

The Word, the Spirit of Prophecy, and Mutual Love: Lessons from the “Daily” Controversy for Conflict Resolution

Denis Kaiser
Berrien Springs, Michigan

Introduction

Theological disputes and controversies of minor and major significance probably characterize the experience of every Christian denomination. Seventh-day Adventism has also had its share of quarrels, controversies, break-ups, and divisions over theoretical and practical issues. Just as the biblical writers described the failures and victories of the forefathers to learn and benefit from them so we may also learn from the mistakes of our predecessors. The conflict over the correct interpretation of the *tāmîd* (lit. daily, continual, perpetual) in the book of Daniel (8:11-13; 11:31; 12:11) may be one of the lesser known discussions in the history of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, at least as compared with the debate between E. J. Waggoner and G. I. Butler about the nature of the law in Galatians in 1888. But study of the conflict provides useful lessons in conflict resolution. The *tāmîd* had traditionally been identified as Pagan Rome, yet shortly after the turn of the 20th century some leading ministers began to reinterpret the term to symbolize the heavenly ministration of Christ.¹ Just as humans are complex and multi-faceted personalities so usually their disputes do not only occur on a mere theological or exegetical level but also involve such levels as emotionality, spirituality, unconscious presuppositions, assumptions, hidden agendas, polemics, and rhetoric. Therefore the present paper attempts to abstain from a discussion of the theological or exegetical arguments. Instead it will briefly discuss the spiritual climate of that conflict and then summarize Ellen G. White’s evaluation of and solution to the conflict which may provide insights for the solution of our modern-day disputes.

The Characteristics of the Conflict

Both parties—the one that identified the *tāmîd* with Roman paganism (old view) vs. the one that identified it with Christ’s heavenly ministration (new view)—had significant reason to believe their view was correct. Supporters of the old view noted that Ellen White had made a statement about sixty years earlier which seemed to settle the identity of the *tāmîd*; thus it seemed that an adoption of the new view would raise questions about the authority of her writings and certainly challenge Christ’s leadership in the Advent movement, so to them the topic was one of great importance.² Meanwhile, supporters of the new view argued that the new

¹See Denis Kaiser, “Ellen White and the ‘Daily’ Conflict,” *Ellen G. White and Current Issues Symposium 6* (2010): 6-34; idem, “The History of the Adventist Interpretation of the ‘Daily’ in the Book of Daniel from 1831 to 2008” (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 2009); idem, “The Interpretation of the *Tāmîd* in Dan 8 by O. R. L. Crosier and Sabbatarian Adventists” (Paper presented at the monthly Church History Brown Bag Discussion, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, November 5, 2009).

²Stephen N. Haskell to Arthur G. Daniells, 27 January 1908, Ellen G. White Estate, Silver Spring, MD [hereafter EGWE]; idem to Ellen G. White, 6 December 1909, EGWE; George B. Starr to C. B. Bollman, September 1930, Andrews University Center for Adventist Research, Berrien Springs, MI [AUCAR].

was based entirely on Scripture and that they did not need an extra-biblical final arbiter, apparently weakening the role, significance, and authority of Ellen White's writings. It should be noted, however, that the groups were not as homogenous as this categorization into two groups seems. While some of the proponents shared merely a few similarities and differed in other important points, they were nevertheless viewed as members of the same group due to guilt by association.

Ellen White, however, was critical of both sides. On the one hand, she did not approve of those who relied on her own writings to settle the question. Her emphatic disagreement is illustrated in the following statement:

I request that my writings shall not be used as the leading argument to settle questions over which there is now so much controversy. I entreat of Elders Haskell, Loughborough, [L. A.] Smith, and others of our leading brethren, that they make no reference to my writings to sustain their views of "the daily." . . . I cannot consent that any of my writings shall be taken as settling this matter. . . . I now ask that my ministering brethren shall not make use of my writings in their arguments regarding this question.³

Her insistence to refrain from using her writings in this discussion is conspicuous. Her first reason for his stance was that she lacked any divine "instruction on the point under discussion."⁴ A second reason was the topic and the whole discussion had "been presented to" her, referring to the divine source of the information, as one having no "vital importance" or, in other words, having only "minor importance."⁵ Thus although she did not have any divine instruction on the exact definition of the *tāmīd*, she did have divine instruction about the minor significance of the topic. Therefore, even proponents of the old view who employed her writings to support their position had to admit that the topic in and of itself was only of minor importance.⁶

Meanwhile, she criticized advocates of the new view for placing excessive focus on trivial matters and for trying to sow dissension.⁷ Of Prescott, she complained that he spent hours discussing minor points that had no real significance "for the salvation of the soul."⁸ Ellen White deplored his tendency to dwell on mistakes and flaws in the denominational history which resulted in confusion, unbelief, and the questioning of the simple truths of God's work.⁹ Indeed, some of the new view promoters contended that Ellen White's writings had no doctrinal

³Ellen G. White, "Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy," St. Helena, CA, 31 July 1910 (Manuscript 11, 1910), reprinted in idem, *Selected Messages*, vol. 1 (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1958), 164.

