strange paths. They will make straight paths for their feet, lest the lame be turned out of the way.

In Desire of Ages, Patriarchs and Prophets, The Great Controversy, and in Daniel and the Revelation, there is precious instruction. These books must be regarded as of special importance, and every effort should be made to get them before the people. Evangelism, p. 366 (referencing EGW Letter 229, 1903).

To non-trinitarians, this poses no problem, for all of these are regarded as good, non-trinitarian books. But to a Trinitarian these books are known to contain clear, unequivocal statements which are regarded as non-trinitarian; even *Arian* in their thinking.

7. Why didn't Ellen White organize (in the 17 years after *Desire of Ages* was published) that all of her books be re-edited, to remove any non-trinitarian thoughts, thus aiding the church along on the path of truth?

8. For a prophetess who supposedly borrowed some terms, expressions, and sometimes whole sentences from other writers, why was she meticulously careful never even once to borrow the term 'trinity' or to state it in no uncertain terms?

9. Why did she not rebuke the two messengers of the 1888 Message during the 1890s regarding their views on the Sonship of Christ and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the Latter Rain and Loud Cry, as their views clearly differed from the Trinitarian position?

Are these valid questions? Do you have answers to them?



AND WHAT ABOUT THIS...

In *Ministry* magazine, dated February 1983, the Adventist leadership published a statement of present understanding on "***The inspiration and authority of the Ellen G. White writings.***" Under the heading "**Denials**" we read the following noteworthy points:

3. *We do not believe that the writings of Ellen White function as the foundation and final authority of Christian faith as does Scripture.*
4. *We do not believe that the writings of Ellen White may be used as the basis of doctrine.*

6. *We do not believe that Scripture can be understood only through the writings of Ellen White.*
7. *We do not believe that the writings of Ellen White exhaust the meaning of Scripture.*

Really? It appears we are faced with something of a contradiction. It's one thing to profess something, but if your actions deny your profession, what is the profession worth? In my experience, in every article, sermon, and discussion on the trinity doctrine, when scriptural references are lacking, the weight of the argument is determined by quotations from Ellen White. For a reminder of the common line of reasoning, just refer back to the quotes from our scholars, Johnson, Valentine, Gane, and Knight.

It becomes unmistakably apparent that we have some hard questions that need honest answers before we can hope to get to the truth of the matter.

That said, let us first take a brief look at some of Ellen White's statements written *after* the writing of *The Desire of Ages*, and see if she did actually clearly renounce the old non-trinitarian position.

One thing it is certain is soon to be realized, - the great apostasy, which is developing and increasing and waxing stronger, and will continue to do so until the Lord shall descend from heaven with a shout. We are to hold fast the first principles of our denominated faith, and go forward from strength to increased faith. Ever we are to keep the faith that has been substantiated by the Holy Spirit of God from the earlier events of our experience until the present time." Special Testimonies Series B, No.7, p.57. (December 4, 1905). Emphasis supplied.

The past fifty years have not dimmed one jot or principle of our faith as we received the great and wonderful evidences that were made certain to us in 1844, after the passing of the time. The languishing souls are to be confirmed and quickened according to His word. And many of the ministers of the gospel and the Lord's physicians will have their languishing souls quickened according to the word. Not a word is changed or denied. That which the Holy Spirit testified to as truth after the passing of the time, in our great disappointment, is the solid foundation of truth. Pillars of truth were revealed, and we accepted the foundation principles that have made us what we are -

Seventh-day Adventists, keeping the commandments of God and having the faith of Jesus. Special Testimonies Series B, No.7, pp. 57-58 (1905). Emphasis supplied.

From the above two statements, we see that the truths which the Pioneers believed have been substantiated **by the Holy Spirit** to be truth. Ellen White made these statements in 1905, clearly showing that the doctrines the Pioneers settled upon were the truth, and were **unchanged** at the time of writing. *At no time* did she ever state that any of the doctrines of the pioneers in that time period had been incorrect and/or needed to be revised. **"The past fifty years have not dimmed one jot or principle of our faith,"** is a clear indication of the time period that she is talking about. The *Declaration of the Fundamental Principles taught and practiced by Seventh-day Adventists* were compiled in 1872 by her husband, James White, a practicing non-trinitarian, and stood during this time period. This *Declaration* clearly was *not* a Trinitarian statement of belief.

