

# The Truth about God and His Son

By Jodel Moore

## Preface:

The God of the Holy Bible is the One and Only True God of the universe, therefore, it is important for the Christian to know who this True God is. Throughout the centuries, there have been many different doctrines within Christianity concerning the identity of the God of the Bible. For example, there's Unitarianism, which teaches that God is the Father alone and never had anyone beside Him when the world was created. They say; *'Who is God – Truly? We believe that only one individual in the Universe has ever been or ever will be God Almighty. That individual is the Father Himself! (Psalm 86:10).'*<sup>1</sup> - (21<sup>st</sup> century Reformation, This Is Us) There is also Sabellianism, commonly known as modalism or 'oneness', which teaches that God is one person who operates in three modes. The United Pentecostal Church (a modalist/oneness church) explains this by stating: *'The United Pentecostal Church in Europe embraces the doctrine of the oneness of God with its Christological implications... We believe in the one ever-living, eternal God: infinite in power, Holy in nature, attributes and purpose; and possessing absolute, indivisible deity... **The invisible God promised to reveal himself and He fulfils it by the means of the body that He uses** for the accomplishment of His work: "through the veil, that is, His flesh," (Hebrews 10:20)*<sup>2</sup> – (UPCE Articles of Faith, p. 1-2) So for those who ascribe to modalism, Jesus is God the Father Himself; 'the invisible God', who then operated as the Son when he took on human flesh; *'We believe that Jesus-Christ is truly God and truly man: Luke 18:18; John 5:27; 1 Corinthians 15:47. This only true God manifested Himself in the Old Testament in various forms. As Son when He walked among men, and as The Holy-Spirit prior His ascension. The one true God, the Jehovah of the Old Testament, took upon Himself the form of man, and as the Son of man, was born of the virgin Mary.*<sup>3</sup> – (UPCE Articles of Faith, p. 2)

Now the most widely held and dominant belief in Christendom is the doctrine of the Trinity. This is one of the most important teachings held amongst the majority of Christian Churches across the world. The Trinity teaches that there is one God who is made up of three distinct, co-eternal, and consubstantial persons: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. So in its briefest explanation, the Trinity teaches that there are three, separate, and co-eternal persons who are completely distinct from each other (unlike modalism), and these three persons constitute the one God. This is the dominant belief held in Christendom today. For example, the Baptists declare in their statements of faith that *'We believe in the one true and living God, in three Persons: the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit...*<sup>4</sup> - (Grace Baptist Partnership, 'Statement of faith', No. 2)

'We believe in only one true God **eternally existing in three persons**; Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.<sup>5</sup> - (Faith Baptist Church, 'Statement of Faith - Faith Baptist Church', No. 2)

The Lutheran Church also expresses this belief when stating, 'With the universal Christian Church, The Lutheran Church... teaches and responds to the love of the **Triune God... The three persons of the Trinity are coequal and coeternal, one God.**<sup>6</sup> - (The Lutheran Church Missouri Synod, 'Belief and Practice')

Likewise, the Methodist Church express the same belief about God as they say 'we join with millions of Christians through the ages in an understanding of **God as a Trinity—three persons in one**: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. God, who is one, is revealed in three distinct persons. "God in three persons, blessed Trinity" ...<sup>7</sup>

The Seventh-Day Adventist Church is also included in upholding this belief, as is shown in number two of their fundamental beliefs which states under the title, 'The Trinity', that 'There is one God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, **a unity of three coeternal Persons.**<sup>8</sup> - ('Seventh-day Adventist 28 Fundamental Beliefs', 2015 Edition, No. 2, p, 3)

This doctrine is one of the ultimate tests of Christian orthodoxy, and has been for centuries. In fact, in order for a church to be a member of the ecumenical World Council of Churches, they have to believe in the Trinity. 'All WCC programmes aim to support the member churches an ecumenical partners to journey together, promoting justice and peace in our world as an expression of faith in **the Triune God.**<sup>9</sup> - (World Council of Churches, 'What we do')

All the various concepts about who God is contradict each other, therefore, this document will investigate who God is according to the apostles and prophets of the Holy Scriptures. Also, this document will analyse what the pioneers of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church, including Ellen G. White, actually taught and believed about the identity of God, and examine whether they would be in agreement with the current trinity doctrine that is upheld by the Seventh-Day Adventist Church today.

---

## The Truth about God and His Son

**Contents:**

Chapter 1 - Who is the One True God? .....	4
Chapter 2 - Who is Jesus Christ? .....	25
Chapter 3 - Ellen G. White on the Sonship of Christ .....	69
Chapter 4 - Who is the Holy Spirit? .....	96
Chapter 5 - Ellen G. White on the Holy Spirit.....	117
Chapter 6 - The Pioneers on the Godhead.....	145
Chapter 7 - The Pioneers on the Trinity.....	168
Conclusion.....	222
References.....	232

---

## Chapter 1: Who is The One True God?

Firstly, the first angel's message in Revelation 14 proclaims a warning to the world of God's judgement and pleads with the inhabitants to turn to Him. The Lord Jesus Christ raised up the Seventh-day Adventist Church to proclaim this message, and thus, as Adventists, we are called to point the world to the True God. Therefore, we must understand who the God of the Bible is as He is revealed in His Word, and make sure we are not proclaiming a false conception of God, and enshrining a god from traditions of men. We must identify who the True God is as He is revealed in the **Bible alone**.

*'Are we worshipers of Jehovah, or of Baal? of the living God, or of idols? No outward shrines may be visible, there may be no image for the eye to rest upon, yet we may be practising idolatry. **It is as easy to make an idol of cherished ideas** or objects as to fashion gods of wood or stone. **Thousands have a false conception of God** and His attributes. **They are as verily serving a false god as were the servants of Baal.** **Are we worshipping the true God as He is revealed in His word**, in Christ, in nature, or are we adoring some **philosophical idol enshrined in His place?** **God is a God of truth...**' - {5T 173.3, 4}*

The first angel's message proclaims, *'And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, Saying with a loud voice, **Fear God**, and give glory to **him**; for the hour of **his** judgment is come: and worship **him** that made **heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.**' - (Rev 14:6-7)*

This message is a call to the world to worship the One True God of heaven & earth. It must be highlighted that the pronouns used to refer to God in these verses are in the singular: 'Him' & 'His'. Therefore, this signifies that these verses are referring to One Person. This reference to the God of heaven & earth is made by Paul in the book of Acts which states; *'Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, To The Unknown God. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, **him** declare I unto you. **God that made the world** and all things therein, seeing that **he is Lord of heaven and earth**, dwelleth not in temples made with hands;'* - (Acts 17:22-24)

Paul alongside Barnabas also referred to the Creator God of heaven & earth a few chapters earlier in the same book.

*'Which when the apostles, Barnabas and Paul, heard of, they rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, crying out, And saying, Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the **living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea**, and all things that are therein.'* - (Acts 14:14-15)

This proclamation mirrors the call of Revelation 14:6-7, as it points to the Creator God which made heaven, earth, and the sea. This same book identifies who the Creator God of heaven & earth is when the believers cried out in prayer.

*'And when they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, Lord, **thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is**: Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things? The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against **the Lord, and** against **his** Christ. For of a truth against **thy holy child Jesus**, whom **thou** hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done. And now, Lord, behold their threatenings: and grant unto thy servants, that with all boldness they may speak thy word, By stretching forth thine hand to heal; and that signs and wonders may be done by the name **of thy holy child Jesus**.'* - (Acts 4:24-30) It is clear that the God of heaven & earth here is in reference to God the Father, and He has a Son, His *'holy child Jesus.'* Jesus Christ also confirms that His Father is Lord of heaven & earth.

*'At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, **O Father, Lord of heaven and earth**, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.'* - (Matt 11:25)

We also have the testimony from the prophet Ellen G. White, that God the Father is the Lord Creator of heaven and earth, and He has a Son.

*'When the law was spoken, **the Lord, the Creator of heaven and earth**, stood by the side **of his Son**, enshrouded in the fire and the smoke on the mount... What condescension was this, that **the infinite God** should stand side by side **with his Son**, while the law, which is the foundation of **his** government, was given.* - {ST October 15, 1896, par, 4}

Clearly there is a distinction between the infinite God and His Son, thus, the Father is the one to whom the first angel's message points us to in Revelation 14:7.

Moreover, one of the most important prayers of the ancient Hebrew religion was the Shema, which affirmed the oneness of God. *'Hear therefore, O Israel, and observe to do it; that it may be well with thee, and that ye may increase mightily, as **the LORD God of thy fathers** hath promised thee, in the land that floweth with milk and honey. Hear, O Israel: The LORD our **God is one LORD**.'* - (Deut 6:3-4). This verse clearly tells us that our God is one. Now some contend that Deuteronomy 6:4 is actually in reference to a plurality of persons who are one in unity or one in being. But we must allow the Bible to speak for itself and see who this One LORD is actually in reference to according to the Scriptures, not what we think it says or want it to say. Firstly, there were no chapter divisions when the prophets wrote the Scriptures, and we see within the same context of this passage two chapters earlier,

that there is a reference to God. *'Unto thee it was shewed, that thou mightest know that the LORD he is God; **there is none else beside him**... Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the LORD he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath: **there is none else.**'* - (Deut 4:35, 39) Notice this verse makes a reference to Jehovah (the LORD), who is God 'in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath,' and it refers to this God of the heavens and earth as a 'He'; **He is God.** Therefore, this God is One single Person, and 'there is none else beside Him.' Clearly then, just two chapters after in Deut 6:3-4, the 'LORD God of thy fathers' (6:3), who is 'One LORD' (6:4), is the same Person of Deut 4:35, 39. It is the same One LORD. It would be a complete tearing down of the Scriptures and nonsensical to say that in Deut 4:39, it's referring to One Person: 'A He', but then just two chapters later, the One God is referring to a unified plurality of persons; 'a they'. Such wouldn't make sense, nevermind the fact that Deut 4:39 clearly says the LORD (Jehovah) is God, and 'there is none else.'

Moreover, we can look at other passages of Scripture for further witness and clarification concerning who the identity of the 'One LORD' is in Deuteronomy 6:4. During Jesus' conversation with the Samaritan woman, we see that He made it plain that the Jews were not ignorant in regards to the identity of their God, unlike the Samaritans who had been corrupted by paganism.

*'Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. **Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews.** But the hour cometh, and now is, when **the true worshippers shall worship the Father** in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. **God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.**'* - (Jhn 4:21-24) Jesus said that the Jews knew who they worshipped, for salvation was of the Jews (v22), thus, Jesus told the woman that she was to worship the God that the Jews worship as He is the True God, the Father (v23-24). Also, notice that in verse 24 Jesus refers to God in the singular 'Him', just as John does in revelation 14:7, for He clearly highlights that God is the Father. Jesus said the Jews knew who they worshipped, and the Jews claimed that the Father was their God. *'Ye do the deeds of your father. Then said they to him, We be not born of fornication; we have **one Father, even God.**'* - (Jhn 8:41) Jesus confirmed this directly after by stating that His Father is the God they claimed to worship. *'Jesus said unto them, **If God were your Father**, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and **came from God**; neither came I of myself, but **he** sent me... Jesus answered, If I honour myself, my honour is nothing: it is **my Father** that honoureth me; of whom ye say, that **he is your God**:'* (Jhn 8:42, 54). Here Jesus was telling the Jews that if the God they claimed to worship was their Father, they'd love Him because He Himself came from God who is His Father (v54).

Further clarity of who the Jews believed their God was and who the Shema was actually pointing to is shown during Jesus' conversation with the scribe, where Deuteronomy 6:4 was referenced.

*‘And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord **our God is one Lord**:... And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said **the truth: for there is one God**; and **there is none other but he**: And to love **him** with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices.’ - (Mark 12:28-29, 32-33)*

We can see in this encounter that the Shema is in reference to one single Person as the singular ‘He’ and ‘Him’ is once again used to refer to God the ‘one Lord.’ The scribe was a 1<sup>st</sup> century Jew and did not believe in a tripersonal god, but rather, he professed to believe in one individual Person who is the God of the Scriptures, God the Father. Also, notice the scribe proclaimed that ‘there is one God’ and ‘there is none other but He.’ This displays the same sentiment as Deuteronomy 4:35 which pointed out that Jehovah is God, and ‘there is none else beside him.’ This would have surely been the perfect opportunity for Jesus to correct the scribe or give him further revelation clarifying that God is triune, or that He Himself is the One that the Shema was pointing to, as per modalistic belief, yet He didn’t correct the scribe, but He commended him for his understanding. ‘And when Jesus saw that he **answered discreetly**, he said unto him, **Thou art not far from the kingdom of God**. And no man after that durst ask him any question.’ - (Mark 12:34)

Jesus clearly approved of the scribes’ understanding and interpretation of Deuteronomy 6:4, which means that this is how Jesus understood and interpreted it also. Like the scribe, Jesus believed that this passage was in reference to a single ‘He.’ This should be enough to curb any confusion. There is no evidence that a three person god is being identified in this text. To arrive at such a conclusion can only be achieved by reading into the text what it doesn’t say. The Jews clearly understood that there was one God, who was a single Person, the Father, and there was none other but He. Such understanding was also shared by Paul, who maintained that ‘...that there is none other God but one.’ - (1 Cor 8:4)

Ellen White also understood that the Shema was in reference to One (Person) God, the Father, and Christ came to reveal to us the One God who is His Father. She said:

*‘It was positively necessary that man should know his Heavenly Father, and discern his paternal attributes of character; for in becoming acquainted with God, men may become partakers of the same virtues and the same glory... To render acceptable service to God, it is essential that we should know God... We could not rejoice in and praise **a being** of whom we had no certain knowledge; but **God has sent Christ** to the world to make manifest **his** paternal character. It is our privilege to know God experimentally, and in true knowledge of God is life eternal. The only begotten Son of God was **God’s gift to the world**, in whose character was revealed the character of him who gave the law to men and angels. **He came to proclaim the fact, “The Lord our God is one Lord,”** and **him** only shalt thou serve. He came to make it manifest that, “Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from **the Father of lights**, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.’ - {RH March 9, 1897, par.8, 9}*

Ellen White says that we couldn't 'praise a being of whom we had no certain knowledge,' and this Being is of course God. So God our 'Heavenly Father' 'sent Christ to the world to make manifest his paternal character.' Jesus Christ was 'God's gift to the world.' And according to Ellen White, Jesus 'came to proclaim the fact' that "The Lord our God is one Lord," who He identified as His Father, 'the Father of lights.' Therefore, He didn't reveal that the Shema was in reference to Himself nor a triune god.

Ellen White stressed the point that she had been shown over and over again that God is a Person, and Jesus is the express image of that One Person, God:

*'Again and again during my experience in the Lord's work, I have been called upon to meet these erroneous sentiments. In every case, clear, powerful **light has been given that God is the eternal, self-existent One.** From my girlhood I have been given plain instruction that **God is a person, and that Christ is "the express image of His person."** [Hebrews 1:3.] God always has been. That which concerns us is not the how or the wherefore. In the Word God is spoken of as the everlasting God. This name embraces past, present, and future. God is from everlasting to everlasting. **He is the Eternal One...**' - {18LtMs, Ms 137, 1903, par. 3-4}*

Ellen White clearly stresses that 'God is a Person', and Christ is "the express image of His person", thus showing that God is one person, and Christ is another.

Now according to the apostles, there is one God. 'Is **he** the God of the Jews only? is **he** not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: Seeing it is **one God**, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.' - (Rom 3:29-30)

*'As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is **none other God but one.**' - (1 Cor 8:4)*

*'Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, **but God is one.**' - (Gal 3:20)*

*'**For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;**' - (1 Tim 2:5)*

*'Thou believest that **there is one God; thou doest well:** the devils also believe, and tremble.'* (James 2:19)

The question then is; what did the apostles actually mean when they said one God? Did they mean a triune God or one numerical God (single person)? Firstly, in the book of Acts, we see a pronouncement from Peter saying "**The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus;** whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go. But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; And killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses.' - (Acts 3:13-15) Peter says that the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob 'hath glorified His Son Jesus.' According to Peter, the God of Israel is one God, and this one God is the Father, and this one God has a Son, Jesus whom He glorified and raised from the dead.



This fact had already been highlighted in Acts 4:24-30, as shown earlier. Peter and the rest of the apostles reiterate this point again when stating that **'The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.'** - (Acts 5:30-31)

This 'God of our Fathers' that Peter speaks of is the same Person as the one spoken of in Deut 6:3; 'the LORD God of thy fathers', who is One (Deut 6:4), and 'there is none else.' (Deut 4:39).

We see that according to the apostles, the God of the ancient fathers in the Old Testament is the Father, which we've already pinpointed from the gospels (See Jhn 4:31-24, 8:41-42, 54, Mark 12:28-29, 32-34).

Moreover, Paul repeatedly referred to the one God as the Father. *'To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints: Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world. For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers;'* - (Rom 1:7-9)

Paul clearly outlines a distinction between God and Jesus Christ. God is the Father and Jesus Christ is His Son. *'For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.'* - (Rom 8:3)

We see a consistent trend in Paul's writings, that the One God is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. *'Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be likeminded one toward another according to Christ Jesus: That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.'* - (Rom 15:5-6)

*'Grace be to you and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort;'* - (2 Cor 1:2-3)

As already stated, we continuously see a distinction between God, who is the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. *'Paul, an apostle, (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead;)... Grace be to you and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ, Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father: -* (Gal 1:1, 3-4)

*'Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.'* - (Phili 1:2)

*'But my God shall supply all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus. Now unto God and our Father be glory for ever and ever. Amen.'* - (Phili 4:19-20)

*'Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ **by the will of God**, and Timotheus our brother, To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse: Grace be unto you, and peace, from **God our Father and** the Lord Jesus Christ. We give thanks to **God and the Father of our** Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you,' - (Col 1:1-3)*

*'...Grace be unto you, and peace, from **God our Father, and** the Lord Jesus Christ. We give thanks to God always for you all, making mention of you in our prayers; Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of **God and our Father**;' - (1 Thess 1:1-3)*

*'Now **God himself and our Father, and** our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you. And the Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you: To the end he may stablish your hearts unblameable in holiness **before God, even our Father**, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints.' - (1 Thess 3:11-13)*

Again in second Thessalonians, we see this consistency from Paul as he refers to God as the Father. *'Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the church of the Thessalonians in **God our Father and** the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, from **God our Father and** the Lord Jesus Christ.'* - (2 Thess 1:1-2)

*'Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, **and God, even our Father**, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace,' - (2 Thess 2:16).*

*'unto Timothy, my own son in the faith: Grace, mercy, and peace, from **God our Father and** Jesus Christ our Lord.'* - (1 Tim 1:2)

It is clear that Paul believed in one numerical God, who he identified as the Father.