⁴White, "Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy," published in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164. Cf. idem to S. N. Haskell, 29 August 1908 (Letter 250, 1908), published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 21 vols. (Washington, DC / Silver Spring, MD: Ellen G. White Estate, 1981-1993), 9:107; idem to W. W. Prescott, Sanitarium, CA, 1 July 1908 (Letter 226, 1908), published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224.

⁵White, "Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy," published in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164. Cf. idem to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; idem to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224; idem to W. W. Prescott, St. Helena, CA, 22 May 1908 (Letter 166, 1908), published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:334.

⁶Haskell to Daniells, 27 January 1908; idem to W. C. White, 6 December 1909, EGWE; idem to Ellen G. White, 6 December 1909.

⁷Ellen G. White to W. W. Prescott, 24 June 1908 (Letter 224, 1908), EGWE; idem to W. W. Prescott, 22 May 1908 (Letter 166, 1908). These letters are all published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 10:334, 359.

⁸White to Prescott, 22 May 1908, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 10:359.

⁹White to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223-225.

significance whatsoever, that Seventh-day Adventists did not need an infallible confirmation of their teachings, and that the reasoning for the old view was absolutely absurd.¹⁰

Although she did not consider it an important topic, for some time Ellen White tried to bring the two parties together for a meeting for prayer and Bible study because, in her opinion, it was through a prayerful and solemn investigation of the Word, with the Bible as the final arbiter of truth, that the exegetical and theological questions were to be mutually solved.¹¹ However, the obvious arrogance displayed by promoters of the new view was hard to swallow for those who had helped to build up the church. That may explain why, by mid-1910, the proponents of the old view began to refuse to participate in these meetings because they believed further dialogue would be fruitless and of no avail.¹² Thus it is easily comprehensible why Ellen White tried to turn the attention away from the specifics of the exegetical or theological aspects to the underlying spiritual problem. She suggested that preconceived opinions, prejudices, evil surmising, irreconcilability, unchristian conduct, callous hearts, and a lack of mutual love were preventing any real solution and true Christian unity.¹³

The Fruits of Continuing the Conflict

Ellen White was in contact with members of both groups, making them aware of their respective mistakes and delineating the actual and potential implications and repercussions of their actions and behavior. She further emphasized that the real problem was not the exegetical or theological question but the spiritual circumstances.

Thus she repeatedly urged Daniells and Prescott to cease picking flaws in significant denominational publications. She stated that even though the authors of these books were in general not alive anymore, it had to be remembered that they had been used by God and led many people to a knowledge of the truth. They were to be exceedingly careful not to introduce any subjects in the *Review* that would seem to suggest “flaws in our past experience” and mistakes in how some of the leading ministers had viewed the sanctuary doctrine with respect to the nature of the *tāmīd*. The inclination to “search out things to be criticized or condemned” was not inspired of God and was not a job assigned to them by the Lord.¹⁴ Ellen White acknowledged that some Adventist publications which “have brought many to a knowledge of the truth” may

¹⁰Ludwig Richard Conradi to Arthur G. Daniells, 11 October 1910, Center for Adventist Research, Berrien Springs, MI [hereafter referred to as CAR]; idem to J. N. Loughborough, 16 April 1907, CAR. Cf. See W. W. Prescott, *The Daily: A Brief Reply to Two Leaflets on This Subject* (n.p.: The Author, [1924]), 1, 13, 23; W. H. Wakeham, *Outline Lessons on the Books of Daniel and the Revelation*, Tentative edition (Berrien Springs, MI: College Press, 1927), 47; Bert Haloviak, “In the Shadow of the ‘Daily’: Background and Aftermath of the 1919 Bible and History Teachers’ Conference” (Washington, DC: Office of Archives and Statistics, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 14 November 1979), 37.

¹¹Ellen G. White to S. N. Haskell and Hetty Haskell, Sanitarium, CA, 24 May 1910 (Letter 50, 1910), published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:223.