Two years before this, Ellen White, speaking to the teachers at Emmanuel Missionary College, September 1903, stated,

Perilous times are before us. Every one who has a knowledge of the truth should awake, and place himself, body, soul, and spirit, under the discipline of God. Wake up, brethren, wake up. The enemy is on our track. We must be wide awake, on our guard against him. We must put on the whole armor of God. **We must follow the directions given in the spirit of prophecy.** We must love and obey the truth for this time. **This will save us from accepting strong delusions.** God has spoken to us through his Word. He has spoken to us through the Testimonies to the church, and through the books that have helped to make plain our present duty and the position that we should now occupy. **The warnings that have been given, line upon line, precept upon precept, should be heeded. If we disregard them, what excuse shall we offer?** Spalding and Magan Collection, p. 324. Emphasis supplied.

What was it that Ellen White was warning about? She continued:

The new theories in regard to God and Christ, as brought out in The Living Temple, are not in harmony with the teaching of Christ. The Lord Jesus came to this world to represent the Father. He did not represent God as an essence pervading nature, but as a personal being. Christians should bear in mind that God has a

personality as verily as has Christ. Ibid. Emphasis supplied.

Here we see that Ellen White was warning about "new theories in regard to God and Christ" that were making their way into the church. Repeatedly, Ellen White sounded the warnings not to make God, or Christ, non-entities by blending their personalities. She said, in 1905:

"And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." *All through the Scriptures, the Father and the Son are spoken of as two distinct personages. You will hear men endeavoring to make the Son of God a nonentity. He and the Father are one, but they are two personages. Wrong sentiments regarding this are coming in, and we shall all have to meet them.* *Review and Herald*, July 13, 1905. Emphasis supplied.

Ellen White could see that there was a problem. But what was she referring to? What was it we would "all have to meet"? We now know that it entered the church through the writings of J. H. Kellogg, and it did not end there. The teachings in Kellogg's book, *The Living Temple*, said Ellen White, were only the 'ALPHA' of the danger; the OMEGA was still to come.

In the book "Living Temple" there is presented the alpha of deadly heresies. The omega will follow, and will be received by those who are not willing to heed the warning God has given. *Special Testimonies Series B*, No. 2, p. 50. Emphasis supplied..

What was the *alpha* Ellen White was talking about? History tells us that she was talking about Dr. Kellogg's views on the nature of God, which we have come to understand as Pantheism. But was there more to the picture?

Interestingly enough, Dr. Kellogg admitted he had become Trinitarian in his thinking, with views on the nature of the Holy Spirit which diverged from those of his contemporaries, and yet the topic of the "Alpha" is little preached about today. Today it appears we have ignored this warning, and embraced a highly controversial doctrine that – amazingly - is on that very subject, the nature and personality of God, and which the founding fathers of Adventism condemned in no uncertain manner. It was not until 65 years after her death, at the 1980 General Con-

ference, that the Adventist Church officially became Trinitarian, *and all along there were those who opposed it.*

Without spending more time on the "Alpha" question, which has been dealt with in other books and articles, let us look at a couple of other questions which require answers.

THE 1888 MESSAGE - A DISTINCTLY NON-TRINITARIAN MESSAGE

The Minneapolis General Conference of 1888 is the greatest milestone in Adventist history. Other General Conference sessions since have been hailed as great, glorious events, but none are still talked about as the 1888 session. As recorded in the book *Christ and His Righteousness*, by E J Waggoner, one of the 1888 messengers endorsed for some years by Ellen White, we find Christ set forth as literally and truly the divine Son of God who was begotten in the recesses of eternity past.

Ellen White, God's inspired prophet to His remnant church, fully endorsed the message of Waggoner and Jones, describing it as a most precious message from God, the Third Angel's message in verity. She *enthusiastically endorsed a message which was so decidedly counter to our current teaching on the trinity!* And she believed that if the message had been accepted it would have resulted in the outpouring of the Latter Rain and shortly thereafter, the second coming of Christ!

At the time when we are told the greatest spiritual enlightenment had come to the church and the world, were Ellen White and the leaders so terribly deluded on this topic (i.e., the nature of God) whilst she had everything else correct?

The evidence from history shows that both Waggoner and Jones were non-trinitarian. During Ellen White's lifetime the denominational stance was non-trinitarian. In fact, Adventists were still *opposing* trinitarian concepts coming into the church well into the 1950's and 60's. Opposition continued from retired pastors, teachers, and laymen. But their opposition went unheeded.