*'There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; One Lord, one faith, one baptism, **One God and Father of all, who is above all**, and through all, and in you all.* - (Eph 4:4-6)

According to Paul, the One God of the Bible is the *'Father of all'*, and it is He *'who is above all'*.

Paul refers to the One God as the Father because He is the source of all things.

*'As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that **there is none other God but one**. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,) **But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things**, and we in him; **and** one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.'* - (1 Cor 8:4-6)

Notice in 1 Cor 8:4-6 that Paul says there is one God (v4), and that in the world there be many gods and lords (v5), however, to us Christians, Paul states that there is *'but one God'*, and he goes on to identify who this one God is, namely, *'The Father'* (v6), for He is the source of all things. Paul doesn't say that 'to us there's but one God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit', like the trinitarian statements of faith do, nor that Jesus is the Father like the modalist statements of faith do, for he clearly separates the two. Hence, Paul often made the distinction between Christ and God.

*'For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the **kingdom of Christ and of God.**'* - (Eph 5:5)

*'I charge thee therefore **before God, and** the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom;'* - (2 Tim 4:1)

*'Paul, **a servant of God, and** an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God's elect, and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness;'* - (Titus 1:1)

*'Wherefore also we pray always for you, that **our God** would count you worthy of this calling, and fulfil all the good pleasure of his goodness, and the work of faith with power: That the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified in you, and ye in him, **according to the grace of our God and** the Lord Jesus Christ.'* - (2 Thess 1:11-12)

So this makes sense of what Paul meant when he said, *'**For there is one God, and** one mediator **between God and men**, the man Christ Jesus;'* - (1 Tim 2:5)

Clearly if Jesus is the one Mediator between the one God and man, then He can't be the one God Himself that Paul is referring to. The Father is the One God, and Christ is the Son of the One God. Ellen White reiterates this point when she says:

*'I feel my spirit stirred within me. I feel to the depth of my being that the truth must be borne... Let the missionaries of the cross proclaim that **there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man**, who is Jesus Christ **the Son of the Infinite God**. This needs to be proclaimed throughout every church in our land. Christians need to know this, and not put man where God should be, that they may no longer be worshipers of idols, but of the **living God.**'* - {7LtMs, Ms 40, 1891, par, 78}

So Jesus Christ, who is *'the Son of the Infinite God'*, is the one Mediator between the one God His Father, and man. This wouldn't make sense if the one God was a trinity, for then the second person of the trinity would be the one mediator between the trinity and man, because according to the trinitarians, the one God is a trinity which mustn't be divided. Also, this wouldn't make sense if Jesus was the Father Himself, for then Jesus would be the one mediator between Himself and man.

Likewise, the Apostle James who also confirmed that there is one God (Jam 2:19), identified the one God as the Father, *‘Therewith **bleſs we God, even the Father**; and therewith curſe we men, which are made after the ſimilitude of God.’* - (James 3:9) Thus, he also made a diſtinction between God and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt. *‘James, a ſervant **of God and of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt**, to the twelve tribes which are ſcattered abroad, greeting.’* - (James 1:1)

In addition, Peter also proclaimed that God is the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

*‘**Bleſſed be the God and Father of** our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt from the dead,’* - (1 Pet 1:3).

Thus, he also mirrored Paul and James in making a diſtinction between God and Jeſus Chriſt.

*‘Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the **knowledge of God, and** of Jeſus our Lord,’* - (2 Pet 1:2).

Again, Ellen White also confirms this by ſtating that *‘There is a **personal God, the Father**; there is a **personal Chriſt, the Son**. And “**God**, who at ſundry times and in divers manners ſpake in times paſt unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in theſe laſt days **ſpoken unto us by his Son**, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom alſo he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the expreſs image of his perſon, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himſelf purged our ſins, ſat down on the **right hand of the Maſteſty on high**.”* - {RH November 8, 1898, par, 9}

So according to Siſter White, *‘there is a personal God’*, and ſhe identifies Him as the Father, not a trinity of perſons, and *‘there is a personal Chriſt’*, God’s Son.

She reiterates this ſame point again when ſhe ſtates;

*‘Therefore, after the fall, nature was not the only teacher of man. In order that the world might not remain in darkneſs, in eternal, ſpiritual night, the God of nature muſt meet [man] in Jeſus Chriſt. The Son of God came to the world as a revelation of the Father. He was “that true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.” [John 1:9.] The moſt difficult and humiliating leſſon which man has to learn, if he is kept by the power of God, is his own inefficiency in depending upon human wiſdom, and the ſure failure of his own efforts to read nature correctly. Sin has obſcured his viſion, and he cannot interpret nature without placing it above God. He cannot diſcern in it **God, or Jeſus Chriſt**, whom **He has ſent**... Nature is not God nor ever was God. God is in nature; the voice of nature teſtifies of God; but nature is not God. It but bears a teſtimony of God’s power, as **His** created works. **There is a personal God, the Father**; there is a personal Chriſt, the Son. (Quotes Hebrews 1:1-3.)... Here the Son of God is referred to, “who being the brightness of **his** glory, and the expreſs image of **his** perſon, and upholding all things by the word of **his***

power.”... *Those who think they can obtain a knowledge of God **aside from the Representative whom the Word declares is “the express image of his person”** [Hebrews 1:3], will need to become fools in their own estimation before they can be wise. Christ came as a personal Saviour to the world. **He represented a personal God.**’ - {13LtMs, Ms 86, 1898, par. 8-9, 11, 15}*

Again, Ellen White makes it clear that God is truly a Person, He is a ‘*Personal God*’, and she identified this Personal God as ‘*the Father.*’ And this personal God can only be known through the one who He sent, ‘*a personal Christ, the Son*’, who ‘*represented a personal God.*’ Hence, as discussed, Christ is the one personal mediator between the one personal God and man, and no one can approach the Father aside from His representative, the Lord Jesus Christ (See Jhn 14:6). Christ came to reveal the True God. The Lord Jesus showed plainly who God is, He did not come to leave us in confusion concerning this, for He declared to the disciples, that ‘*...I shall shew you plainly of the Father.*’ - (Jhn 16:25) Hence, Ellen White says that ‘*the Son of God came to the world as a revelation of the Father.*’

Furthermore, according to the Apostle John, God is the Father who sent His Son Jesus Christ. ‘*Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love. In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that **God sent his only begotten Son** into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and **sent his Son** to be the propitiation for our sins.*’ - (1 Jhn 4:7-10)

These verses outline that the one God John refers to has a Son. ‘*If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the **witness of God** which he hath **testified of his Son**. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that **God gave of his Son**. And this is the record, that **God hath given to us eternal life**, and **this life is in his Son**. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*’ - (1 Jhn 5:9-12) So God has given to us eternal life, which can only be found in His Son. Also, in the book of revelation we see that God gave the revelation to Jesus Christ His Son. ‘*The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which **God gave unto him**, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John.*’ - (Rev 1:1).

Jesus Christ made us kings and priests unto God, who is His Father. ‘*And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, And hath made us kings and priests **unto God and his Father**; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.*’ - (Rev 1:5-6)

Also, during John’s vision, he saw one Being/Person sitting on the throne.

‘And immediately I was in the spirit: and, behold, a throne was set in heaven, and **one sat on the throne**. And **he that sat** was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone: and there was a rainbow round about the throne, in sight like unto an emerald. And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him; and they were full of eyes within: and they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, **Lord God Almighty**, which was, and is, and is to come. And when those beasts give glory and honour and thanks **to him that sat on the throne**, who liveth for ever and ever, The four and twenty elders fall down before **him that sat on the throne**, and worship **him** that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.’ (Rev 4:2-3, 8-11) Now take note in the verse directly after. This one Being/Person sitting on the throne has a book in His hand. ‘And I saw in the **right hand of him that sat on the throne a book written within** and on the backside, sealed with seven seals.’ - (Rev 5:1) The Lamb (Jesus) stood in front of the throne in the midst of it, and He took the book out of the right hand of Him that was sitting on the throne. ‘And I beheld, and, lo, **in the midst of the throne** and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, **stood a Lamb as it had been slain**, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And **he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne**.’ - (Rev 5:6-7) We find that it is God the Father who is sitting on the throne and being worshipped in heaven alongside His Son, the Lamb. ‘After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, **stood before the throne, and before the Lamb**, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; And cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to **our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb**.’ - (Rev 7:9-10) Notice that the multitude John saw said ‘Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, **and unto the Lamb**’. We’ve established that the Being sitting on the throne is the Father, and the Lamb is Jesus Christ. So we find once again that God here is in reference to One Person, and is distinguished from Jesus Christ, the Lamb. The God sitting upon the throne is not a trinity, nor Jesus Himself. Thus, we see that John also makes the distinction between God and Christ. ‘Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests **of God and of Christ**, and shall reign with him a thousand years.’ - (Rev 20:6) John clearly illustrates in his vision that the Father is the Lord God Almighty, and is with His Son, the Lamb. ‘And I saw no temple therein: for **the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb** are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the **glory of God** did lighten it, **and the Lamb** is the light thereof.’ - (Rev 21:22-23)

‘And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the **throne of God and of the Lamb**.’ - (Rev 22:1)

Therefore, like Paul, James, and Peter, John affirms that the one God of the Bible is the Father. Jude also maintains this same point; ‘For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the **only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ**.’ - (Jude 4)

Notice that the '**only Lord God**' is noted as being a separate Person to the Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, it is clear from Scripture that when the apostles said that there is one God, they meant one single Person, and they referred to this one Person as the Father, thus, the One God is the Father.

The Bible also tells us that the Father is the God of our Lord Jesus Christ. '**The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not.**' - (2 Cor 11:31)

'Grace be to you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. Blessed be the **God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ.**' - (Eph 1:2-3)

'Blessed be **the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,**' - (1 Pet 1:3)

'That the **God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him:**' - (Eph 1:17)

Jesus Christ Himself stated to Mary that His Father is His God. 'Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to **my Father**: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto **my Father**, and your Father; and to **my God**, and **your God.**' - (Jhn 20:17)

In the book of Revelation, when Jesus is glorified in heaven, He yet again still refers to the Father as His God. 'Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of **my God**, and he shall go no more out: and I will write upon him the name of **my God**, and the name of the city of **my God**, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from **my God**: and I will write upon him my new name.' - (Rev 3:12)

Therefore, it is God the Father who is above all: '**One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.**' - (Eph 4:6)

And Jesus will deliver the kingdom to God, who Paul identifies as the Father.

'But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end, **when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father**; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet.' - (1 Cor 15:23-25)

In this chapter, we see that when sin is finally dealt with and everything has been subjected under the feet of the Lord Jesus Christ, then Jesus Himself will be subject under the Father, so that God may be all in all, because God the Father is the source of all things (1 Cor 8:6), and the Supreme Sovereign.

*'For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that **he is excepted** (excluded), which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, **then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him,** that **God may be all in all.**' - (1 Cor 15:27-28)*

In the above text, Paul explains that the Father has put all things under the feet of the Lord Jesus. Paul presents here that every single thing has been subjected under the feet of the Lord Jesus Christ. So God has placed all things under Christ, and Christ will be Lord and Head over all, and this will be for all eternity:

*'**That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory,** may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, **Which he wrought in Christ,** when he raised him from the dead, and **set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church,** Which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.' - (Eph 1:17-23)*

The Father raised Christ from the dead, set Him at His own right hand, and thus placed Him 'Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion.' All has been placed subject to Christ; 'For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, **that he might bring us to God,** being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit... Who is gone into heaven, **and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.**' - (1 Pet 3:18, 22)

However, Paul pinpoints in 1 Corinthians 15 that there is an exception to this. According to Paul, all has been put under the feet of Jesus, but it is evident, or it is obvious, that there is an exception to this, for the one who put all things under Christ is not Himself under Christ (v27). The Father, who is the one that placed all things under Christ, is excluded from this category. Instead, the Son Himself shall be subject to the One who put all things under Him, and this will be for all eternity (v28), for the Father is His God. Hence, Paul tells us that God is the head of Christ:

*'But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and **the head of Christ is God.**' - (1 Cor 11:3)*

*'Therefore let no man glory in men. For all things are yours;... And ye are Christ's; and **Christ is God's.**' - (1 Cor 3:21, 23)*

The Lord Jesus has God for His Head, but the Father has no one above Him, hence, the Father alone is the Most High God. And God the Father has highly exalted His Son, and made Him equal to Himself. Ellen White states:



*'The Scriptures clearly indicate the relation between God and Christ, and they bring to view as clearly the **personality and individuality of each** (Quotes Hebrews 1:1-5)... **God is the Father of Christ; Christ is the Son of God.** To Christ has **been given an exalted position.** He has been **made equal with the Father.** **All the counsels of God** are opened to **His Son.**' - {8T 268.1-3}*

So clearly, the One who holds exclusive sovereignty and the Highest rank, has the authority to confer their power and authority to someone else, and God has conferred such exaltation and authority to His Son, and *'made Him equal with'* Himself. And lest some think that Ellen White only meant this in reference to Christ after His incarnation, she made it clear that this took place in heaven before the Earth was ever created:

*'The great Creator assembled the heavenly host, that he might in the presence of all the angels **confer special honor upon his Son.** The Son was seated on the throne with the Father, and the heavenly throng of holy angels was gathered around them. The Father then made known that **it was ordained by himself that Christ, his Son, should be equal with himself;** so that wherever was the presence of his Son, it was as his own presence. The word of the Son was to be obeyed as readily as the word of the Father. **His Son he had invested with authority to command the heavenly host.** Especially was his Son to work in union with himself in the anticipated creation of the earth and every living thing that should exist upon the earth. His Son would carry out his will and his purposes, but would do nothing of himself alone. **The Father's will would be fulfilled in him.**' - {1SP 17.2}*

Again, Ellen White clearly demonstrates that Christ's high and exalted position next to the Father was conferred upon Him by God before the world was. It was the Father who ordained that Christ *'should be equal with himself.'* The Father *'had invested'* Jesus with the authority He has, and He could thereby *'command the heavenly host'* in heaven. All the power, authority, and majesty that Christ has was given to Him by God the Father. Such would not make sense if Christ was the Almighty God Himself. And such wouldn't be necessary if Jesus was always co-equal with the Father and possessed all authority and power in and of Himself.

So the Father is the One Supreme God of heaven and earth, and Jesus Christ is His Son who shares equality with His Father, which Ellen White confirms. *'Our heavenly Father is the God of the universe, and Christ is the divine Son, the One equal with the Father.'* - {21LtMs, Ms 49, 1906, par 26} Ellen White was consistent and she maintained that God the Father is the Supreme Ruler and Sovereign of all, not a triune god.

*'We can understand as much of His purposes as it is for our good to know; and beyond this we must still trust the might of the Omnipotent, the love and wisdom of the Father and Sovereign of all.'* - {5T 699.1}

*'Though they (the Jews) professed to know and to worship the true and living God, they wholly misrepresented him, and the character of God, as represented by his Son, was as an original subject, a new gift to the world. Christ made every effort so to sweep away the misrepresentations of Satan, that the confidence of man in the love of God might be restored. He taught man to address the Supreme Ruler of the universe by the new*

**name “Our Father.”**... **Christ leads us to the throne of God** by a new and living way, to present **him** to us in his paternal love... The only begotten Son of God was to teach men the goodness, mercy, and benevolence of the **character of God**. He taught men to regard God as the **fountain of all parental affection**... ‘ - {RH September 11, 1894, par.6, 8}

So Ellen White tells us here that the Jews professed to worship 'the true and living God', and they misrepresented 'His' character, which was revealed by 'His Son', for Jesus Christ came to reveal the true and living God, 'the Supreme Ruler of the universe' who He taught us to address as 'our Father'. Thus, the One Supreme True and Living God and Sovereign of all is not Jesus, nor a tripersonal god, but He is One individual Person: God the Father.

The Holy Scriptures make it plain that the Father is the Only True God, hence, Jesus Christ referred to His Father as the Only True God when praying to Him. *“These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, **Father**, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee: As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know **thee the only true God**, **and** Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.”* - (Jhn 17:1-3)

Notice that Jesus uses the singular pronoun ‘**thee**’ when referring to His Father as *the ‘only true God.’* If the One True God was a multipersonal being that Jesus Himself was a member of, then it would have made more sense for Jesus to use a plural pronoun and say that *‘this is life eternal, that they might know **Us, the only true God**’*, for both are members of the tripersonal one god according to the trinitarians. But instead, Jesus uses the singular pronoun (thee), and an exclusive word ‘**only**’, to direct the title solely to His Father, and then He says; *‘and Jesus Christ, whom thou (the only True God) hast sent.’* So clearly here Jesus was praying directly to His Father and addressed Him as the only True God, whilst separating Himself from that title. Jesus affirms that He was sent by the Only True God, who is His Father.

So in order to know the True God, we have to know the One whom He sent, hence Jesus told His disciples; *‘Let not your heart be troubled: **ye believe in God**, believe **also in me**.’* - (Jhn 14:1) Again, we see here that Christ clearly distinguishes Himself from God. The definition of the word ‘also’ according to Oxford and Webster is ‘in addition; too.’ So Jesus presents Himself as someone in addition to God. The disciples believed in God, and Christ was telling them that they should believe in Him too in addition to God. This is plain and simple language if we just allow the Scriptures to speak to us without us interjecting what the texts do not say.