¹²White to Haskell and Haskell, 24 May 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:223.

¹³White to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; idem to Haskell and Haskell, 24 May 1910, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 20:223; idem to My Brethren in the Ministry, St. Helena, CA, 3 August 1910 (Letter 62, 1910), published in idem *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168.

¹⁴White to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:225; idem to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; idem to A. G. Daniells, 11 August 1910 (Letter 70, 1910), published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:336; idem, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910 (Manuscript 67, 1910), published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:17, 18, 20.

contain some things of “minor importance” that should be carefully studied and corrected.¹⁵ In her estimation the bone of contention was, however, just “jots and titles,” “unimportant,” “unnecessary,” “not vital,” and “not essential for the salvation of the soul.”¹⁶ Thus it would be entirely counterproductive to overemphasize these things and draw everybody’s attention to them. Instead of having everybody—ministers, canvassers, administrators, etc.—publicly debating these issues, the responsibility of looking into these matters should lie with those who were “regularly appointed” to look at these issues in Adventist publications. Otherwise it would result in discrediting soul-saving literature, in providing those who had turned away from the truth with arguments against the church, and in confusing those who had accepted the message just recently.¹⁷

Ellen White gave a good talking to Daniells, who was president of the General Conference from 1901 to 1922 and who tended to put in the weight of his office “to decide the question.” According to Ellen White, God had not called him to decide theological questions or to meddle with the denomination’s publications. She condemned the exercise of such “dominating power” and “kingly rule” for the president of a conference or the General Conference was not supposed to be an oppressive ruler.¹⁸ Similarly, she rebuked Haskell for republishing and circulating the 1843 chart¹⁹ because it was calculated to create confusion, quarrels, and divisions. It was a mistake that would play into Satan’s hands who would use it to this end.²⁰

Concentrating on the subject of the *tāmīd* would divert their attention from the golden moments that should be spend in familiarizing people with the message of salvation and in training church members how to do the same.²¹ Making the question a prominent issue would draw those who should earnestly search for Christ’s saving grace into this controversy.²² Ellen White insisted that both groups were to cease fire and calm down. She observed that both groups lacked wise actions and needed divine wisdom.²³ The behavior and actions exhibited by both groups in the conflict would encourage and invite Satanic agencies to take even little differences and magnify these as major disagreements to produce confusion, divisions, uncertainty, loss of

¹⁵White, “Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy,” 31 July 1910, reprinted in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164.

¹⁶White to Prescott, 24 June 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:359; idem to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224; idem to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; idem, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:17, 18; idem to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168.

¹⁷White, “Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy,” 31 July 1910, reprinted in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164.

¹⁸White, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:19-21.

¹⁹For more information on the 1843 chart, see Kaiser, “Ellen White and the ‘Daily’ Conflict,” 7, 8, 10, 14, 16, 19; P. Gerard Damsteegt, *Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1977), 54, 310; LeRoy Edwin Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, vol. 4 (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1954), 547, 557, 616, 617, 638, 669, 720-722, 728, 733-737.

²⁰White to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106.

²¹White, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:17; idem to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168.

²²White to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224.

²³White to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224; idem to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; idem to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168.

confidence, skepticism, doubts, questioning, and unbelief among believers and non-believers.²⁴ The agitation of the subject would not only unsettle minds and “place the truth in an uncertainty” but also tempt those who had not been thoroughly converted to jump to quick conclusions and to hasty decisions.²⁵ People would become uncertain about God’s leading in the Advent movement and the “doctrines that have been established by the sanction of the Holy Spirit.”²⁶ Restoring the confidence of those who had been unsettled and confused would require much time and effort.²⁷

Beyond the injury done to church members, Ellen White also foresaw damage to the church’s evangelistic work. Time and again she emphasized that the unchristian behavior of some of the ministers and church leaders and the loud chatter about supposed mistakes, errors, and flaws in Adventist publications and past experience only provided ammunition for Satan, the enemy of truth, to deploy opponents of the truth, people “who have departed from the faith” and “gone out from us.” They would take advantage of the inner-Adventist conflict and make a “mountain out of a molehill,”²⁸ and as a result hinder the church’s divinely appointed evangelistic work, turn people away from the truth, and cause even “a worse issue.”²⁹

A Spiritual Redirection

In Ellen White’s view the theological and exegetical details of the debate were only of minor importance whereas the real underlying problem was of a spiritual nature. This is evident from her frequent mention that the leaders of both groups were encouraging “Satan,” “Satanic agencies,” “evil angels,” “the enemy,” “the enemy of truth,” and “fallen angels.”³⁰ That being the case it is easily comprehensible why she pushed for a spiritual redirection as the solution to the conflict. Thus she urged leading ministers and church members to humble their hearts before the Lord and to pray often, though not necessarily long, in faith for the sanctification of soul and

²⁴White to Prescott, 22 May 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:334, 336, 337; idem to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224, 225; idem to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; idem to A. G. Daniells, 11 August 1910, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:334; idem, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:17, 18, 21, 22; idem to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168.