Today, it is a minute selection of Ellen White statements which are taken to support the trinity doctrine, despite the vast number of statements which are clearly non-trinitarian. If Ellen White taught the trinity but never used the

term, why is it that it can only be deduced with much controversy, especially when she was supposedly making a decided effort to introduce it?

When Elder M. L. Andreasen, thinking that the statements in *The Desire of Ages* were a new understanding, visited Ellen White to ascertain if she had indeed penned these words, Mrs. White, although confirming that she had written it, did not in any way link this to the trinity doctrine. We have no record of the conversation between Ellen White and Andreasen, and he does not tell us if he asked her the specific purpose of her statements in *The Desire of Ages*. This meeting occurred in 1909. It was not until 1948 that we find Andreasen's first public reference to this in a chapel talk at Loma Linda University. Why did he take so long to comment on it? Isn't it strange that she did not embrace an opportune moment to unequivocally state her dramatic change to a new position, particularly in the presence of one of our young up-and-coming Bible teachers of the time?

THE DESIRE OF AGES

In *Selected Messages, Book I*, p. 296, the same expression as found in *The Desire of Ages*, p. 530 is used under the caption "Christ the Life Giver." Although this expression is commonly used today to argue that the life of Christ was not begotten, i.e., ingenerate, yet in the same chapter she states that this "life, original, unborrowed, and underived" which she describes as immortal life, may also be received as a gift by all repentant sinners. This would be impossible from a Trinitarian understanding. Could it be that we are misunderstanding Ellen White in what she wrote in this much controverted statement?

In the gospel of John we read these words of Christ: "For as the Father hath life in Himself; so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself; and hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of man." John 5:26. This text, which clearly states that Christ was given inherent life by His Father, is in perfect harmony with Ellen White's statement, "life, original, unborrowed, underived," but in no way supports the trinity doctrine. Christ is teaching that He Himself received immortal life from His Father, not as a gift as to sinners, but as His inherent birthright as the only begotten Son of God. Hebrews chapter 1

supports this and gives further insight into it.

Ellen White frequently wrote that the Son of God existed from all eternity. She also wrote that he did not always have a separate existence from His Father, which in turn explains his eternal existence. She was equally categorical that he was truly the Son of God, not by creation, not by adoption, but one begotten from the Father's bosom and made in the express image of His Father's person (*Advent Review & Sabbath Herald*, July 9, 1895; *Signs of The Times*, May 30, 1895). Again, I find it strange that those who claim that Ellen White taught the trinity doctrine totally ignore the statements in which she taught the literal pre-incarnate Sonship of Christ.

Between the writing of *The Desire of Ages* in 1898 and 1915 (when Ellen White died), although she used several "three" statements in regard to the Godhead, she never used the term trinity. Many who claim that these terms such as "heavenly trio" prove that she taught the trinity fail to realize that Ellen White precisely understood what the term "trinity" meant: one Being with three parts or manifestations functioning as three separate persons, whereas a trio meant three persons or personalities functioning harmoniously to effect one common goal. Could it be that Ellen White was aware that to use the word trinity would have misrepresented what she believed?

Unlike some in the church today, she did not believe that "persons" meant exactly the same as "beings." In her writings we find that the term "being(s)" referred to the Father and the Son, who were personal beings. According to the first chapter in *Patriarchs and Prophets*, the third highest "being" in Heaven before the entrance of sin was Lucifer! (p. 35 onward)

Ellen White taught that Christ, the Son of God, was a personal, independent being with His own will and self consciousness, as opposed to the established Trinitarian doctrine which teaches that Christ was a *hypostasis*, i.e., an expression, a mode or extension of the Father. And yet Ellen White is considered to have taught the trinity when her concept of the Sonship of Christ is fundamentally different. In studying the writings of Ellen White, her teachings bear little - or no - resemblance to the established understanding of the trinity, and yet many today will argue that her writings support the doctrine.

IS THERE AN ANSWER?

So, from all of the above, and without writing another book on the topic, we need to ask ourselves the obvious question: Is there an alternative conclusion we can draw? I would suggest that there is.

Could it be that we see our own doctrinal history with pre-conceived vision - glasses darkened with new views that cloud the past?

Could it be that Ellen White was in perfect unity with the non-trinitarian position of her husband and her colleagues, and that there has been a gradual change in *our* understanding on this important doctrine?

Could we have reached a point where the facts are made to *appear* that Ellen White has endorsed this great doctrinal change to the pro-trinitarian position, when in reality she did not? There is a precedent for this. In Leroy E. Froom's monumental work, "*Movement of Destiny*," the author spent considerable time attempting to make the 1888 messengers, Waggoner and Jones, appear to be trinitarian, despite the obvious theological difference in their writings, from which he conveniently neglected to quote.