So like the apostles, Jesus makes a distinction between Himself and the only True God, which He confirms is His Father. Thus, eternal life is to know the only True God and His Son Jesus Christ whom He sent. John also clarifies this. *‘And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may **know him that is true**, and we are **in him that is true**, even **in his Son** Jesus Christ. **This is the true God**, and **eternal life**.’* - (1 Jhn 5:20)

So the Son of God came to give us an understanding, so that we can know 'Him' that is true. And this 'Him' that John refers to has a Son called Jesus Christ, and it is by being in His Son that we can know this same 'Him', which is the True God according to John. So the Son has come that we may know the Father, the True God. As has been shown numerous times from inspiration, Jesus is the only way to the Father, He came to reveal the Father, represent the Father, and He intercedes between man and the Father, hence, the only way to know the True God is to be in His Son Jesus Christ. Thus, John clarifies that the only True God is God the Father, which is in complete agreement with what Jesus said according to his (John's) own Gospel (Jhn 17:3). This is plain. Seventh-day Adventist pioneer, J. H. Waggoner, states that *'In the "Manual of Atonement," 1 John 5:20 is quoted as containing most conclusive evidence of a trinity and of the Supreme Deity of Christ. It is there claimed that he is called "the true God and eternal life." The whole verse reads thus: "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." A person must be strongly wedded to a theory who can read this verse and not see the distinction therein contained between the true God and the Son of God. "We are in him that is true." How? "In his Son Jesus Christ." The distinction between Christ and the true God is most clearly shown by the Saviour's own words in John 17:3: "That they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent."*<sup>10</sup> - (ELDER J. H. WAGGONER, 'The Atonement AN EXAMINATION OF A REMEDIAL SYSTEM IN THE LIGHT OF NATURE AND REVELATION', REVIEW & HERALD: BATTLE CREEK, MI, (1884) p, 118/168)

Paul also affirms that the Father is the True God, and He has a Son; *'For they themselves shew of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye **turned to God** from idols to serve **the living and true God**; And to wait for **his Son** from heaven, **whom he raised from the dead**, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come.'* - (1 Thess 1:9-10) We see in these verses that Jesus Christ is the Son of the 'living and True God', and was raised up from the dead by Him. God the Father is the only True God spoken of in the Holy Bible. If the trinitarians were to be consistent with their belief, they'd have to interpret these verses as saying that we are waiting for the triune god's Son, for the living and true God is a trinity. Such of course would be both a butchering of the Scriptures and illogical. Yet, such is what a consistent trinitarian would be forced to ascribe to, for they believe that the One True God is tripersonal: Father, Son & Holy Spirit.

Now notice what Sister White says; *'There is no place for gods in the heaven above. **God is the only true God. He** fills all heaven. Those who now submit to **his** will shall see **his** face; and **his name will be in the foreheads** of all who are pure and holy.'* - {1888 Materials, 1633.2}

Ellen White tells us that those who are 'pure and holy' will have the name of the only True God written in their foreheads. The Apostle John tells us that this is the name of the Father. *'And I looked, and, lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his **Father's name written in their foreheads.**'* (Rev 14:1)

We already saw this confirmed by Jesus Christ when He said that He'll write the name of His God on those who overcome (See Rev 3:12).

As already stated, The Father is the One True God, for He is the Ultimate Sovereign and source of all things. Ellen White affirms that it is God the Father who is the source of all. **'The Ancient of Days is God the Father.** Says the psalmist: "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God." Psalm 90:2. It is He, the source of all being, and the fountain of all law, that is to preside in the judgment.' - {GC 479.2} Ellen White plainly states that the Ancient of Days, who is the Father, is 'the source of **all being**,' and the fountain (originator) of '**all law**'. A few lines later, Ellen White goes on to state that in Daniel 7:13-14, 'The coming of Christ here described is not His second coming to the earth. He comes to the Ancient of Days in heaven to receive dominion and glory and a kingdom, which will be given Him at the close of His work as a mediator. It is this coming, and not His second advent to the earth... Attended by heavenly angels, our great High Priest enters the holy of holies and there **appears in the presence of God** to engage in the last acts of His ministration in behalf of man' - {GC 479.3} Ellen White states that Christ 'appears in the presence of God'. This is in harmony with the author of Hebrews who says, 'For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to **appear in the presence of God** for us:' - (Heb 9:24)

Again, the consistent trinitarian would have to understand this as Christ appearing in the presence of the trinity, as they believe the term 'God' is in reference to a triunity of persons, the 'triune God.' Yet, the majority of trinitarians, if not all, would not interpret this in such a way, for such would clearly be ludicrous. However, this then pushes the trinitarians into a corner of inconsistency. Is the God of the Bible identified by the prophets and apostles a trinity or not? One can't simply interchange the meaning when it suits. We've seen the trinitarian affirmations that the one God of the Bible is revealed as a trinity of persons, and thereby this one God must always come in a three. If the One God is only referred to as the Father, surely this then destroys the identity of the triune God, for he's three in one and one in three. The trinity completely depersonalises our God, and turns Him into a philosophical idea, rather than a real true Personal Being, whereas Sister White tells us that '*there is a Personal God, the Father*', and she rejoiced in this fact;

*'...I delight to dwell on the **relation of God to us, as the Father of our Lord Jesus. It is through the Son** that we can look to **Him and call Him our Father.** We cannot have too exalted views of our relationship with the Father of all the human family.'* - {22LtMs, Lt 363, 1907. par. 3}

However, many like to argue that God isn't a single entity due to the Hebrew word for God (**ēlōhîm**)<sup>Strong's H430</sup> being plural, thus, they conclude that the one God must be a plurality of persons. However, by allowing Scripture to interpret itself, we can see that although 'ēlōhîm' is plural, the word can be used to refer to one singular being. God referred to Moses as a god (elohim). '*And the LORD said unto Moses, See, I have **made thee a god***'<sup>Strong's H430</sup> (**ēlōhîm**) **to Pharaoh:.....'** - (Ex 7:1)

Yet, one wouldn't arrive at the conclusion that God made Moses a multipersonal being. Elōhîm is also simply a title to denote supremacy and can be used as plural for greatness and majesty. *'Wherefore David blessed the LORD before all the congregation: and David said, Blessed be **thou, LORD God** (ēlōhîm) **of Israel our father**, for ever and ever. **Thine**, O LORD is **the greatness**, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and **the majesty**: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is **thine**; **thine** is the kingdom, O LORD, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honour come of **thee**, and **thou** reignest over all; and in **thine** hand is power and might; and in **thine** hand it is to make great, and to give strength unto all.'* - (1 Chron 29:10-12) We see that David addresses the '**God** (ēlōhîm) *of Israel our father*' using a second-person singular pronoun: '**thou**'. He then goes on to use the singular second person possessive pronoun: '**thine**', to denote that all '*the greatness*' and '*the majesty*' belongs to '*ēlōhîm... our father.*' Therefore, God making Moses a 'god' (ēlōhîm) to Pharaoh meant Moses was made very great in the land of Egypt. *'And the LORD gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians. Moreover the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh's servants, and in the sight of the people.'* - (Ex 11:3) Therefore, we see that God (ēlōhîm) is plural, yet it can be used to refer to one person. Also, the Greek word for God in the New Testament: '**theos**,<sup>Strong's G2316</sup> is not plural, but singular.

Another argument used to claim that God is a trinity is the fact that in Genesis 1:26, God appears to be speaking to someone else during the creation of man when using the plural words, 'us' and 'our'. *'And **God said, Let us** make man in **our** image, after **our** likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.'* - (Gen 1:26) The reason God appears to be speaking to someone else in this verse is because God, quite simply, is speaking to someone else, He is speaking to His Son Jesus Christ who He created the world through. *'And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in **God, who created all things by Jesus Christ**.'* - (Eph 3:9)

Ellen white also affirms this when she says, *'After the earth was created, and the beasts upon it, **the Father and Son carried out their purpose**, which was designed before the fall of Satan, to make man in **their own** image. They had **wrought together** in the creation of the earth and every living thing upon it. And now **God said to His Son**, "Let **us** make man in **our** image."* - {LHU 47.3} God speaking to His Son in Genesis 1:26 cannot signify that God is tripersonal. Such would be forming a conclusion that is not there, and thus, would be an assumption. If God is the Trinity, how can one read this as the Trinity speaking to his son, or the Triune god speaking to himself? This also destroys the modalist concept of God, for Jesus is clearly not the Father, but He was the agent of the Father in creation. Moreover, this also destroys the Unitarian doctrine, for clearly God was not alone before creation, for the pre-existent Son of God was with Him. The Bible simply presents that the One God, which is the Father, created the world through His Son, Jesus Christ. All things that come from Jehovah God, come through the channel of His Son Jesus Christ.

*'It is through the gift of Christ that we receive every blessing. Through that gift there comes to us day by day the unfailing flow of Jehovah's goodness. Every flower, with its delicate tints and its fragrance, is given for our enjoyment **through that one Gift**. The sun and the moon **were made by Him**. There is not a star which beautifies the heavens that He did not make. Every drop of rain that falls, every ray of light shed upon our unthankful world, testifies to the love of God in Christ. **Everything is supplied to us through the one unspeakable Gift, God's only-begotten Son**. He was nailed to the cross that all these bounties might **flow to God's workmanship**.' - {MH 424.5}*

Ellen White makes it plain that the Father is the God of the Bible, and Jesus Christ is the Son of the God of the Bible.

*'With my husband I have stood on some lofty height, and looked upon the mountains rising peak above peak, until our souls were thrilled with a sense of God's majesty and power... we acknowledged with reverent awe that all was the handiwork of **the Most High**. We rejoiced that the **God of creation is the God of the Bible**, and that we can claim **this infinite Being as our Father**. We talked of the glories of **his** power and wisdom, and adored the matchless love which has made it possible, **through Jesus Christ**, for fallen man to become a son and heir of the **Maker and Sovereign of the universe**.' - {RH November 1, 1881, par. 4}*

Sister White being in full harmony with the apostles uses the singular word 'His' to refer to the One God of the Bible, as she clearly pinpoints that this 'God of the Bible' is a single 'Being', namely 'our Father', and He is 'the Maker and Sovereign of the universe'. Ellen White demonstrates that the God of the Bible has made man's adoption into His Family possible through His Son Jesus Christ.

Many Christians often think and fear that proclaiming the One True God is the Father alone diminishes the position of Christ, and in order to exalt Jesus, they think He must be the Almighty God Himself with no distinction from the Father. Many believe that they are lifting up Christ by saying that there is no difference between Him and His Father in any way, but in actuality, although with honest genuine intent, they are dishonouring the Father, for they rob Him of His glory and honour as the absolute and Only True and Living God. Doctrines like modalism go as far as to deny the Father's very existence as a Person, as they call themselves 'Jesus only,' to imply that Jesus Himself is the Almighty Father, and there is none else. Such doesn't please the Lord Jesus. Christ had no problem with calling His Father His God (Rev 3:12), the apostles had no problem with calling the Father the God of our Lord Jesus Christ (Eph 1:17). The Lord Jesus Christ had been with the Father in eternity before the world was (Jhn 17:5), He is the one through whom all things were made (Col 1:15-16), the express image of the Father (Heb 1:3), the radiant of the Father's glory, the one who came down from heaven (Jhn 6:38), and yet all along, He still maintained that His Father was greater than all, including Himself.

*‘My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. **My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all**; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.’ - (Jhn 10:27-29) ‘Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: **for my Father is greater than I.**’ - (Jhn 14:28)*

Jesus always recognised that there was One above Himself, and all praise was always transferred up to the source of goodness, His Father: *‘And a certain ruler asked him, saying, **Good Master**, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, **Why callest thou me good? none is good, save one, that is, God.**’ - (Luke 18:18-19)* Again, when the ruler called Jesus good, Jesus responded by saying that *‘none is good, save (except) one, that is, God.’* Was Jesus here denying that He Himself was good? Of course not! This couldn't be so, for the Lord Jesus is the spotless Lamb of God (1 Pet 1:19), the Righteous one (1 Jhn 2:1). The Lord Jesus Christ is the epitome of good. Nevertheless, we see in this encounter that Christ still recognised His Father as the ultimate standard of goodness, for He alone is the Ultimate Sovereign, and therefore, is the one who determines what is good or bad. The Lord Jesus knew that *‘**Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.**’ - (James 1:17)*

The Son Himself was that good and perfect gift that God sent down from heaven to give life to the world (See Jhn 6:28-40). Therefore, Jesus responded to the certain ruler by making a clear distinction between Himself and the One who is good, *‘that is, God.’* All praise was transmitted to God His Father, for the Father is greater.

May we not find ourselves fighting against the authority and sovereignty of God the Father. Ellen White warned:

*‘An intelligent knowledge of His word has been given to prepare men and women to contend zealously for the law of Jehovah; to reestablish the holy law; make up the breach that has been made in the law of God and restore the tables of stone to their ancient, exalted, honorable position. And God's faithful servants when brought into straight places should not confer with flesh and blood. **There will be, even among us**, hirelings and wolves in sheep's clothing who will persuade some of the flock of God to sacrifice **unto other gods before the Lord**. We have reason to know how Paul would act in any emergency. “The love of Christ constraineth us.” (2 Corinthians 5:13). Youth who are not established, rooted and grounded in the truth, will be corrupted and drawn away by the blind leaders of the blind; and the ungodly, the despisers that wonder and perish, **who despise the sovereignty of the Ancient of Days and place on the throne a false god, a being of their own defining**, a being altogether such an one as themselves,—these will be agents in Satan's hands to corrupt the faith of the unwary.’ - {1888, 484.2-3}*

*‘The disciples had asked many questions that revealed their ignorance of God's relation to them and to their present and future interests. **Christ desired them to have a clearer, more distinct knowledge of God.** I will show you the Father and will make you better*

acquainted with Him, He said. It is this knowledge that Christians today need. This knowledge, which Christ alone can give, is the highest of all education... Christ took with Him to the heavenly courts His glorified humanity. To those who receive Him, He gives power to become the sons of God, that at last **God may receive them as His, to dwell with Him throughout all eternity.** If during this life they are loyal to God, they will at last “see **His** face; and **His** name shall be in their foreheads.” [Revelation 22:4.] And what is the happiness of heaven but to see God? What greater joy could come to the sinner, saved by the grace of Christ, **than to look upon the face of God and know Him as Father?** “Now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.” [1 Corinthians 13:12.] **Some today are coming to hold false ideas of the invisible God and are presenting these ideas to others.** Let those who do this know that their childish portrayal of God is a misconception. They know not God. Before the world, before angels, and before men, they are giving a false representation of **Him**. To those to whom these fanciful interpretations are presented, I would say, Let not these sentiments charm your senses and lead you into paths of Satan’s making. **Beware, beware of spiritualistic ideas of God. Those who entertain such ideas greatly dishonor Him.** Let every one humble his heart before God.’ - {18LtMs, Ms 124, 1903, par. 9, 12-14}

Overall, the Word of God shows plainly that God is truly One (Deut 4:39, 6:4, Mark 12:28-29, 34). Our God is One single Person, and this is the Father (1 Cor 8:6, Eph 4:6). We find in Scripture that the One True God has a Son; our Lord Jesus Christ, and created the world through His Son (Eph 3:9). Hence, not once in the Bible do we ever see the term ‘*God the eternal Son*’<sup>11</sup> used like in number 4 of the SDA 28 fundamental beliefs. This is because the Bible explicitly tells us that the One True God is the Father (Jhn 4:22-24, 17:3, 1 Jhn 5:20, 1 Thess 1:9-10). To deviate in any way from this clear scriptural teaching is to cling onto man-made traditions and a god of man's imagination. Such would be a failure to worship ‘*the true God as He is revealed in His word*’{5T 173.3, 4}, which sister White warned us against. Therefore, it is of great importance that we go with what the Bible says and not force our own presuppositions into Scripture, especially if we are to preach the three angel’s messages, point the world to the True God (Rev 14:7), and preach about the Second Advent of His Son (1 Thess 1:10). It is imperative that the Church has the correct understanding of who God is.

**‘A knowledge of God is the foundation of all true education and of all true service.** It is the only real safeguard against temptation. **It is this alone that can make us like God in character.** This is the knowledge needed by all who are working for the uplifting of their fellow men. Transformation of character, purity of life, efficiency in service, adherence to correct principles, all depend upon a right knowledge of God. **This knowledge is the essential preparation both for this life and for the life to come.** “The knowledge of the Holy is understanding.” Proverbs 9:10. Through a knowledge of **Him** are given unto us “all things that pertain unto life and godliness.” 2 Peter 1:3. “This is life eternal,” said Jesus, “that they might know **Thee the only true God, and** Jesus Christ, whom **Thou** hast sent.” John 17:3.’ - (MH 409. 1 - 410. 10)



## Chapter 2: Who is Jesus Christ?

We discovered in the first chapter that according to the inspired writers, the Father is the One True God of the Bible. This then raises the question; who is Jesus Christ according to the Bible? Now it must first be highlighted that when Jesus prayed to His Father concerning His apostles, He said: *I have manifested **thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word... For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them...** I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine.*' (Jhn 17:6, 8-9) Then later down in the chapter Jesus prayed for the rest of the believers and said: *'Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me **through their word;***' - (Jhn 17:20) Thus, it is through the word of the apostles and their understanding of what the holy prophets spoke concerning Christ, that we are to believe upon our Lord Jesus Christ. In Paul's second letter to the Corinthians, he warns the church that they'll be preachers who preach another Jesus, and he greatly feared that the church would receive this different Jesus. *'But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. **For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached,**... ye might well bear with him.'* - (2 Cor 11:3-4) In order to avoid falling into this trap of following a false Jesus, we must investigate who the True Jesus is from our sole guide and authority, the Holy Bible.

As it was Paul who gave the warning of receiving a different Jesus '*whom we have not preached*', let us see what Jesus Paul had preached. *'...Then was Saul certain days with the disciples which were at Damascus. And straightway he **preached Christ** in the synagogues, that **he is the Son of God.**'* - (Acts 9:19-20) After Paul's conversion, the first thing he preached was that Jesus is the Son of God. *'Immediately Saul received sight and arose and was baptized. He then taught in the synagogues that **Jesus was indeed the Son of God...** All were acquainted with Saul's opposition to Jesus and his zeal in hunting out and delivering up to death all who believed on His name; and his miraculous conversion convinced many that **Jesus was the Son of God.** Saul related his experience in the power of the Holy Spirit... as he journeyed to Damascus, suddenly a great light from heaven shone round about him, and **Jesus revealed Himself to him, and taught him that **He was the Son of God.****'* - {EW 201.1}

When the Lord '*Jesus revealed Himself*' to Paul, He '*taught him*' about Himself concerning His identity. He revealed to Paul '*that He was the Son of God*'. Therefore, Paul spoke about a God who has a Son named Jesus. *'**God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.**'* - (1 Cor 1:9)

Paul reaffirmed his teaching that the Jesus he preached is the Son of God. *'For **the Son of God, Jesus Christ**, who was **preached among you** by us, even by me and Silvanus and Timotheus, was not yea and nay, but in him was yea.'* - (2 Cor 1:19)

And as shown in the previous chapter, Paul preached that the God of the Bible is the Father of Jesus Christ. *'Blessed be God, **even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ**, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort;'* - (2 Cor 1:3)

Again, as already shown in the previous chapter, Paul refers to Jesus as God's own Son. *'For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending **his own Son** in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.'* - (Rom 8:3)

*'But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth **his Son**, made of a woman, made under the law,'* - (Gal 4:4)

Paul said that the Jesus he lived in faith by was the Son of God. *'I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of **the Son of God**, who loved me, and gave himself for me.'* - (Gal 2:20)

The author of Hebrews, who many believe to be Paul, preached a Jesus that is the Son of God. *'Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, **Jesus the Son of God**, let us hold fast our profession.'* - (Heb 4:14) Therefore, we see that the Jesus Paul preached is the Son of God.