²⁵White to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223, 224; idem to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 9:107; idem, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:21.

²⁶White to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 9:107; idem to A. G. Daniells, 11 August 1910, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:337.

²⁷White to Daniells, 11 August 1910, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:337.

²⁸She employed this phrase frequently to describe the issue of the *tāmīd* and the way it was discussed by members of both parties. See White to Prescott, 22 May 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:334; idem to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106.

²⁹White to Prescott, 24 June 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:359; idem to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224; idem to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; idem, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:18, 21; idem to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168; idem to Daniells, 11 August 1910, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:336.

³⁰White to Prescott, 22 May 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:334; idem to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:225; idem to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; idem, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:17, 18, 21, 22; idem to Daniells, 11 August 1910, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:336, 337.

mind.³¹ They were to follow Christ's example and cultivate meekness and lowliness of heart (Mat 11:29).³² She frequently emphasized that the controversy about the *tāmīd* was completely unnecessary, but that there was a real need for searching the Lord for a reconversion³³, a true conversion of heart and life³⁴, a "daily" conversion³⁵. Bringing self "under the control of the Holy Spirit," members were to consecrate their hearts unreservedly to God, depend fully on him, and cooperate with divine and angelic influences.³⁶ God would transform their mind and lead them through the Holy Spirit.³⁷ Walking in the divinely revealed light and wisdom would manifest faithfulness that works by love and purifies the soul.³⁸ This individual effort³⁹ would make a "sacred impression" on the minds of fellow ministers, church members, and new converts.⁴⁰

A second important aspect emphasized by Ellen White was the need for unity. She wished to see in the ministers a desire to answer Jesus' last prayer (John 17) and develop true Christian unity.⁴¹ She asked them to bury their differences and "press together," keep a "united front," "blend together under the guidance of the Holy Spirit," show "respect for the men of age," and, as far as possible, be in accord in their preaching and activities.⁴² Interestingly, Ellen White did not call them to renounce their present distinct positions but to refrain from voicing their differences of opinion.⁴³ In this context the phrase "silence is eloquence" was a reoccurring theme, emphasizing the need to cease any contention and agitation of the subject under

³¹White to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223; idem, "Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells," 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:20; idem to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168; idem to Daniells, 11 August 1910, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:337.

³²White to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168.

³³White, "Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells," 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:20; idem to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168.

³⁴White to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223.

³⁵White, "Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy," 31 July 1910, reprinted in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:165.

³⁶White to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 9:107; idem, "Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells," 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:21; idem, "Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy," 31 July 1910, reprinted in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:165, 166; idem to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910.

³⁷White, "Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy," 31 July 1910, reprinted in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:165, 166.

³⁸White, "Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells," 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:20; idem, "Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy," 31 July 1910, reprinted in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:165, 166.

³⁹White, "Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy," 31 July 1910, reprinted in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:166.

⁴⁰White to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168.

⁴¹White to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168.

⁴²White to Haskell and Haskell, 24 May 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:223; idem, "Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells," 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:18-20; idem to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167; idem to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106.

⁴³White to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168.

discussion.⁴⁴ She explained that people were to cultivate the wisdom to know when to speak and when to be silent, what burdens to bear and which matters to leave alone.⁴⁵ The avoidance of strife, openness to one another, cooperation in the work of salvation, and the preaching of the clear and common truths will have a “powerful impression on human minds” for “in unity there is strength.”⁴⁶