Froom's agenda is now well known, and an embarrassment to Adventist scholars everywhere. His revisionist history and his work in the Evangelical Conferences of the 1950s left their influence, and a black mark goes down in Adventist history against his name. This information is now readily available, but what did Adventist pastors and laymen believe when his books were first published? As he was regarded as the "official" church historian, his position was generally accepted.

Is history being repeated again - *today*?

IN CONCLUSION

As I have already said, the thoughts and questions in this paper demand answers.

Since becoming non-trinitarian, in 1993, I have yet to find any Trinitarian who deals with this topic in a satisfactory way. Remember, the Adventist Pioneers had clear doctrinal exegesis for all of our beliefs, and yet when it comes to the Trinity – a very recent addition to the Fundamentals – no one as yet has found even **one clear text in Scripture** to prove the doctrine. By this I mean one text (at least) that shows that God is composed of three co-equal,

co-eternal persons or beings composed of the same substance.

Scholars around the world have acknowledged for years that the trinity doctrine is not found in Scripture but is a later addition. And yet people take sides, arguing theology from a few Ellen White statements, ignoring the Word of God and the vast majority of Ellen White

NO ONE AS YET HAS FOUND EVEN ONE CLEAR TEXT IN SCRIPTURE TO PROVE THE DOCTRINE SCHOLARS AROUND THE WORLD HAVE ACKNOWLEDGED FOR YEARS THAT THE TRINITY DOCTRINE IS NOT FOUND IN SCRIPTURE BUT IS A LATER ADDITION.

statements over the whole length of her lifetime. She even told us *how* to interpret her writings, but no scholar to date has taken the time to do it. In 1903 she stated: "The testimonies themselves will be the key that will explain the messages given, as scripture is explained by scripture." *Selected Messages*, Vol. 1, p. 42. She also stated: "He [God] requires of His people faith that rests upon the weight of evidence, not upon perfect knowledge." *Testimonies*, Vol. 3, p. 258.

Some have asked, "Does it really matter which position I take?" My personal study has led me to the realization that acceptance of the trinity doctrine has brought with it a string of other confusing doctrines which grow out of it, the combination of which leads away from the path of truth, into serious error.

The Great Second Advent Movement regarded itself as 'a people of the Book'. So does Seventh-day Adventism. In the history of the Advent Movement, no precedent exists of God using Ellen White to change the whole direction of the church on any given topic. For the "Lord has declared that the history of the past shall be rehearsed as we enter upon the closing work. Every truth that He has given for these last days is to be proclaimed to the world. Every pillar that He has established is to be strengthened. We cannot now step off the foundation that God has established." *Selected Messages*, Vol. 2, p. 390; Ms. 129, 1905.

If we as a people are to be used by God to restore the Gospel to its original purity and share it with a world who is dying to hear it, we are faced with a decision. On either side we have the extremes of Arianism and Trinitarianism. Should we not study the Word and re-

discover the Gospel truth about God, which avoids the pitfalls of both camps and presents the beauty and simplicity of Christ, the divine Son of God, who came and died, that you and I might choose life – life, for all eternity?

“We are to hold fast the first principles of our denominated faith, and go forward from strength to increased faith. Ever we are to keep the faith that has been substantiated by the Holy Spirit of God from the earlier events of our experience until the present time.” EGW, Dec. 4, 1905.

It will take prayer and study on the part of all believers to re-discover the truth as originally given, that we may be prepared for the *true* outpouring of the Latter Rain, and not the false.

Let us not forget these solemn words: "The spirit in which you come to the investigation of the Scriptures *will determine the character of the assistant at your side*. Angels from the world of light will be with those who in humility of heart seek for divine guidance. . . . But if the heart is filled with prejudice, Satan is beside you, and *he will set the plain statements of God's Word in a perverted light*." *Testimony to Ministers*, p. 108. Emphasis supplied.

Obviously, *who* we worship, is more important than *when* and *how* we worship. This whole issue of worship will continue to shake our church, whether we like it or not; ... it will eventually shake the whole world.

“The spirit in which you come to the investigation of the Scriptures will determine the character of the assistant at your side.”

Testimonies to Ministers, 108.

If you have any comments, criticism, or thoughts on this article, or if you wish to read additional pieces on the nature and character of the God whom we worship, feel free to email the author at:
truthvstradition@mail.com