Moreover, the Apostle John shared these same sentiments as Paul concerning who Jesus is; that He is the Son of God: *'This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ **his Son** cleanseth us from all sin.'* - (1 Jhn 1:5-7)

*'He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose **the Son of God** was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.'* - (1 Jhn 3:8)

Clearly John taught that Jesus is the Son of God the Father. *'Grace be with you, mercy, and peace, from **God the Father**, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, **the Son of the Father**, in truth and love.'* - (2 John 3) Also, Mark began his gospel by introducing Jesus as the Son of God. *'The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, **the Son of God**;'* - (Mark 1:1)

Peter also preached in his sermon that Jesus is God's Son. *'The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified **his Son Jesus**; whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go... Unto you first God, having raised up **his Son Jesus**, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.'* - (Acts 3:13, 26)

Also, Jesus had asked His disciples who the people had been saying He was, and they informed Him that there had been confusion in regards to His identity among many of the people. *'When Jesus came into the coasts of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that **I the Son of man am?** And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets.'* - (Matt 16:13-14) When Jesus asked the disciples who they believed He was, Peter proclaimed that He is the Son of God. *'He saith unto them, **But whom say ye that I am?** And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, **the Son of the living God.**'* - (Matt 16:13-14) And Jesus greatly commended Peter for this profession. *'And Jesus answered and said unto him, **Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona:** for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but **my Father** which is in heaven.'* - (Matt 16:17) Peter and the disciples declared that they were certain of who Jesus is. *'Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. And **we believe and are sure** that thou art that Christ, **the Son of the living God.**'* - (Jhn 6:68-69)

The disciples worshipped Jesus with a full understanding of who He was. *'Then they that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying, **Of a truth thou art the Son of God.**'* - (Matt 14:33) Ellen White tells us that it was this reminder of who God told them Jesus is that strengthened the disciples faith when they began to doubt. *'Some of the disciples had gained confidence to enter where Jesus was and witness His trial. They expected that He would manifest His divine power, and deliver Himself from the hands of His enemies, and punish them for their cruelty toward Him. Their hopes would rise and fall as the different scenes transpired. Sometimes they doubted, and feared that they had been deceived. But the voice heard at the mount of transfiguration, and the glory they there beheld, strengthened their faith that **He was the Son of God.**'* - {EW 171.1}

Martha also gives us insight into who she believed Jesus was when *'She saith unto him, Yea, Lord: I believe that thou art the Christ, **the Son of God, which should come into the world.**'* - (Jhn 11:4)

According to the Spirit of prophecy, the wife of pontius pilate even had an angel of God visit her in a dream to reveal to her who Jesus is:

*'From the first, **Pilate was convicted that Jesus was no common man.** He believed Him to be an excellent character, and entirely innocent of the charges brought against Him. The angels who were witnessing the scene marked the convictions of the Roman governor, and to save him from engaging in the awful act of delivering Christ to be crucified, **an angel was sent to Pilate's wife, and gave her information through a dream that it was the Son of God** in whose trial her husband was engaged, and that*

*He was an innocent sufferer. She immediately sent a message to Pilate, stating that she had suffered many things in a dream on account of Jesus and warning him to have nothing to do with that holy man. The messenger, pressing hastily through the crowd, placed the letter in the hands of Pilate. As he read, he trembled and turned pale, and at once determined to have nothing to do with putting Christ to death. If the Jews would have the blood of Jesus, he would not give his influence to it, but would labor to deliver Him.’ - {EW 173.1}*

At Jesus' crucifixion, the Roman soldier also came to the realisation of who Christ was. *‘Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, **Truly this was the Son of God.**’ - (Matt 27:54)*

*‘The Roman officers in charge were standing about the cross when Jesus cried out, “It is finished,” in a voice of startling power, and then instantly died with that cry of victory upon his lips. They had never before witnessed a death like that upon the cross. It was an unheard-of thing for one to die thus within six hours after crucifixion. Death by crucifixion was a slow and lingering process; nature became more and more exhausted until it was difficult to determine when life had become extinct. But for a man dying thus to summon such power of voice and clearness of utterance as Jesus had done, immediately before his death, was such an astonishing event that the Roman officers, experienced in such scenes, marveled greatly; and **the centurion who commanded the detachment of soldiers on duty there, immediately declared, “Truly this was the Son of God.”** Thus three men, differing widely from one another, openly declared their belief in Christ upon the very day of his death—he who commanded the Roman guard, he who bore the cross of his Saviour, and he who died upon the cross by his side.’ - {3SP 169.2}*

*‘Many had believed on Jesus as they saw the terrible sights that took place. They remembered the voice that was heard at the foot of the cross amid the noise and confusion. **“When the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God.”** [Matthew 27:54.] As Christ cried out, “It is finished,” the cloud of blackness rolled back from the cross. The light seemed more bright in contrast with the darkness. **Then the words of confession were heard, not in whispered tones, but as a witness, “Truly this was the Son of God.”** All eyes were turned to the place from whence came the voice. Who had spoken? **It was the centurion and the Roman soldiers, heathen and idolaters.** Thus was the evidence given that soon our Redeemer would see of the travail of His soul. What so enlightened and convinced these men that they could not refrain from confessing their faith in Jesus? It was the sermon that was given in every action of Christ and in His silence under cruel abuse. At His trial one seemed to vie with the other in making His humiliation as degrading as possible. But His silence was eloquence. **In that lacerated, bruised, broken body hanging on the cross, the Centurion recognized the form of the Son of God.**’ - {12LtMs, Ms 115, 1897, par. 25-26}*

Even the demons couldn't help but testify who they believed Jesus was when they stood in His presence. 'And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, **Thou art Christ the Son of God.** And he rebuking them suffered them not to speak: for they knew that he was Christ.' - (Luke 4:41) 'And when he went forth to land, there met him out of the city a certain man, which had devils long time, and ware no clothes, neither abode in any house, but in the tombs. When he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, **thou Son of God** most high? I beseech thee, torment me not.' - (Luke 8:27-28) 'And unclean spirits, when they saw him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, **Thou art the Son of God.**' - (Mark 3:11)

*"The malice of the Jews was so great in consequence of the miracle of Jesus in healing the man with the withered hand on the Sabbath day, that he with his disciples withdrew to a more favorable field of labor. They went to the seaside of Galilee, and great multitudes followed him, for this new miracle wrought upon the Sabbath day was noised abroad through all that region. As Jesus taught, many of the sick, and those possessed with demons, were brought to him, and he made them whole. His great heart of love was filled with divine pity for the poor sufferers, many of whom sought only to draw near enough to touch him, believing that in so doing they would be healed, and in this they were not disappointed, for the touch of faith brought healing power from the great Physician, and their distress and gloom were changed to joy and thanksgiving. **He also cast out many demons, who, in leaving their victims, acknowledged Christ, saying, "Thou art the Son of God."**" - {2SP 201.1}*

*'Jesus taught the people at Capernaum in their synagogues upon several successive Sabbaths. They were astonished at his doctrine; for his lessons of instruction were given with power. Here he cast out devils with his divine power. These demons, in a most public manner, entreated him not to disturb them. Said they, What can we do to resist thy power? Has the time come now to destroy us? "I know thee, who thou art, the Holy One of God." Demons were unable to resist the power of Christ. They surrendered to him, and in the presence of the astonished multitude, **acknowledged him to be the all-powerful Son of God.**' - {1Red 69.1}*

This was because Satan and his fallen angels knew who Christ was from the time they were still in heaven.

*'Satan imbued Herod with the very feelings and fears that disturbed his own mind. He inspired the corrupt mind of Herod to invent a plan which he thought would succeed in ridding the earth of the infant king, by slaying all the children from two years old and under in Bethlehem. But against his plans, Satan sees a higher power at work. Angels of God protected the life of the infant Redeemer. Joseph was warned in a dream to flee into Egypt, that in a heathen land he may find an asylum for the world's Redeemer. Satan followed him from infancy to childhood and from childhood to manhood, inventing means and ways to allure him from his allegiance to God, and overcome him with his subtle temptations. The unsullied purity of the childhood, youth, and manhood, of Christ which Satan could not taint annoyed him exceedingly. All his darts and arrows of temptation fell **harmless before the Son of God.** And when he found that all his temptations prevailed nothing in moving Christ from his steadfast integrity, or in marring the spotless purity of*

the youthful Galilean, he was perplexed and enraged... That there should be one who walked the earth with moral power to withstand all his temptations, who resisted all his attractive bribes to allure him to sin, and over whom he could obtain no advantage to separate from God, chafed and enraged his Satanic majesty... He (Satan) was on the ground at the time when Christ presented himself to John for baptism. He heard the majestic voice resounding through heaven and echoing through the earth like peals of thunder. He saw the lightnings flash from the cloudless heavens, and **heard the fearful words from Jehovah, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased."** He saw the brightness of the Father's glory overshadowing the form of Jesus, thus, with unmistakable assurance, pointing out the One in that crowd **whom he** (Jehovah) **acknowledged as his Son**. The circumstances connected with this baptismal scene had aroused the most intense hatred in the breast of Satan. He knew then for a certainty that, unless he could overcome Christ, from henceforth there would be a limitation of his power. He understood that the communication from the throne of God signified that Heaven was more directly accessible to man. As Satan had led man to sin, he had hoped that God's abhorrence of sin would forever separate him from man, and break the connecting link between Heaven and earth. But the opening heavens in connection with **the voice of God addressing his Son** was like a death-knell to Satan. He feared that God was now to unite man more fully to himself, and give him power to overcome his devices. And for this purpose, Christ had come from the royal courts to the earth. **Satan was well acquainted with the position of honor Christ had held in Heaven as the Son of God, the beloved of the Father**. And **that he should leave Heaven and come to this world as a man** filled him with apprehension for his own safety. He could not comprehend the mystery of this great sacrifice for the benefit of fallen man.' - {RH March 3, 1874, par.16-18, 20-21}

Notice that 'Satan was well acquainted with the position of honor Christ had held in Heaven as the Son of God,' and it was this same Son of God who would 'leave heaven' and enter the world 'as a man.' So according to this, Jesus was always the Son of God, He was the Son of God before He came into the world as a man, and Satan knew this. Jehovah spoke from heaven declaring that which the enemy was already well 'acquainted with.'

And most importantly, we have the testimony of Jesus Christ and God the Father Themselves that tells us who Jesus is. Jesus called Himself the Son of God. 'When Jesus heard that, he said, This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that **the Son of God** might be glorified thereby.' - (Jhn 11:4)

'Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because **I said, I am the Son of God?**' - (Jhn 10:36)

'And unto the angel of the church in Thyatira write; These things saith **the Son of God**, who hath his eyes like unto a flame of fire, and his feet are like fine brass;' - (Rev 2:18)

God the Father only spoke audibly from heaven three times in the Gospels, and two of these times He also testified of who Jesus is. 'And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is **my beloved Son**, in whom I am well pleased.' - (Matt 3:17) 'While he yet spake, behold, a

*bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, **This is my beloved Son**, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.'* - (Matt 17:5)

The Apostle Peter remembered what he heard on the mount from the very voice of the God of heaven Himself, thus, he knew that the testimony was sure, and was no fable:

*'Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things, though ye know them, and be established in the present truth. Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me. Moreover I will endeavour that ye may be able after my decease to have these things always in remembrance. **For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard**, when we were with him in the holy mount.'*  
- (2 Pet 1:12-18)

Therefore, we have confirmation from both God and Christ that the True Jesus is the Son of God.

We've already seen Ellen White state plainly that; '**God is the Father of Christ; Christ is the Son of God.** To Christ has been given an exalted position. He has been made equal with the Father. All the counsels of God are opened to **His Son.**' - {8T 268.3}

*'... **The God of heaven sent his Son into our world** to give lessons which contain the true science. But were Christ in our world today, he would say to many teachers, as he said to the Pharisees, "Ye neither know me, **nor my Father**:..."* - {RH October 25, 1898. Par 12}

Therefore, we can affirm from the Bible writers that the True Jesus is the Son of God, but no Christian would disagree with this. All professed Christians of all denominations across the world would be in complete agreement with the statement that 'Jesus is the Son of God.' However, there are different interpretations concerning what this actually means in the Christian world. For instance, as highlighted in the introduction, some Christians such as the oneness pentecostals believe in modalism, which teaches that the Son of God is the Father but in a different mode or manifestation, in which the Father became the Son at His incarnation, because the one God is one person who has three manifestations according to them. Some believe that Christ was not always the son, but rather, he was another co-eternal being beside God the Father, and entered into the role of a son for the plan of redemption. Some such as the Jehovah's Witnesses believe that the son is a created being, the first of God's creation, and is a literal angel (the first angel created and highest of all angels). Others such as the 'Biblical Unitarians', who ascribe to the Christology of Socinianism, believe that Christ is just a man and prophet who God foreordained in the beginning to be the Messiah, and that he only came into existence after being conceived by the virgin Mary, and was thus then the son of God. Consequently, they reject the belief in the pre-existence of Christ, and teach that He is not divine.

The trinitarians believe that the term 'son' is just a title given to the second co-eternal person of the trinity or 'Godhead', and that the second person is just role playing as the son. Some trinitarians also argue that the term 'son' is used to describe a relationship. Moreover, some trinitarians believe that Christ's sonship to God is only in reference to him as a human, and he was not the son prior to his incarnation. In order to eradicate all confusion and have a true understanding of what the Word of God means when it says that 'Jesus is the Son of God', we must again analyse what the Bible plainly teaches concerning this, and allow the Scriptures to interpret themselves.

Firstly, let's start by analysing what one of the most well known Bible verses says. *'For God so loved the world, that he gave his **only begotten Son**, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'* - (Jhn 3:16) This verse refers to Christ as being God's *'only begotten Son.'* The word begotten is translated from the Greek word **'monogenēs'**,<sup>Strong's G3439</sup> which is a combination of two words: **'monos'**(alone/only)<sup>Strong's G3441</sup> & **'ginomai'**(come into being)<sup>Strong's G1096</sup>. Together, this means 'only-born.' Notice, it says that He *'gave'* His only begotten Son. In order to have given His only begotten Son, He would have needed to have a begotten Son to begin with, thus, this can't be speaking about begotten after Christ's incarnation. Now since the 19th century, there has been a growth in modern scholars and theologians who have changed the meaning of the word 'monogenēs' to mean 'unique' or 'one of a kind,' which is why many of the modern Bible translations omit the word begotten in reference to Christ. However, these alterations to the meaning of the word stem from theological motive rather than objective reasonings of the evidence provided by both history itself and the Bible. Such must be avoided, therefore, we must examine how this word is used concerning other people in the context of a parent and child in the New Testament. For example, in the book of Luke, we see the same word used. *'Now when he came nigh to the gate of the city, behold, there was a dead man carried out, **the only***<sup>Strong's G1096</sup> **(monogenēs)** *son of his mother, and she was a widow: and much people of the city was with her.'* - (Luke 7:12) This man was the 'only son' of his mother, and in the context of this situation, this would mean that he was the 'only begotten' of his mother. It wouldn't make sense to imply from this verse that the man wasn't her only son, but rather, he was her 'one of a kind' son or 'unique' son. We see the same word occur in the next chapter. *'And, behold, there came a man named Jairus, and he was a ruler of the synagogue: and he fell down at Jesus' feet, and besought him that he would come into his house: For he had **one only***<sup>Strong's G1096</sup> **(monogenēs)** *daughter, about twelve years of age, and she lay a dying. But as he went the people thronged him.'* - (Luke 8:41-42) Again, in verse 42 we see the earnest concern of Jairus for the life of his daughter. His great concern is founded upon his proclamation that she is his *'one only'* daughter, thus, in this context, she is his 'only begotten' daughter. Again, one couldn't come to the conclusion that 'monogenēs' here means 'unique' or 'one of a kind'. Again, in the next chapter, we see the same word (monogenēs) being used. *'And, behold, a man of the company cried out, saying, Master, I beseech thee, look upon my son: for he is mine **only child***<sup>Strong's G1096</sup> **(monogenēs)** *.'* - (Luke 9:38) Again, in this context, the word 'monogenēs' refers to the man's son as his 'only begotten' child, which explains the earnestness of the fathers appeal. Monogenēs here can't mean 'unique' or 'one of a kind'. All these verses with the word 'monogenēs' clearly imply 'only-begotten' in the context of a parent and child.



Now, the verse that tends to cause the most confusion concerning the word ‘monogenēs’ is in Hebrews which says: *‘By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his **only begotten (monogenēs) son,**’* - (Heb 11:17) The assertion is that Isaac was not Abraham’s ‘*only begotten son*’ at this point, as Abraham had another son before Isaac, namely Ishmael. Thus, it is argued that for ‘only-begotten’ to mean just that, would be a contradiction. Therefore, ‘monogenēs’ must mean ‘unique’. However, this is a strange premise. The initial confusion surrounding this verse should not lead to the conclusion that monogenēs cannot mean ‘only-begotten’ whenever the word is used elsewhere in Scripture. To abrogate all clear evidence that ‘monogenēs’ means ‘only-begotten’ from all other parts of the Bible because of this one verse is completely unreasonable. Moreover, if we look at the account in Genesis which states: *‘And God said, **Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son** indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will **establish my covenant with him** for an everlasting covenant, and **with his seed after him.**’* - (Gen 17:19) Now, Abraham only had one begotten son with Sarah. God proclaimed that Isaac was the one who He’ll establish His covenant with. As far as the author of Hebrews is concerned, Isaac was Abraham’s only-begotten son in regards to Sarah and Abraham who God made the covenant with. The promise of a son was given to Abraham and Sarah. Abraham only had one son with Sarah, and this son was an only-begotten son. Also, the word ‘bear’ in this verse in the Hebrew is ‘yālad’<sup>Strong’s H3205</sup> which is translated ‘beget’. This Hebrew word can be an equivalent of ‘ginomai’; the latter word of monogenēs. Thus, Isaac was indeed Abraham’s only begotten Son that Sarah begat, and it was solely through him that God’s promises would be fulfilled through the seed of Abraham. Ishmael, *‘...who was of the bondwoman was **born after the flesh;**...’* - (Gal 4:23) In contrast, Isaac who was born *‘...of the freewoman **was by promise**’* - (Gal 4:23) Ishmael was never meant to feature, he was never God’s arrangement, *‘But **my covenant will I establish with Isaac,** which **Sarah shall bear unto thee** at this set time in the next year.’* - (Gen 17:21) God desired Abraham to have a son that would be a type of Christ in order to foreshadow the giving of His (God’s) own Son. The message of the Gospel was to be presented in Abraham and his son, Isaac:

***‘The offering of Isaac was designed by God to prefigure the sacrifice of his Son. Isaac was a figure of the Son of God, who was offered a sacrifice for the sins of the world. God desired to impress upon Abraham the gospel of salvation to men, and in order to make the truth a reality, and to test his faith, he required Abraham to slay his darling Isaac. All the agony that Abraham endured during that dark and fearful trial was for the purpose of deeply impressing upon his understanding the plan of redemption for fallen man. He was made to understand in his own experience how great was the self-denial of the infinite God in giving his Son to rescue man from ruin.’*** - {YI March 1, 1900, par. 3}

Isaac was to be the first-born, the promised one of God. But Sarah and Abraham had taken it upon themselves to have a son, rather than wait for the appointed time of God (See Gen 16:1-4. 15-16). Therefore, Ishmael was born outside of God’s plan and promise, he came about as a result of human works and efforts in an attempt to fulfil the promises of God absent from God.