Besides emphasizing the need for daily conversion and true Christian unity, Ellen White also urged ministers to focus on different lines of ministry—church, schools, family, and evangelism. They should preach and teach the “important lines of truth,” the “sacred truths,” the “testing truths,” and “vital subjects” in an earnest, simple, coherent, favorable, and faith-affirming way. The *tāmīd* and its related issues were not a “test question” even though many presented it like that, but the real “testing questions” were obedience and salvation or, in other words, “the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ.”⁴⁷ In the same vein she suggested: “The truth as it is in Jesus—talk it, pray it, believe every word in its simplicity.”⁴⁸ They were not only to preach at church members but also to train and mentor them. Thus they themselves were to learn from the simple albeit essential teachings of Christ and also teach church members “how to give others a knowledge of the saving truth for this time.”⁴⁹ In particular, the church was to make special and earnest efforts to help parents consecrate their time and strength to their children so that these might understand the need of searching Christ for their own salvation.⁵⁰ Similarly, in all Adventist schools teachers were to help their students to learn how to be saved, how to “put on the white robe of the righteousness of Christ.”⁵¹ Going beyond efforts for church members, parents, children, and young adults, Ellen White frequently called attention to a most neglected cause, the necessary work of evangelizing the cities.⁵² Therefore ministers were to carry a burden for souls with mind and heart, “preach the Word,” follow Christ’s example in saving people, and share the knowledge of Christ’s saving truth and message with those living in the great cities as well as in the worldwide mission fields.⁵³

⁴⁴White to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:168; idem to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; idem, “Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy,” 31 July 1910, published in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164; idem, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:17, 18.

⁴⁵White to Prescott, 22 May 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:334; idem, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:18, 19.

⁴⁶White to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:168.

⁴⁷White to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168; idem to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:224, 225; idem, “Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy,” 31 July 1910, reprinted in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:164, 165.

⁴⁸White, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:21.

⁴⁹White to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:225.

⁵⁰White to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223, 224.

⁵¹White to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223.

⁵²White, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:18-21.

⁵³White to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:168; idem, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:21; idem, “Our Attitude Toward Doctrinal Controversy,” 31 July 1910, published in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:165, 166. In the case of W. W. Prescott she suggested that his spiritual strength would increase if he were to devote time to public evangelistic ministry. See idem, “A Message to Responsible Men and Church Members,” 3 June 1909 (Letter

Conclusion

The features of and the solutions to the historic quarrel about the correct interpretation of the *tāmîd* in Dan 8 may help us in the resolution of some of the disputes in our denomination today. The Spirit of Prophecy through Ellen White told the two contending parties that Scripture, the Word, should be the foundation for settling doctrinal and exegetical questions.⁵⁴ However, settling such questions is only possible when everyone involved comes to the table with a spiritual attitude and a spirit of mutual love. A lack of that mutual willingness to come to an agreement and to find a biblical answer should not be an excuse for tabling a controversial topic but a call to an individual search for a new heart and a new spirit. If the interaction with one another is not characterized by such an attitude and spirit, a continued discussion of the subject will only make matters worse. The contending parties should turn away from the subject and focus on individual heart conversion, the training of church members, the education of parents, children, and students, and the sharing of the gospel message with those who are in need of salvation. All these different lines of ministry should be pervaded by a mutual desire for unity with fellow believers and by a desire of forming a close love relationship with Jesus. Even though a mutual investigation of the subject of the *tāmîd* may have been impossible in her time, Ellen White seemed to envision that there would in the future be a time to study and settle the subject based on Scripture, as is indicated by her frequent clarification that the issue should be put to rest only “at this time,” “now”, “just now,” “at this period of our history,” and “at this stage of our experience.”⁵⁵ Still, it is clear that the spirit in which the church approaches both doctrinal and practical questions is more important than the settling of the issues themselves.

41, 1909), published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 10:335; idem, “Proclaiming the Third Angel’s Message,” Takoma Park, MD, 11 June 1909 (Letter 53, 1909), published in *Manuscript Releases*, 10:335, 336. That the burden for other people could also be viewed as a family matter is implied in the following statement which she also made in that context: “All the world is to be regarded as one great family. . . . True religion teaches us to regard every man and woman as a person to whom we can do good.” See idem, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:18, 19.

⁵⁴It should be mentioned that Ellen White clearly affirmed and confirmed the doctrines of “present truth,” such as the extended atonement ministry of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, the seventh-day Sabbath, the third angel’s message, and the sealing message, in view of erroneous teachings because the Holy Spirit had lead the early Sabbatarian Adventists in the discovery of these truths in the mid- and late 1840s. See Denis Kaiser, “The History of the Adventist Interpretation of the ‘Daily’ in the Book of Daniel from 1831 to 2008” (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 2009), 118, 119.

⁵⁵White to My Brethren in the Ministry, 3 August 1910, published in idem, *Selected Messages*, 1:167, 168; idem, “Errors and Dangers of Prescott and Daniells,” 19 June 1910, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 20:17; idem to Haskell, 29 August 1908, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 9:106; idem to Prescott, 1 July 1908, published in idem, *Manuscript Releases*, 12:223-225.