Therefore, Ishmael could not be regarded as the typified Son of God that Jehovah intended for Abraham's first-born son. ***'The lack of faith on the part of Abraham and Sarah had resulted in the birth of Ishmael, the mingling of the righteous seed with the ungodly.'*** - {PP 173.5}

This is why the angel of the LORD refers to Isaac as being Abraham's only son. *'And he said, Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me.'* - (Gen 22:12) As far as the story of redemption goes, Isaac was Abraham's only-begotten son (Heb 11:17). Isaac was the only son Abraham had with Sarah. and all along, Isaac was still a begotten son. Isaac was supposed to be an example *'to make the truth (of the Gospel) a reality'*, to be emblematic of *'the infinite God in giving his Son.'* The fact that Abraham had a son outside of God's will does not negate the truth and reality that the typified son of Abraham was supposed to typify.

Moreover, the Bible gives us an even clearer understanding of what it means when it says that Christ is begotten. For instance, in proverbs chapter 8, Wisdom is presented as speaking. The Scriptures declare to us who Wisdom is personified as. ***'But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God... But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: - (1 Cor 1:24, 30)*** Paul tells us that Christ is *'the wisdom of God'* and is *'made unto us wisdom'*. Jesus also confirms that He is the wisdom of God when He says: ***'Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall slay and persecute:'*** - (Luke 11:49) We know that Wisdom here is referring to Christ, for He tells us that it is He who will send prophets when He says: ***'Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them ye shall kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city:'*** - (Matt 23:34)

However, some argue that Wisdom in Proverbs 8 can't be Christ speaking because verses 1-3 refer to wisdom as *'her'* and *'she'*. But this is the nature of the language. In Hebrew, the word *'wisdom'* is grammatically feminine. Many languages have gendered words, yet many times the gender of the word is not linked with whether something is actually male or female, it is just simply the word itself that is gendered.

Now let's analyse what the Wisdom of God says in Proverbs 8.

***'The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth: While as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world.'*** - (Prov 8:22-26)

Notice that Wisdom says before the world was created, during the days of eternity, they were *'brought forth.'* God's servant, Ellen White, confirms that this is Christ speaking:

*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. This was no robbery of God. "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way," **he declares**, "before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, **I was brought forth**; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was **I brought forth**; while as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When he prepared the heavens, **I was there**: when he set a compass upon the face of the depth." **There are light and glory in the truth that Christ was one with the Father before the foundation of the world was laid.** This is the light shining in a dark place, making it resplendent with divine, original glory. This truth, infinitely mysterious in itself, explains other mysterious and otherwise unexplainable truths, while it is enshrined in light, unapproachable and incomprehensible.*  
 - {RH April 5, 1906, par. 7-8}

Here, Ellen White quotes Proverbs 8:22-27 and thus, displays that the Divine Son of God was with the Father from eternity before the world was created, thereby highlighting that Jesus was brought forth in eternity past. Holding on to the current doctrine of the trinity that the SDA Church ascribes to today forces us to reject the Spirit of Prophecy, whether knowingly or unknowingly. For example, SDA minister, Pastor Doug Batchelor, completely contradicts Ellen White in a video concerning those that believe Proverbs 8 is Jesus speaking. He states: "Then they'll be people that read proverbs 8... I'm going to read 22-25. They believe that this is a prophecy speaking about Jesus..." **when there were no depths I was brought forth", they saying see He was from everlasting but it's saying that He was brought forth. They say this is about Jesus. Keep reading (reads v25-26)... so it's saying that Jesus was brought forth before the world was created.** This song is not a Proverb, it's in the book of Proverbs, but it's one of the songs of Solomon. Starts with verse 8, (it) **has nothing to do with Jesus being brought forth. It is a metaphor for wisdom, the whole thing.**<sup>12</sup> - ('Was Jesus Created? with Pastor Doug Batchelor', [Mins - 05:56-06:56])

These remarks are completely opposed to what Ellen White says regarding Christ in Proverbs 8. She says:

*"Before Abraham was, I am." Christ is the pre-existent, self-existent Son of God. The message He gave to Moses to give to the children of Israel was, "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you." The prophet Micah writes of Him, "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, tho thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of Thee shall He come forth unto Me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." Through Solomon **Christ declared**: "The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, **I was brought forth**; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was **I brought forth**.... When He gave to the sea His decree, that the waters should not pass His commandment; when He appointed the foundations of the earth; then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him; and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him."...**In speaking of His pre-existence, Christ carries the***

**mind back through dateless ages.** He assures us that there never was a time when He was not in close fellowship with the eternal God. He to whose voice the Jews were then listening had been with God **as one brought up with Him.** - {ST August 29, 1900, par. 13-15} Ellen White explicitly says that it is Jesus speaking in Proverbs 8, and He was 'speaking of His pre-existence'. Before all creation, in the days of eternity, Jesus Christ was 'brought forth.' And He has always been 'in close fellowship with the eternal God,' His Father.

'Only by the gift of God's Son could the ransom of the human race be obtained. Without this sacrifice, all that remained for man was death in his sins. But by giving His life for the life of the world, Christ bridged the gulf that sin had made, joining this sin-cursed earth to the universe of heaven as a province. God chose this world to be the theater of His mighty work of grace. While the sentence of condemnation was suspended over it because of the rebellion of its inhabitants, while the clouds of wrath were accumulating because of transgression of God's law, a strange and mysterious voice was heard in heaven: "Lo, I come ... to do Thy will, O God." "Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared me." **"The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old," Christ says. "When He gave to the sea His decree, that the waters should not pass His commandment; when He appointed the foundations of the earth; then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him; and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him."** **But the only-begotten Son of God humbled Himself to come to this earth.** He took the sinner's place; the guiltless suffered for the guilty. This was the hiding of His glory. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death." God accepted the death of His Son to save a rebellious race. But in this was there no sacrifice made by the Father? **The Creator Himself, the Omnipotent God, suffered with His Son.**' - {ST February 22, 1899, par.4-6}

Now notice how the Speaker in Proverbs 8 makes it even clearer that Wisdom is a Personal Being speaking.

'When he prepared the heavens, **I was there**: when he set a compass upon the face of the depth: When he established the clouds above: when he strengthened the fountains of the deep: When he gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment: when he appointed the foundations of the earth: Then **I was by him, as one brought up with him: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him;**' - (Prov 8:27-30) 'I was by him, as one brought up with him: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him': This is clearly a Person speaking. Jesus Christ gives us a beautiful insight into the intimate and loving relationship He had with His Father from the days of eternity before the world was. Also, in verse 30 of this chapter, the words 'one brought up' are translated from the Hebrew word '**āmôn**,' <sup>Strong's H525</sup> This word means 'master-workman' or 'artificer.' The definition of artificer according to Merriam-Webster's dictionary is a 'skilled worker' or 'craftsman.' So a literal translation of 'one brought up' in proverbs 8:30 can be 'master-workman' or 'artificer (craftsman)'. So Wisdom here is saying that before anything was created, 'I was by Him (Jehovah), as a master-workman.'

Other Bible translations accurately translate it this way:

'Then I was beside Him, **as a master workman**;...' - Prov 8:30 NASB

'Then I was beside Him **as a master craftsman**;...' - Prov 8:30 NKJV

'Then I am near Him, **a workman**...' - Prov 8:30 LSV

So this speaker is saying that in the days of eternity, they were with God, and were His master-workman in creation. This is clearly a direct parallel to Col 1:16-17;

*'By Him (Jesus) were all things created... **All things were created by Him (Jesus) and for Him, and He is before all things...**'*

and Eph 3:9;

*'...which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, **who created all things by Jesus Christ:**'*

So the picture presented in Prov 8:30 is that Jehovah (The Father) was the architect, and His Son was the constructor/builder Himself, hence God created all things by/through His Son Jesus Christ. It is no wonder that in Proverbs 8, Wisdom makes the statement saying; '**For whoso findeth me findeth life, and shall obtain favour of the LORD. But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death.**' - (Prov 8:35-36) To find Wisdom is to find life and the favour of Jehovah God, and to reject and hate Wisdom is to love death. Can this speaker be anyone other than the Lord Jesus Christ Himself? For '**The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.**' - (Jhn 3:35-36)

We know that '**...the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.**' - (Rom 6:23) Whoever finds Christ finds life and obtains the favour of the Father, and all those that hate the Lord Jesus Christ love death. '**If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha.**' - (1 Cor 16:22)

So again, it is clear that Wisdom in Proverbs 8 is the Lord Jesus Christ. In this chapter of Proverbs, we get a beautiful glimpse into the plan of creation that was wrought between the Father & Son.

***'The Sovereign of the universe was not alone in His work of beneficence. He had an associate—a co-worker who could appreciate His purposes, and could share His joy in giving happiness to created beings. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God." John 1:1, 2. Christ, the Word, the only begotten of God, was one with the eternal Father—one in nature, in character, in purpose—the only being that could enter into all the counsels and purposes of God. "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Isaiah 9:6. His "goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." Micah 5:2. And the Son of God declares concerning Himself: "The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting.... When He appointed the foundations of the earth: then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him: and I was daily His delight,***

rejoicing always before Him." Proverbs 8:22-30. **The Father wrought by His Son in the creation of all heavenly beings.** "By Him were all things created, ... whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: **all things were created by Him, and for Him.**" Colossians 1:16.' - {PP 34.1-2}

Therefore, we see that Jesus has truly been 'in close fellowship with the eternal God' from eternity. Moreover, it must be noted that 'from eternity' does not denote co-eternality. Eternity refers to the duration outside of time or before time began. There is no conflict between being begotten and eternal unless we want to use one fact to reject the other. To argue that these two clash with each other is to deny what the Bible plainly tells us. The Bible makes it clear that Christ's origin is from the days of eternity. *'But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he (Jesus) come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from the days of eternity.'* - (Micah 5:2 - margin) Although Jesus Christ is begotten, He is essentially eternal. The pioneers understood this plain scriptural teaching. Notice what Uriah Smith said in regards to Christ's origin:

*'God alone is without beginning. At the earliest epoch when a beginning could be, - a period so remote that to finite minds it is essentially eternity, - appeared the Word. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." John 1:1. This uncreated Word was the Being, who, in the fulness of time, was made flesh, and dwelt among us. His beginning was not like that of any other being in the universe. It is set forth in the mysterious expressions, "his [God's] only begotten Son" (John 3:16; 1John 4:9), "the only begotten of the Father" (John 1:14), and, "I proceeded forth and came from God." John 8:42. Thus it appears that by some divine impulse or process, not creation, known only to Omniscience, and possible only to Omnipotence, the Son of God appeared.'* - {LUJ 10.1}

SDA pioneer, E. J. Waggoner understood this too. *'The Scriptures declare that Christ is "the only begotten son of God." He is begotten, not created. As to when He was begotten, it is not for us to inquire, nor could our minds grasp it if we were told. The prophet Micah tells us all that we can know about it, in these words: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto Me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from the days of eternity." Micah 5:2, margin. There was a time when Christ proceeded forth and came from God, from the bosom of the Father (John 8:42; 1:18), but that time was so far back in the days of eternity that to finite comprehension it is practically without beginning.'*<sup>13</sup> - (E. J. Waggoner, 'Christ and His Righteousness', p. 19/21-22)

*'The Word was "in the beginning." The mind of man cannot grasp the ages that are spanned in this phrase. It is not given to men to know when or how the Son was begotten; but we know that He was the Divine Word, not simply before He came to this earth to die, but even before the world was created... more than seven hundred years before His first advent, His coming was thus foretold by the word of inspiration: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto Me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from the days of eternity." Micah 5:2, margin. We know that Christ "proceeded*

**forth and came from God**" (John 8:42), **but it was so far back in the ages of eternity as to be far beyond the grasp of the mind of man.**<sup>14</sup> (E. J. Waggoner, 'Christ and His Righteousness', p. 10/9)

For the pioneers, Christ's point of origin dates so far back in the ages of eternity that it cannot be measured by mortal man. Alonzo T. Jones stated:

"IN the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God." "In the beginning," that is, before creation, before time was; for in his prayer at the last supper he said: "O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold the glory which thou hast given me; for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." John 1.7 : 5, 24. **How long before; no finite mind can measure;** for in the announcement by the prophet of the place of his birth, when he came into the world, it is said,: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou, be little among the thousands of Judah., yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." Micah. 5 : 2.. The margin reads, Hebrew, from " the days of eternity." **The mind must be able to grasp eternity before it can measure the length of days of the Saviour of the world; before it can know how long the Word was before the world was.**<sup>15</sup> - (A. T. Jones, The Signs of the Times, March 25, 1886, Page. 10/186)

Therefore, like her brethren, Ellen White also declared that Christ's existence cannot be measured by figures, for it is far beyond the grasp of man or human calculation. She stated:

*The scribes and Pharisees accused Christ of blasphemy because He made Himself equal with God. But He promptly met and denied their accusations. "Art Thou greater than our father Abraham, which is dead?" they asked Him; "whom makest Thou Thyself?" Jesus answered: "If I honor Myself, My honor is nothing; it is My Father that honoreth Me; of whom ye say, that He is your God; yet ye have not known Him, but I know Him; and if I should say, I know Him not, I shall be a liar like unto you; but I know Him, and keep His saying. Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see My day, and he saw it, and was glad. Then said the Jews unto Him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast Thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am." Here Christ shows them that, altho(ugh) they might reckon His life to be less than fifty years, **yet His divine life could not be reckoned by human computation. The existence of Christ before His incarnation is not measured by figures.**' - {ST May 3, 1899, par. 3-4}*

This is a parallel to A.T Jones statement when he said that 'no finite mind can measure' the length of Christ's existence before the world was. There was clearly a harmony amongst the pioneers concerning this understanding.

So although the Lord Jesus Christ had a beginning, He can still rightly be called eternal, the eternal Son of God, for He is from eternity and creator Himself.

There were still Seventh-Day Adventist Churches that understood and maintained this biblical teaching as late as 1936:

*“Cumulative evidence that the Son existed with the Father before creation is abundant in the Scriptures. In the few passages we have studied here, we find that Christ was with the Father "before the world was," "from, the days of eternity," "before the foundation of the world," "before all things." He was therefore no part of creation, but was "**begotten of the Father**" in the days of eternity, and was very God Himself.*<sup>16</sup> - (SDA Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly, Lesson 4, October 1936, p. 13)

The Bible teaches that God has a Son from eternity past that He created the world through. The wisest man who ever lived (Solomon) had revelation that God had a Son. *‘Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended? who hath gathered the wind in his fists? who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is his name, and what is **his son's name**, if thou canst tell?’* - (Prov 30:4)

Furthermore, Jesus expounded even more on His origin and what He actually meant by begotten when He told the Jews that He proceeded forth from God, and was sent by Him: *‘Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for **I proceeded forth and came from God**; neither came I of myself, but he sent me.’* - (Jhn 8:42) *‘Proceeded forth’* here is translated from the Greek word **‘exerchomai’**,<sup>Strong's G1831</sup> which means to ‘issue out of’ something or ‘come out of’ something. A usage for the word ‘exerchomai’ can be to ‘leave something or somewhere’:

*‘And when his friends heard of it, they **went out** (exerchomai) to lay hold on him: for they said, He is beside himself.’* - (Mark 3:21)

*‘And the Pharisees **came forth**,(exerchomai) and began to question with him, seeking of him a sign from heaven, tempting him.’* - (Mark 8:11)

*‘And his disciples **went forth**,(exerchomai) and came into the city, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover.’* - (Mark 14:16)

*‘Then they **went out** (exerchomai) to see what was done; and came to Jesus, and found the man, out of whom the devils were departed, sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed, and in his right mind: and they were afraid.’* - (Luke 8:35)

It must be noted that in the above texts, the objects of where these people *‘went out’* from, *‘went forth’* from or *‘came forth’* from are inexplicit. Although it is possible that the people in these verses came out from or out of something, such as a building or enclosure of some sort, it isn’t stated, and therefore, there can be room left for ambiguity in these verses because they are not clear. But ‘exerchomai’ still means what it means, it is the lack of an indicated object that makes the meaning of these sorts of verses indefinite, not the word exerchomai itself. If an object of what something or someone comes out of (exerchomai) is identified, then there is no room for ambiguity, and the description is definite.



So, in such cases as this, when the word exerchomai is used to express that of ‘coming out’ of ‘object’ or ‘forth’ from ‘object’, then that is what it means. Here are some examples:

*‘When the unclean spirit is **gone** (exerchomai) **out of a man**, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest; and finding none, he saith, I will return unto **my house** whence I **came out**. (exerchomai)’ - (Luke 8:35)*

We see in this verse that the objects of which the unclean spirits come out (exerchomai) from are identified (man & house). So the unclean spirit was initially inside of something, and then came out of it. It came out of a man and out of a house.

We see this same thing again: *‘For unclean spirits, crying with loud voice, **came out** (exerchomai) **of many that were possessed with them**: and many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed.’ - (Acts 8:7)*

Acts 8:7 makes it clear that the unclean spirits ‘came out’ (exerchomai) of the people that ‘were possessed with them.’ This is definite.

*‘And whatsoever house ye enter into, there abide, and thence depart (exerchomai). And whosoever will not receive you, **when ye go** (exerchomai) **out of that city**, shake off the very dust from your feet for a testimony against them.’ - (Luke 9:4-5)*

*‘Then they **went** (exerchomai) **out of the city**, and came unto him.’ - (Jhn 4:30)*

So again in the above verses, we see no ambiguity of what was described. In Luke 9:4, Jesus told His disciples to abide in the houses they ‘enter into’, and then depart (exerchomai); come out of the houses they are inside of. Again, the same implication occurs in verse 5; ‘when ye go (exerchomai) out of that city.’ The city is the identified object of what the disciples would come out (exerchomai) of. And the same applies for John 4:30; the people of Samaria went out (exerchomai) of the city they were in.

*‘But the same day that **Lot went** (exerchomai) **out of Sodom** it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all.’ - (Luke 17:29)*

Again, the same point applies here. Lot was in Sodom, and he went out (exerchomai) of Sodom.

*‘Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and **went out** (exerchomai) **of the temple**, going through the midst of them, and so passed by.’ - (Jhn 8:59)*

Again, we see the same usage of exerchomai apply concerning an identified object. The temple here is the identified object that Jesus came out (exerchomai) of.

*'And this did she many days. But Paul, being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ **to come (exerchomai) out of her**. And he **came out (exerchomai) the same hour.**' - (Acts 16:18)*

In this encounter, we see that Paul commanded the spirit to 'come out' (exerchomai) of the damsel that was possessed (v16) with it, and it came out (exerchomai) of her that same hour. Once again, the damsel was the object that was identified, so exerchomai in this passage means just that; to come out of something, with the object in this case being the woman. This is definite.

So we see in the above verses that when an object is identified, or a person is described as coming out of an identified object, then that is what exerchomai literally means. It means that **A** came out of **B**, and there is no ambiguity, it is explicit and definite.

So concerning the Lord Jesus Christ in John 8:42, what He was saying was definite. *'Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for **I proceeded forth (exerchomai) and came from God**; neither came I of myself, but he sent me.'* - (Jhn 8:42) Jesus does not leave His statement ambiguous. The identified object is clearly presented, this being God the Father. So Jesus was telling the Jews in this verse that He issued out of God, and was sent by Him. This is why He said '**I proceeded forth**'. This was a reality. Jesus is the only Being that can truly know the Father like no other, for He literally came out of God. *'Then cried Jesus in the temple as he taught, saying, Ye both know me, and ye know whence I am: and I am not come of myself, but he that sent me is true, whom ye know not. But I know him: **for I am from him, and he hath sent me**.'* - (Jhn 7:28-29) Jesus makes the distinction of being 'from' God and being sent by Him. He came out of the Father, and the Father sent Him. Also, Jesus explained to His disciples that He came forth (exerchomai) from the Father. *'For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed **that I came out (exerchomai) from God. I came forth (exerchomai) from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.**'* - (Jhn 16:27-28) Take note of the order of these verses: Jesus tells us '*He came out from God*'(v27)... '*and am come into the world*'(v28). These are two separate events! Also, take note that Jesus says '*I came forth from the Father*'(v28). Jesus is reaffirming what He said about Himself in Proverbs 8:24; that '*I was brought forth*.' Moreover, notice that John 16:27-28 is a positive reversal to what Jesus said in John 8:42. In John 8:42, Jesus states that the Jews don't truly have God for their Father because they fail to recognise that He (Jesus) Himself came out of God, and therefore, don't love Him. Hence, Jesus tells them that '*Ye are of your father the devil*' - (Jhn 8:44) In contrast, Jesus told the disciples in John 16:27 that the Father loves them because they love Christ and believe that He came out from God. The picture presented is clear in Scripture of Christ's origin. Jesus said that He was God's only begotten Son (Jhn 3:16), that He was brought forth (Prov 8:24), and that He proceeded forth from the Father. The Lord Jesus was clearly demonstrating a clear picture of His relation to God, that God is truly His Father, that He truly came out from God and was begotten of God.

One can only come to a different conclusion by refusing to take the words of Christ for what they plainly state, and to cling onto pre-established beliefs.

Notice what the Sabbath school lesson from 1936 says: *‘What testimony concerning His deity did Christ Himself give? John 16:27, 28; 8:58. NOTE.—The direct statement of Jesus, "I came forth from the Father," reads literally, "I came out of the Father." Putting with this, His testimony in John 10:38, "The Father is in Me, and I in Him," we have His personal witness that He truly was "begotten of the Father," as John says in 1:14.*<sup>17</sup> - (SDA Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly, Lesson 4, October 1936, p. 12)

At this point, there were still Seventh-day Adventist Churches being faithful to Scripture and taking God’s Word for what it literally says. We have Jesus Christ's *‘personal witness that He truly was begotten of the Father.’* The fact that Christ truly came out from God proves that He is fully Divine. This was the *‘testimony concerning His deity’* that He gave. Jesus' disciples also understood exactly what He meant. *‘His disciples said unto him, Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no parable. Now are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee: by this we believe that thou camest forth (exerchomai) from God.’* - (Jhn 16:29-30 - margin) Jesus told the disciples that He would speak no more to them in parables, but He would show *‘them plainly of the Father’* (v25). So the disciples then understood Him plainly and knew that Jesus was speaking *‘no parable’*(v29 - margin). Therefore, they took Him at His word, and believed that He truly came *‘forth from God.’* Can we not also just take our Lord's word for what He plainly said, and believe that He truly came out from God?

In the next chapter, Jesus affirms again that He came out of God and expresses His happiness that His disciples believed this: *‘Now they (disciples) have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee. For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out (exerchomai) from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.’* - (Jhn 17:7-8)

Again, Jesus describes two separate events. He confirms that He *‘came out from’* God, and was sent by Him. And these were the words that the Father wanted Christ to relay to the disciples. These were the words of God Himself. Clearly there is a link between believing Christ came out of the Father and having the Father’s favour because of this. This is because believing that Jesus came out of the Father is linked to believing the words that the Father spoke from heaven when saying, *‘This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.’* - (Matt 3:17) God finds favour with those who truly believe that Christ is His only-begotten Son, for they truly know the great gift that He gave to redeem them.

*‘The prediction given in Eden refers in a special manner to Christ, and to all who accept and confess Him as the only begotten Son of God. Christ has pledged Himself to engage in the conflict with the prince and power of darkness and bruise the serpent's head, and all who are the sons of God are His chosen ones, His soldiers, to war against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. It is an unwearied conflict of which there is to be no end, until Christ shall come the second time without sin unto salvation to destroy him*

*who has destroyed so many souls through his masterly deceiving power. "And as soon as it was day, the elders of the people and the chief priests and the scribes came together, and led Him into their council, saying, Art thou the Christ? tell us. And He said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not believe: And if I also ask you, ye will not answer Me, nor let Me go. Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God. Then said they all, Art Thou then the Son of God? And He said unto them, Ye say that I am. And they said, What need we any further witness? for we ourselves have heard of His own mouth" - {19MR 169.2-170.1}*

To believe that Jesus came out of the Father as His begotten Son brings us into a special connection with the Living God, where we can be given the right to become sons of God and be loved by Him as He loves His own literal Son: *'That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and **hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.**' - (Jhn 17:21-23)*

*'Christ impresses upon the mind of believers the fact that they are to have the glory which the Father has given him, in order that all who love and serve him may be one with God. "For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known **surely that I came out from thee**, and they have believed that thou didst send me.... And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory [character], which thou hast given me; for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." Oh, what a request! He asked not that which was impossible for the members of the human race who believe on him to receive. He asks that the Father shall love those who believe in him, who love and serve him, **as he loves his Son**. Is this not sufficient to fill our mind with profoundest awe and love? Where is our faith? Oh, let it be strengthened in contemplation of the thought of the possibility of God loving finite men, **even as he loved his only-begotten Son!** Let our faith be strengthened in contemplating the thought that as followers of Christ we may be complete in him.'* - {SSW February 1, 1896, par. 3-4}

*'...Christ gave this commission to his disciples just before, in his risen and glorified body, he ascended to his Father. This charge he gives to every one who has an intelligent knowledge of the plan of salvation. It is the privilege of his followers to reveal Christ and the Father to the world. **The work of Christ in the world was to reveal the Father**; and when praying for his disciples, he said: "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word. Now they have known that all things whatsoever thou hast given me are of thee. For I have given unto them the words which*

thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have **known surely that I came out from thee**, and they have believed that thou didst send me.” **This is the knowledge that every true witness will have. Upon this rock** will he stand. **His faith in Christ as the Son of the infinite God**, the mighty Counselor, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, will give him assurance. And resting his faith in Christ, he will become one with the Father. He will have an experimental knowledge of what Christ is to the believer.’ - {RH August 16, 1898, par. 2-3}

Ellen White ends her quotation of John 17 at verse 8, then expresses that *‘this is the knowledge that every true witness will have.’* The true witness will stand *‘upon this rock’*, and believe and have *‘faith in Christ as the Son of the infinite God.’* This is the same rock that Peter stood upon (See Matt 16:16-18).

By allowing the Scriptures to speak for themselves, we can see that Jesus is truly the literal Son of God, and it is no proverb. Jesus was truly begotten of the Father, and thus, possesses all the glory of His Father: *‘And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of **the only begotten of the Father**,) full of grace and truth.’* - (Jhn 1:14) The true Sonship of Christ reveals the magnitude of God’s love. He sacrificed His only Son for the sake of mankind. *‘In this **was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son** into the world, that we might live through him.’* - (1 Jhn 4:9)

Again, we notice that John says **‘God sent his only begotten Son into the world’**. Jesus was a begotten Son before He entered the world and was sent by God. And it is in this that the love of God is manifested.

*‘Giving Christ, God has given everything. Nothing greater, nothing more costly, could He bestow. **In giving His Son, He gave all heaven**, not because of any goodness or righteousness that we possess, **but because He loved us.**’* - {18MR 337.3}

*‘The thought that God’s eye is watching over us, that he loves us, and **cared so much for us as to give his dearly beloved Son** to redeem us, that we might not miserably perish, is a great one; and he who opens his heart to the acceptance and contemplation of themes like these, will never be satisfied with trivial, sensational subjects.’* - {CE 188.3}

By understanding that Christ is truly God’s Son, we can understand how much of a harder decision this was for God to make. *‘Then praise and adoration was poured forth for the self-denial and sacrifice of Jesus, in consenting to leave the bosom of His Father, and choosing a life of suffering and anguish, and an ignominious death, that He might give life to others. Said the angel, “Think ye that the Father yielded up His dearly beloved Son without a struggle? No, no.” **It was even a struggle with the God of heaven**, whether to let guilty man perish, or to **give His darling Son to die for them**’* - {EW 126.2, 127. 1}

God desired for mankind to grow in a fuller understanding of His love for us when humans beget their own children. The parent with a child can be brought to a greater understanding of how God sacrificing His only begotten Son reveals His great love for us. Ellen White says that Enoch reached a higher experience in his relationship with God when he begat his own son.

*‘Enoch had loved and feared God and had kept His commandments. He was one of the holy line, the preservers of the true faith, the progenitors of the promised seed. From the lips of Adam he had learned the dark story of the Fall, and the cheering one of God’s grace as seen in the promise; and he relied upon the Redeemer to come. **But after the birth of his first son, Enoch reached a higher experience**; he was drawn into a closer relationship with God. He realized more fully his own obligations and responsibility as a son of God. And as he saw the child’s love for its father, its simple trust in his protection; as he felt the deep, yearning tenderness of his own heart for that first-born son, **he learned a precious lesson of the wonderful love of God to men in the gift of His Son**, and the confidence which the children of God may repose in their heavenly Father.’ - {PP 84.3}*

*It is for this exact reason that God wanted all the firstborns to be dedicated to Him. ‘And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, **Sanctify unto me all the firstborn**, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast: **it is mine**.’ - (Ex 13:1-2)* This was to be a representation of God’s promise to give His own First-Born. Notice what Sister White says: *‘The dedication of the **first-born had its origin in the earliest times**. God had promised to **give the First-born of heaven** to save the sinner. This gift was to be acknowledged in every household by the consecration of the first-born son. He was to be devoted to the priesthood, as a **representative of Christ** among men.’ - {DA 51.2}* Ellen White tells us that Christ is the ‘First-born of heaven’, hence, He is the only begotten Son of God. *‘Christ is the star that should arise out of Jacob, and the one in whom all the nations of the earth should be blessed, **as the first born of heaven, and the only begotten of the Father**, filled with all the treasures of eternity. **He assumed humanity**, and impressed upon it the glorious **image of the everlasting God**.’ - {11LtMs, Lt 101, 1896, par, 7}* The First-born of heaven and only begotten of the Father, assumed humanity. He was the firstborn and begotten before His human conception. The gift of God’s Son is to be ‘*acknowledged in every household,*’ but ‘*Satan is determined that men shall not see the love of God **which led Him to give His only-begotten Son** to save a lost race; for it is the goodness of God that leads men to repentance.*’ - Manuscript 154, 1897. {1 SM 156.2}

Clearly the love of God is found in the sacrifice of His Son (Jhn 3:16, 1 Jhn 4:9).

Also, it is of great importance to know that our Lord Jesus Christ is fully Divine, but it is also important to know how the Bible reveals that He is Divine. Hebrews 1 tells us that Christ is Divine because divinity came with His inheritance as a begotten Son of God.

*‘God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these last days spoken unto us by **his Son**, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; Who **being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person**, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high: **Being made so much better than the angels**, as he hath **by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they**. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, **Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?** And again, **I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?** And again, **when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him**. And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his*

*ministers a flame of fire. But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, **even thy God,** hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.* - (Heb 1:1-9) We see here that Jesus is the literal Son of God, and God has spoken to us through His Son, whom He has appointed heir of all things, through whom He also made the worlds (v2). It is by inheritance that Jesus obtained a better name than the angels (v4), for none of the angels were begotten of God as His literal Son (v5). Thus, all the angels of God are to worship Christ (v6) for He is God's very own Son who inherited all things from His Father and partakes in His Father's glory (v3). Hence, Christ comes in the glory of His Father: *'For the Son of man shall come **in the glory of his Father**'* - (Matt 16:27). Also, notice that Christ is called God by His Father (v8). This passage is quoted from the Psalms: *'**Thy throne, O God,** is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: **therefore God, thy God,** hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.'* - (Ps 45:6-7)

The context before and after these verses show that the passages were referring to a king when written. An earthly king could be called 'god' (elohim) as it is also used as a title to denote rulership or authority (See Ex 7:1). We see in Psalm 45 that this king has been exalted and anointed by God. And as we've seen in Hebrews 1, these two verses (6-7) apply to the Lord Jesus Christ. We've seen that the Father has exalted Christ and placed all things under Him. In this sense, the Father made Christ God concerning His rulership and authority, hence He says to the Lord Jesus 'thy throne o, God.' And whilst Jesus is called God here, we see that He still has a God over Him where it says 'God thy (your) God.' As has been established already, the Father is the Most High God, for the Almighty God has no God above Him.

Now as has been already pointed out, Christ is not only God in regards to the authority that has been given to Him by His God, but Christ is God by His very nature, He is fully Divine. We see elsewhere in Scripture that Jesus is called God. We see this in John chapter 1 which states, *'In the beginning was the Word (Jesus), and the Word was with God, and **the Word was God.** The same was in the beginning with God.'* - (Jhn 1:1-2) This is because Jesus is fully God. Jesus being the literal Son of God makes Him God by nature. This is because He shares the exact same nature as His Father, which is the Divine nature, just as human sons share the exact same nature as their fathers, which is human nature. Jesus is the literal Son of God, and therefore, has the exact same nature as His Father, and He was with the Father from eternity past before creation.

*"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God." John 1:1, 2. **Christ, the Word, the only begotten of God,** was one with the **eternal Father—one in nature,** in character, in purpose—**the only being** that could enter into all the counsels and purposes of God. "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Isaiah 9:6. His "goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." Micah 5:2. And **the Son of God declares concerning Himself:** "**The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting.... When He appointed the foundations of the earth: then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him: and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him.**" Proverbs 8:22-30.' - {PP 34.1}*

The Lord Jesus Christ is unique because He is the only begotten Son of God. There is no other being like that in the whole universe. This straight away sets Him apart, and as the only begotten Son of God, it establishes His divinity like no other proof. Not what He said, nor what He did, but simply who He is is the evidence of His divinity. God set out this principle of inheritance through creation. *'And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature **after his kind**, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth **after his kind**: and it was so. And God made the beast of the earth **after his kind**, and cattle **after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind**: and God saw that it was good.'* - (Gen 1:24-25)

We see that God set forth a rule in nature; everything produces or begets after its own kind, including in the plant world (Gen 1:11-12). Yet, we can't understand how God can beget One after His own Kind, and we form our own conclusions using human reasoning outside of Scripture. In nature, God has revealed to us the great origin of this principle. God begat a Son, and His Son was after His kind, the divine kind (Jhn 1:1). The greatest evidence that a creature or any living entity is of a specific kind is that it is from that kind of parent. The son of a human isn't a lesser human than their parent just because their parent precedes them, likewise the Son of God isn't a lesser God because His Father precedes Him. The pioneers understood this principle. John G. Matteson stated:

*'**Christ is the only literal Son of God. "The only begotten of the Father."** John i, 14. **He is God because he is the Son of God** ; not by virtue of his resurrection. If Christ is the only begotten of the Father, **then we cannot be begotten of the Father in a literal sense**. It can only be in a secondary sense of the word.'*<sup>18</sup> (John G. Matteson, Review & Herald, October 12, 1869 p. 123)

Furthermore, a lesson can also be learnt from Adam and Eve in regards to the Son's equality with God. *'And the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; **And the rib, which the LORD God had taken from man, made he a woman**, and brought her unto the man.* - (Gen 1:21-22)

Adam was before Eve, yet Eve still shared the exact same human nature as Adam. We would not conclude that Eve was less human than Adam. Eve was not inferior to Adam, she was of the very same substance as Adam, for she was taken out of his very own material. Therefore, she was completely equal to him in every way. Ellen White illustrates this when she says that *'**Eve was created from a rib taken from the side of Adam**, signifying that she was not to control him as the head, nor to be trampled under his feet as an inferior, **but to stand by his side as an equal**, to be loved and protected by him. **A part of man, bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh, she was his second self**, showing the close union and the affectionate attachment that should exist in this relation. "For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it." Ephesians 5:29...'* - {PP 46.2}

Eve was Adam's equal, she was from him, she was a part of him, *'she was **his second self***. Adam recognised this image of himself when he beheld her.



*‘And Adam said, This is now **bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh**: she shall be called Woman, **because she was taken out of Man**.’ - (Gen 2:23)*

Adam understood that there was a difference with Eve from all the beasts of God's creation. He identified that unlike the animals, Eve was the same as him, she bore his image. Eve was of the same substance as Adam. This is one of the ways that they were one, Adam and Eve were of one substance, and this is one of the ways that God and Christ are one, they're of one substance. Sister White confirms this point. She says: *'With what firmness and power he uttered these words. The Jews had never before heard such words from human lips, and a convicting influence attended them; for it seemed that divinity flashed through humanity as Jesus said, "I and my Father are one." The words of Christ were full of deep meaning as he put forth the claim that **he and the Father were of one substance**, possessing the same attributes. The Jews understood his meaning, there was no reason why they should misunderstand, and they took up stones to stone him.'* - {ST November 27, 1893, par.5}

Jesus was not saying that He and His Father are one God, but He was confirming that They are of one substance, just like Adam & Eve were not one human, but they were of one substance too. They were both man (human), as God and Christ are both Divine.

So Eve was equal to Adam by nature, just as Jesus Christ is equal to the Father by nature. Yet, Eve was subordinate to Adam as Christ is subordinate to the Father. Paul perfectly illustrates this order when he says: *'But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the **head of the woman is the man**; and **the head of Christ is God**.'* - (1 Cor 11:3)

Also, the example of Adam & Eve also demonstrates how Christ is God, yet not the One True God. Remember, the Father and Son decided to make man in Their own image. *‘And God said, **Let us make man in our image, after our likeness**: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.*’ - (Gen 1:26)

Man reflects the image of God in many ways, especially before the fall. And one of the ways this is reflected can be learnt between the relationship with Adam & Eve and God & Christ. We see that both male and female were called Adam by God. *‘This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; **Male and female created he them**; and blessed them, and **called their name Adam**, in the day when they were created.*’ - (Gen 5:1-2)

The word Adam is from the hebrew word ‘**ādām**,’<sup>Strong's H120</sup> which just means ‘man’. So Eve was also Adam (man). As we’ve already established, Eve was also Adam (man) because she was of the very same nature as Adam, she was fully man. So we find that there were two Adams (humans) at the start, yet Paul says that all of humanity comes from one blood/man. *‘And hath **made of one blood all nations of men** for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation;*’ - (Acts 17:26) Why does Paul say that all of humanity came about from one human when we know that procreation involved two humans? Quite simply, it’s because even though procreation involved two (Adam & Eve), all of humanity was still made from one flesh. Adam was made from the dust of the ground (See Gen 2:7) but Eve was made from the very flesh of

Adam (See Gen 2:21-23). Eve herself was from that one flesh, for she came out of Adam's very substance. So Adam is the ancestral source of all humanity, yet all of humanity came about through his wife, ***'For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God'*** - (1 Cor 11:12)

All of humanity derives from two humans (Adams), yet one flesh (Adam), for Adam is the originator or the source. Adam being the originator or one source does not negate Eve's role as co-ancestor with Adam, for without her no human being came into existence. So we see that God made Eve from Adam's own substance, and therefore all of mankind is from one flesh, and thus, all of humanity traces their ancestry back to one source (flesh), and that's Adam. God could have made Eve from the dust of the ground too, but this would have meant that all of humanity is made from two flesh, not one. We'd trace our ancestry all the way back to two Adam's, for there would be two sources, as Eve would have been an independent source in and of herself. But this was not so, there were two Adams but one originator, for Eve came out of that one source (Adam) herself. This is a lesson we can learn concerning God and Christ. As we've discovered, the Father is referred to as the One God throughout the Bible, and Paul says that this is because He is the source of all things (See 1 Cor 8:6), yet Jesus is also called God, for He came out of God's very substance, and all of creation came into existence through Him, but all along this doesn't make Christ and His Father the same One God of the Bible. Eve was called Adam because she partook of Adam's nature, yet this did not make Adam & Eve one Adam (human). Eve was fully Adam (man) by nature, but she was not literally Adam himself, she was not the one true Adam (original), and she was not a second component of the one Adam. Eve was Adam but not Adam in the absolute sense, she was a distinct person from the one Adam. So Eve was Adam by nature but not in person. This is how we can understand John 1:1-3. ***'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.'*** - (Jhn 1:1-3) If the Word was with God, then obviously the Word was someone else other than the God He was with. So when John says that the Word (Jesus) was with God and the Word was God, he is telling us that they are of the very same nature, and this is because Jesus Christ came out of God (See Jhn 17:8). One theologian explains it this way concerning John 1:1:

*'Let us now turn to the Prologue, the first 18 verses of the Fourth Gospel to see what John has to say about Jesus as the Logos... He tells us **what Jesus personally was**. He begins with a brief statement which provides the translator with a problem not far from insoluble in the English language. "The Word", say both the AV and the RSV, "was God" (John 1:1). Moffatt is one of the few modern translators who dare to depart from that rendering. "The Logos", he translates, "was divine." In a matter like this we cannot do other than go to the Greek, which is theos en ho logos. Theos is the Greek for God, en for was, ho for the, logos for word. Now normally, except for special reasons, **Greek nouns always have the definite article in front of them, and we can see at once here that theos the noun for God has not got the definite article in front of it. When a Greek noun has not got the article in front of it, it becomes rather a description than an identification, and has the character of an adjective rather than of a noun.** We can see exactly the same in English. If I say: "**James is the man**", then I identify James with some definite man whom I have in mind; but, if I say: "**James is man**", then I am simply describing James as human, and the word man has*

**become a description and not an identification.** *If John had said  $\text{ho theos en ho logos}$ , using a definite article in front of both nouns, then he would definitely have identified the logos with God, but because he has no definite article in front of theos it becomes a description, and more of an adjective than a noun.* The translation then becomes, to put it rather clumsily, **"The Word was in the same class as God, belonged to the same order of being as God"**. The only modern translator who fairly and squarely faced this problem is Kenneth Wuest, who has: "The Word was as to his essence essential deity." But it is here that the NEB has brilliantly solved the problem with the absolutely accurate rendering: **"What God was the Word was."** John is not here identifying the Word with God. To put it very simply, he does not say that Jesus was God. What he does say is that no human description of Jesus can be adequate, and that Jesus, however you are going to define it, must be described in terms of God.<sup>19</sup> - (William Barclay, 'Many Witnesses, One Lord', (1963), p. 16/16-17/17)

This theologian was pointing out the fact that in the Greek text of John 1:1, the definite article (The) is not in front of 'God' when identifying the Word (Jesus), but it is in front of 'God' that the Word is described as being with. So John was saying; 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with **[The]** God, and the Word was God.' And this theologian is highlighting that the definite article was in front of 'The' God to identify God with a specific definite person in mind. This is an identification, and Jesus was with this person that is identified, **The God**. And as the theologian points out, John omits the definite article in reference to the Word being God. This is because John is no longer identifying **The God**, but he is describing what the Word is. The definite article was in front of Word (**The Word**) as an identification (In the beginning was **the** Word), and he then describes what this identity is; 'God.' The Word was (description) God but not The (identification) God. So The Word was with 'The' God and the Word was what 'The' God is (Divine), the Word was God. Hence, Barclay states that *"The Word was in the same class as God, belonged to the same order of being as God."* And this makes perfect sense because the Word is 'the only begotten of the Father' (See Jhn 1:14), who is identified as The God. This harmonises all of Scripture and explains why throughout the Gospel of John, and the rest of the Bible, the One God is identified as the Father, yet the Son is described as divine/deity. John did not intend to blur the distinction between the Word and the Almighty God, yet many do, and the extreme result of this leads to modalism (Jesus being the Father).

Again, this is a parallel to Adam and Eve. The woman was (description) Adam/man but not the (identification) Adam/man. There is no confusion between description and identification here. Adam is one person and Eve is another. Adam (the man) is Adam alone without qualification, that is his identity. And Eve is Adam by qualification of what she is (man) and who she comes from (the man). We've seen in Genesis 5:2 that Eve is also called Adam. So we could read the beginning of humanity as thus: 'In the beginning was the woman, and **the woman was with Adam, and the woman was Adam.** The same was in the beginning with Adam. All humanity came into existence through her; **and without her was not any human born that was born.**' Genesis refers to the woman as Adam, for she was taken out of Adam, and is of the very same nature and substance as Adam (See Gen 2:23). Do we then imply that Adam was a multipersonal being, or that Adam here means one human that's dyad in unity? No, we don't, and clearly this is the same principle that John was demonstrating. John was telling us that Jesus Christ is God (Divine), and all things were created by Him. But all along this doesn't tell us that Christ and His Father are the same One

God, just like Adam and his wife weren't one man/human, yet they were both 'Adam', and one in purpose. Eve derived her humanity from Adam, hence, the woman reflects the glory of the man, and not the man of the woman. *'For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: **but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman: but the woman of the man.**'* - (1 Cor 11:7-8) Likewise, throughout Scripture we see that the Father is not the brightness of the Son's glory, but the Son is the brightness of the Father's glory. God *'Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; **Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person,** and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high:'* - (Heb 1:2-3)

*'Christ Himself is the pearl of great price. **In Him is gathered all the glory of the Father, the fullness of the Godhead. He is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person.** The glory of the attributes of God is expressed in His character.'* {COL 115.1}

As God's Son, Christ is the express image of His Father, not the other way round. *'In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, **who is the image of God,** should shine unto them.'* - (2 Cor 4:4) The Son's deity originates from the Father. The Father is the source of that one deity. There aren't two deities, there's only one which originates from the Father and is inherited by the Son, hence there are two Divine Beings, but one source of deity, which is why the Bible maintains that there is only One God, the Father (See Mal 2:10, Mark 12:29, 32, Jhn 17:3, 1 Cor 8:4-6, Eph 4:6). And *'... **it pleased the Father** that in him (Jesus) **should all fulness dwell;**'* - (Col 1:19) The Bible writers understood the Father to be the One God in the sense that He is the fundamental Divine Person, that He alone holds ultimate preeminence above all (See Eph 4:6), including over His Son Jesus Christ who is subordinate to Him (See Jhn 14:28, 1 Cor 3:23, 11:3 & 15:24-28). God the Father is not subordinate to anyone (See 1 Chron 29:10-11). As has been shown, Paul demonstrated this in great detail in 1 Corinthians chapter 15:

*'But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end, **when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father;** when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. **For he hath put all things under his feet.** But when he saith all things are put under him, **it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him.** **And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.'** - (1 Cor 15:23-28)*

So after the Lord Jesus destroys all enemies (v25), the last of which is death (v26), He will then subject and reconcile all of creation back to God (v24). Since the fall of Lucifer, and the fall of Adam on earth, there have been forces who are at variance with God, in conflict with God's will, and opposing God's Sovereignty and Rulership. These forces have continued to spread dissension, chaos, darkness, and misery. And it will remain this way until Michael, the Archangel comes to finally destroy evil, sin and death. Paul tells us that the resurrection of Christ Jesus guarantees that the day will come when the Lord Jesus Christ will destroy all opposition and remove all opposing forces (v13-26). He will destroy everything and anything that refuses to repent and be subject to God's authority; *'and to you who are troubled rest with us, **when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power;**'* - (2 Thess 1:7-9)

The Lord Jesus Christ will destroy all the opposers of God Almighty, so that He will present to His Father a fully reconciled heaven and earth, in which there'll be no more opposition to the will of God, but perfect peace, union, and harmony with God and all creation. This is the goal of creation; **'God may be all in all.'** That is Paul's way of saying that when Jesus our Lord destroys all opposition, removes every obstacle, and presents to God a fully reconciled creation, God will be in union with everything, in fellowship with everything, reconciled to everything, and at peace with everything. This will be a complete reversal of what Adam had caused for earth and humanity, which was God being completely separated from His creation. The second Adam completely reconciles God's creation back to Him, as it was originally supposed to be. All things will be in complete harmony and subjection to the Great sovereign and source of All, the Father (v28). And once all this is complete, the Son Himself will also place Himself in complete subjection to God, for the Father is His God and the source of Him too. Christ will restore the kingdom to God His Father (v24), so that for all eternity, the Father can rightly usurp His true position; as the Ultimate, Supreme, Almighty Ruler and sovereign of the universe. All will be in harmony with Him who is the source of all things, and acknowledge Him as the Only True God, including His Son Jesus Christ. This is the ultimate goal of Christ's mission, to reveal to all creation and *'... shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of Lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen.'* - (1 Tim 6:15-16)

For all eternity, there will be no more opposition or rebellion to God. All will be at peace and surrendered to the *'one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.'* - (Eph 4:6)

This is the true Biblical monotheism that Scripture presents. As has already been discussed, if Eve was also made from the dust independent of Adam, she would have possessed human nature in and of herself, and thus humanity would have been derived from two independent sources, likewise, if creation owed its existence to two or three independent sources that possessed divinity in and of themselves, then they'd be multiple originators, and thus multiple true gods (sources of deity). It is important to understand the distinction between the Father and Son as the Bible presents it. It is important to understand that the Father alone is the One Almighty God. In this sense, Jesus is not necessarily another God.

Another God could be another co-equal and co-eternal Divine Being next to the Father with no relation to Him. So for all eternity, you would just have two self originated, self existing, self empowered, and self sufficient God's who got their own source of power and divinity, and do not relate to each other in any way. That could be considered two Gods in the truest sense; two completely distinct Gods who have always existed alongside each other with no relation to each other. But this does not reflect the relation between Jesus and His Father because Jesus is not His own existing, self originating, self source independent God. He is begotten from God the Father, He comes from the One God. So technically, they're not two God's, but in a sense, they are because Jesus is not the same God as the Father even though He has the same nature as the Father. God is One, not two or three. God is One, and this One God has a Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. And Jesus is described as the only begotten Son of God. He is the only Being brought forth from this One God. Jesus is not the God who sent His Son, He is the Son of that God. Being begotten of God, Jesus is God in His very nature. The Apostles never say that Jesus and His Father are the same one God. They don't describe them as two Gods either. This is because they were careful to depict Jesus as His true identity, which is **The** Son of God. Jesus is the Son of God and God sent Him. Jesus is not God the Father, and God the Father is the One Most High God, and He is God over Jesus.

So, as we've established, Scripture reveal that there is only one source of deity, and hence only One True God (the Father), and Christ is the only being who has inherited this Divinity, for He is the only being begotten of the One True God (See Jhn 1:14). No other being but God's Son is the express image of God. Ellen White reiterates this by saying: *'Man was to bear God's image, both in outward resemblance and in character. (But) **Christ alone is "the express image" (Hebrews 1:3) of the Father.***' - {PP 45.2} This is important to understand because it ensures the Sons unity and equality with the Father. If the Father has a Divine nature, then the Son also has this because He's begotten of Him. *'Though He (Christ) took humanity upon Himself, **He was divine. All that is attributed to the Father Himself is attributed to Christ.***' - {DG 61.3} The Father & Son both have the same nature, and the Father is the source of His Son's deity, thus they're both fully God. This is why Ellen White stated that to deny the divinity of Christ is to actually deny the Father's divinity.

***'The great object that brought Christ to the earth was to reveal the Father.*** When Moses had desired a closer acquaintance with God, and had prayed, "I beseech thee, show me thy glory," the Lord had answered, "I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee; and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy." (Quotes Ex 34:5-7)... *But who that is not infinite can understand the infinite?* Christ declares, "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son shall reveal him." It is recorded of Epictetus that when his hearers said to him, "You have uttered many excellent things of God; but we cannot as yet understand what he is," he truly and nobly replied, "Were I able fully to set forth God, I should either be a god myself, or God himself would cease to be what he is." The greatness of God cannot be measured or comprehended. And ***that doctrine that denies the absolute Godhead (divinity) of Jesus Christ, denies also the Godhead (divinity) of the Father;*** for no man knoweth the Son but the Father.' - {ST June 27, 1895, par. 1, 3}

To deny the deity of Christ is to deny the deity of the Father, and this is because Christ came out of the Father. Everything that the Son is the Father is. One can only possess the nature of the one they came from. Christ's divinity is derived from His Father, so if one denies the divinity of Christ, they are denying the divinity of the One He was born of. The Lord Jesus Christ came out of God, and is therefore God Himself by nature because all the fullness of the Father's glory and divinity (Godhead) was received by the Son through natural inheritance; birth. So the Son is subordinate to the Father, yet is not inferior to the Father, for He inherited all the exact same divine attributes of His Father. This is because like Eve with Adam, Christ was torn from the very bosom of the Father, and thus is of the very same substance as His Father. Ellen White supports this sentiment when she says:

*'The Eternal Father, the unchangeable one, **gave his only begotten Son, tore from his bosom** Him who **was made** in the express image of his person, **and sent him down to earth** to reveal how greatly he loved mankind.'* - {RH July 9, 1895, par, 13} Ellen White here is declaring that Jesus Christ, the begotten Son, was torn from the bosom of the Father, and then sent down to earth. This is why Christ told His disciples that He *'came out from God'* (See Jhn 16:27, 17:8), and they knew that this was no parable (See Jhn 16:29). Ellen White did not mean this metaphorically, she meant this just as Christ did. When God gave His Son, He literally gave a part of Himself, One who came out of His own substance.

*'Who can anticipate the gifts of infinite Love. "**God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son**, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life."* God's love for the world was not manifest because he sent his Son, but because he loved the world He sent his Son into the world that divinity clothed with humanity might touch humanity, while divinity lays hold of infinity. Though sin had produced a gulf between man and his God, divine benevolence provided a plan to bridge that gulf and **what material did he use? A part of himself, the brightness of the Father's glory came to a world all seared and marred with the curse**, and in his own divine character, in his own divine body, bridged the gulf, and opened a channel of communication between God and man. The windows of heaven were opened, and the showers of heavenly grace in healing streams came to our benighted world. O what love, what matchless, inexpressible love!' - {1888 711.3}

The very substance of Christ, the very material He is, is that of the Eternal God Himself. Although as a Person, Christ had a beginning, the source of the material He is made from is from everlasting to everlasting, for He was made from the material of the very Eternal God (See Ps 90:1-2). This is why Christ could not be created, for He had the Almighty God for His Father and proceeded forth from His substance. And it is this that vindicates the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Sonship of Christ is the basis for why He is equal with God. The angels are sons of God (See Job 37:7), but they're not equal with God. Adam was a son of God (See Luke 3:38), but he was not equal with God. The Israelites were sons of God (See Ex 4:22), but they were not equal with God. The born-again believer is a son of God (See Jhn 1:12-13), but is not equal with God. Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and is equal with God because He is the only literal Son of God. This is why Jesus defended His authority by affirming His Sonship. *'When accused of Sabbathbreaking at Bethesda, **Jesus defended Himself by affirming His Sonship to God**, and declaring that He worked in harmony with the Father...'* - {DA 284. 3}

This is why God declared that we should listen to Christ as our authority, because He is His Son. *'And there came a voice out of the cloud, saying, **This is my beloved Son: hear him.**'* - (Luke 9:35) This is why the Jews wanted to kill Him. *'The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, **because he made himself the Son of God.**'* - (Jhn 19:7) Like Ellen White and the pioneers, the Jews understood that Jesus' claim of Sonship to God was making Himself equal with God. *'Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also **that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.**'* - (Jhn 5:18)

The Bible clearly teaches that it's Christ's literal Sonship that makes Him fully God, hence, *'**For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.**'* - (Col 2:9) The word 'Godhead' in this verse is translated from the Greek word **'theotēs'**, Strong's G2320 which means divinity or deity. So Paul is literally saying that all the fullness of Divinity/Deity dwells in Christ. The Lord Jesus Christ is thus, fully Divine, which essentially makes Him fully God in the highest sense. *'The world was made by Him, "and without him was not any thing made that was made" (John 1:3). If Christ made all things, He existed before all things. The words spoken in regard to this are so decisive that no one need be left in doubt. **Christ was God essentially, and in the highest sense.** He was with God from all eternity, God over all, blessed forevermore.'* - {1 SM 247.3}

Therefore, we are to worship Christ accordingly: *'**That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.** He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him.'* - (Jhn 5:23) All worship to the Son goes to the Father. *'**That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.**'* - (Phili 2:10-11) But we must worship our Lord Jesus Christ as who He said He is, the Son of God. Jesus never claimed to be the One True God, He claimed to be the Son of the One True God, He claimed to have received all the authority of God (See Luke 10:21-22 & Matt 28:18), but He never claimed to be the One True God Himself, and we must respect and believe His word for it without going beyond what the Bible tells us.

However, some may argue that the Son is the One True God because He is referred to as Jehovah or speaks as Jehovah in the Scriptures. For example, we see that the Angel of the LORD, which is Jesus Christ Himself in the Old Testament, is called the LORD (Jehovah). *'And **the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel**, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them:...And it came to pass, that in the morning watch **the LORD looked unto the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of the cloud**, and troubled the host of the Egyptians,...'* - (Ex 14:19, 24) Paul confirms that the Angel who went before the camp of Israel in the wilderness was none other than the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. *'Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in*



*the sea; And did all eat the same spiritual meat; And did all drink the same spiritual drink: **for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ.***' - (1 Cor 10:1-4) We see the Angel of God also being referred to as the 'LORD your God' in Deuteronomy when the text says: 'Yet in this thing ye did not believe **the LORD your God**, Who went in the way before you, to search you out a place to pitch your tents in, in fire by night, to shew you by what way ye should go, and in a cloud by day' - (Deut 1:32-33) We see that it was the Angel of the LORD (Jesus) who brought the Israelites out of Egypt and made a covenant with Israel. 'And **an angel of the LORD** came up from Gilgal to Bochim, and said, I made you to go up out of Egypt, and have brought you unto the land which I sware unto your fathers; and I said, I will never break my covenant with you.' - (Judges 2:1) Stephen tells us that it was the Angel (Jesus) who spoke to Moses in the burning bush. 'And when forty years were expired, there appeared to him in the wilderness of mount Sina an **angel of the Lord in a flame of fire in a bush**. When Moses saw it, he wondered at the sight: and as he drew near to behold it, **the voice of the Lord came unto him...**' - (Acts 7:30-31) Now the word 'Angel' comes from the Hebrew word 'mal'āk', Strong's H4397 which just means 'messenger'. This is the same with the Greek word for angel: 'angelos', Strong's G32 which means 'a messenger'. So Angel of the LORD literally means messenger of the LORD. So this Being is a Messenger of the LORD (Jehovah). If this is a Messenger of Jehovah, it stands to reason that the Messenger (Angel) can't be the very Jehovah God Himself, but rather the Messenger is sent by Jehovah, comes in the name of Jehovah, and speaks the words of Jehovah, hence He's called the Angel (Messenger) of the LORD (Jehovah). The words delivered by the Angel were the very words of Jehovah God Himself, *for he whom God hath sent **speaketh the words of God***'... - (Jhn 3:34)

Now this Messenger of God was not like any other messenger that has spoken for God. Unlike angels and men, this Messenger was the very Divine Son of God. Therefore, we see that the Angel of the LORD (Jesus) also received worship. 'And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and, behold, there stood a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand: and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries? And he said, Nay; but as **captain of the host of the LORD** am I now come. And **Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship**, and said unto him, What saith my lord unto his servant? And **the captain of the LORD's host** said unto Joshua, **Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy**. (See Ex 3:5) And Joshua did so.' - (Josh 5:13-15) This is just one of many examples.

Now notice what Isaiah says. 'I will mention the lovingkindnesses of the LORD, and the praises of the LORD, according to all that the LORD hath bestowed on us, and the great goodness toward the house of Israel, which he hath bestowed on them according to his mercies, and according to the multitude of his lovingkindnesses. For he said, Surely they are my people, children that will not lie: so he was their Saviour. In all their affliction he was afflicted, and **the angel of his presence saved them**: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old. - (Isa 63:7-9)

We see here that the Angel of God is called the 'Angel of His (God's) presence (v9)'. Therefore, this Angel brings the presence of the LORD (Jehovah). The plan of salvation is attributed to the LORD and the Angel of His presence (v9).

Both of these Divine Beings are involved in the plan of redemption. Stephen also affirmed this when he said, *'This Moses whom they refused, saying, Who made thee a ruler and a judge? the same did **God send** to be a ruler and a deliverer **by the hand of the angel which appeared to him in the bush.**'* - (Acts 7:35) We see the LORD speaking throughout Exodus 20:1-2, 21-22. Now we see that God speaks through the Angel's voice. *'Behold, **I send an Angel before thee**, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: **for my name is in him.** But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries. **For mine Angel shall go before thee**, and bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites: and I will cut them off.'* - (Ex 23:20-23) God speaks through the Angels voice (v21), therefore, the Angel of the LORD is the Word of God, He is the thought of God made audible. *'Jesus was to reveal God both to men and to angels. **He was the Word of God,—God's thought made audible.**'* - {DA 19.2} The Angel of the LORD has the name of God in Him (v21), thus, He is the one in whom the LORD (Jehovah) put His name. In Exodus 20:1-2, it was the Angel of the LORD who spoke those words, thus, throughout the Old Testament, we see that the Angel of the LORD speaks the words of God the Father (Jehovah), for the Angel had the name of Jehovah in Him. Ellen White says, *'Christ was not only the leader of the Hebrews in the wilderness—the Angel in whom was the name of **Jehovah**, and who, veiled in the cloudy pillar, went before the host—but it was He who gave the law to Israel. Amid the awful glory of Sinai, **Christ declared in the hearing of all the people the ten precepts of His Father's law.** It was He who gave to Moses the law engraved upon the tables of stone.'* - {PP 366.2} So it was God speaking through His Son when His law was being delivered on Mount Sinai.

*'When the law was spoken, **the Lord, the Creator of heaven and earth, stood by the side of his Son**, enshrouded in the fire and the smoke on the mount... What condescension was this, that **the infinite God** should **stand side by side with his Son**, while the law, which is the foundation of his government, was given. He would give his people an intelligent knowledge of his will... Man was so dear to **the Creator of the world** that he **spoke to him through Jesus Christ**, with an audible voice, giving unmistakable evidence of his presence and majesty.'* - {ST October 15, 1896, par, 4, 5}

This is why we see Christ speak as Jehovah, because Jehovah has given His name to Christ, as Christ is His very own Son. Ellen White confirms this when she states, *'**Jehovah is the name given to Christ.**'* - {ST May 3, 1899, Par 18} Ellen White's Son, James Edson White, was in agreement with his mothers view and understood what she taught. He said, *'**Only one Being in the universe besides the Father bears the name of God**, and that is **His Son**, Jesus Christ. Hence **this Angel that accompanied Israel in their wanderings was no other than Christ.**'<sup>20</sup> - (James Edson White & Alonzo L. Baker, 'The Coming King', p. 27)*

God the Father's name is in Jesus Christ, hence, Christ came in His Fathers name. *'**I am come in my Father's name**, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive.'* - (Jhn 5:43)

Therefore, as a Person, Jesus is not Jehovah, yet He can still be referred to as Jehovah. Jesus inherited the Divine name of God because He is God's very own Son. Jesus didn't earn the name of God or work for it, but it came by inheritance with His Sonship. *'Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath **by inheritance obtained** a more excellent **name than they.**'* - (Heb 1:4) Jesus has the right to claim the name of God because the name of the Father is in Him (Ex 23:21). Jesus is the only Being in the universe that has the right to bear the name of God because He is the only begotten Son of God, the express image of God's Person. It is important to understand that the Father & Son can share the same titles without confusing their distinction and personalities. We see in Scripture that Christ has the same titles as His Father. For example, we've seen Paul state: *'I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession; That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: Which in his times he shall shew, **who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords;**'* - (1 Tim 6:13-15)

Here we see that Jesus Christ will show who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords. This is obviously God the Father. And notice Paul highlights that Christ will show that the Father is the *'only Potentate.'* Potentate means monarch, ruler, or sovereign. So Christ will show the Father to be the only ruler and sovereign. Then we see Paul say that the Son will reveal the Father as the King of kings and Lords and Lords. Yet, we see in Scripture that that the Son has these titles too;

*'These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb (Jesus) shall overcome them: for he (Jesus) is **Lord of lords, and King of kings:** and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful.'* - (Rev 17:14)

*'And he (Jesus) hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, **KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.**'* - (Rev 19:16)

The Lamb (Jesus) is King of kings and Lord of lords too, just as His Father is. We've seen that Christ is coregent with His Father, and this coregency that Christ has with God was given to Him by God Himself. So God the Father ordained that His Son should carry the same high and honourable titles as Himself, for Christ is the Highborn of the Most High. The Lord Jesus Christ is even called *'the everlasting Father'* (See Isa 9:6), yet this does not mean that He is literally the Father Himself. We must not think that the Father and Son sharing the same titles; (King, Lord, God) makes them the same being or person in some mysterious way. These lines should not be blurred. They are not both the One God of Scripture. And we also see in Scripture that the Son of God has titles that God the Father does not; such as the Prince of princes (See Dan 8:25) great Prince (See Dan 12:1), the Prince/Captain of the host (See Josh 5:14 & Dan 8:11) and Archangel (See Dan 12:1 & Jude 9). Yet, these titles don't take away previous titles that Christ has as God's coregent. Jesus Christ is Lord over all, King over all, and God over all. But the Father is not Prince of princes or can be called a prince, for a prince has a king above him, and God the Father has no king, but He is King and Lord over His Prince, the Lord Jesus Christ. Again, this does not negate Christ's role of authority. An example of this can be seen in the family unit. Children are commanded to obey both their parents. *'Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee.'* - (Ex 20:12) *'Ye shall fear every man **his mother, and***

**his father**, and keep my sabbaths: I am the LORD your God.’ - (Lev 19:3) ‘Children, **obey your parents in the Lord**: for this is right. **Honour thy father and mother**; which is the first commandment with promise;’ - (Eph 6:1-2)

Within the family unit, the man (father) is the head of his wife and family (See 1 Cor 11:3 & Eph 5:22-23) and it is the father’s name that represents the family. However, despite this, both parents are to be honoured equally. There is not even the slightest hint in Scripture that suggests a child should not honour the mother as much as the father, or that they should obey the mother less than the father because the father is the ultimate head. For the child, both parents as a unit are lord over them, they work in unison, and without that unified relationship between the mother and father, the child would not even exist. Both the father and mother require the same respect, honour and obedience from their children. One parent is not supposed to receive this more than the other. They are equal in authority over their household. But the wife still has the father for her head. We’ve seen throughout Scripture that there are similar elements of this in how the relationship is described between the Father and Son, and how they rule in unison. The Divine name is the name of the God the Father. Yet still, He created all things through His Son and set Him at His own right hand (See Eph 3:9 & 1:20). Therefore, we are to give praise, honour, and adoration to the Father and Son as a unit. We can’t honour one more than the other (See Jhn 5:17-24). Even though it must be acknowledged that inspiration clearly pertains Headship to the Father in an exclusive sense, it must also be acknowledged that inspiration pertains Headship to the Son in an inclusive sense. The Father and Son are one in nature, in spirit, character, and purpose. And they both reign over all things.

Now, because of sin, Jehovah God no longer communicates with man directly, but He does so through other agencies, including His very own Son Jesus Christ. Ellen White tells us that ‘*The transgression of that law caused a fearful **separation between God and man**. To Adam in his innocency was granted communion, direct, free, and happy, with his Maker. After his transgression **God would communicate to man through Christ** and angels.*’ - {SR 50.3}

‘*Adam, in his innocence, had enjoyed open communion with his Maker; **but sin brought separation between God and man**, and the atonement of Christ alone could span the abyss and make possible the communication of blessing or salvation from heaven to earth. **Man was still cut off from direct approach to his Creator, but God would communicate with him through Christ** and angels.*’ - {PP 67.2}

The Lord Jesus Christ came as a representative of the One Almighty Jehovah, and to reveal Him. Jehovah could not personally communicate with men, so He sent His representative to be His channel of communication and reveal who He (The True God) is. Jehovah reveals Himself through His Son. Ellen White says:

'God is a spirit; **yet He is a personal being**; for men were made in His image. **As a personal being, God has revealed Himself in His Son.** Jesus, the outshining of the Father's glory, "and the express image of His person," was on earth found in fashion as a man. [Hebrews 1:3.] As a personal Saviour, He came to the world. As a personal Saviour, He ascended on high. As a personal Saviour, He intercedes in the heavenly courts. Before the throne of God in our behalf ministers "One like the Son of man." [Daniel 7:13.] **As Jehovah, the supreme Ruler, God could not personally communicate with sinful men**, but He so loved the world that **He sent Jesus to our world as a revelation of Himself.** "I and My Father are one," Christ declared. [John 10:30.] "No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." - {18LtMs, Ms 124, 1903, par.1-2}

Ellen White reiterates what the Lord Jesus proclaimed; that 'God is a spirit' (See Jhn 4:24). And again, she maintains that He is still also 'a personal being', not three. And this personal being revealed 'Himself in His Son,' thus, again highlighting that God is the Father. And notice she makes it clear that Jehovah (who is the Father) is 'the supreme Ruler,' as has been highlighted already, and He 'could not personally communicate with sinful men,' so 'He sent Jesus to our world as a revelation of Himself.' This is plain that Jesus is not literally Jehovah Himself, but the Son of Jehovah, Messenger (Angel) of Jehovah, and representation of Jehovah.

'God's plan was to give man clear-sightedness in all his work. This was arranged for Adam by his heavenly Father. There was to be co-operation between God and man. But this plan was interfered with by Adam's transgression. Satan led Adam into sin, and **the Lord could not communicate with him after he had sinned as He did when he was without sin...** After the fall, Christ became Adam's instructor. **He acted in God's stead toward humanity, saving the race from immediate death. He took upon Him the work of mediator between God and man.** In the fulness of time He was to be revealed in human form. He was to take His position at the head of humanity by taking the nature but not the sinfulness of man.' - {ST May 29, 1901, par. 9, 11}

This is why we can only be reconciled to God through the blood of His very own Son, for '**Without the atonement of the Son of God there could be no communication of blessing or salvation from God to man.**' - {SR 50.3}

And James E. White was once again in harmony with his mother when he stated that, 'There was One, however, and **only One in the universe, who could pay the debt.** He only could redeem who had power to create. **The Son of God, the Only-begotten of the Father,** could meet man's needs, and He offered Himself as a ransom for sinners.'<sup>21</sup>  
(James Edson White & Alonzo L. Baker, 'The Coming King', p. 17)

The Father does nothing absent from His Son and the Son does nothing without His Father. God created the world through Christ and He continues to do everything through His Son. Jesus is the one through whom God saves sinners from eternal destruction. The Father & Son have always worked together. Jesus will always be the one through whom God accomplishes everything. Through Genesis to Revelation we see no one else lay claim to the name of Jehovah but Christ. It is only through Christ that we have the opportunity to be

called children of God (See Jhn 1:12 & Gal 4:3-7). This is the true relation that Christ has to Jehovah His Father.

**‘Christ is declared in the Scriptures to be the Son of God.** From all eternity **He has sustained this relation to Jehovah.** Before the foundations of the world were laid, **He, the only begotten Son of God,** pledged Himself to become the Redeemer of the human race should men sin. Adam fell, and **He, who was partaker of the Father’s glory before the world was,** laid aside His royal robe and kingly crown and stepped down from His high authority to become a babe in Bethlehem, that He might redeem fallen human beings by passing over the ground where Adam stumbled and fell.’ - {20LtMs, Ms, 1905, par. 4}

Ellen White left it in no uncertain terms concerning who Jehovah God is and who the Lord Jesus Christ is. We see from Scripture that there is a real Father-Son relationship between God & Christ. Ellen White says:

*‘The great Creator assembled the heavenly host, that he might in the presence of all the angels confer **special honor upon his Son.** The Son was seated on the throne with the Father, and the heavenly throng of holy angels was gathered around them. **The Father then made known that it was ordained by himself that Christ, his Son, should be equal with himself;** so that **wherever was the presence of his Son, it was as his own presence.** The word of the Son was to be obeyed as readily as the word of the Father. **His Son he had invested with authority** to command the heavenly host. Especially was his Son to work in union with himself in the anticipated creation of the earth and every living thing that should exist upon the earth. **His Son would carry out his will and his purposes, but would do nothing of himself alone. The Father’s will would be fulfilled in him.**’ - {SR 50.3}*

This is why we see two Divine Beings throughout the Old Testament. For example, in Genesis 19, The LORD that was on earth that came with the two angels to Abraham rained down fire & brimstone from heaven from the LORD that was in heaven. **‘Then the LORD rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven;’** - (Gen 19:24) We see that the LORD is sent by the LORD. **‘For thus saith the LORD of hosts; After the glory hath he sent me unto the nations which spoiled you: for he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye. For, behold, I will shake mine hand upon them, and they shall be a spoil to their servants: and ye shall know that the LORD of hosts hath sent me.** Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion : for, lo, I come, and **I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the LORD.**’ - (Zech 2:8-10) We see that the salvation of man and council of peace that established the plan to bring peace was between two Beings. **‘And speak unto him, saying, Thus speaketh the LORD of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is The BRANCH (Jesus); and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the LORD: Even he shall build the temple of the LORD; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.’** - (Zech 6:12-13) These two are the LORD, and the Man who is the BRANCH (v12) and became the Priest (v13) is Jesus Christ. Thus, the council of peace is between two Beings; the Father & Son. And the word ‘both’ (v13) can only refer to two.

Therefore, we see in the Old Testament that there is One God, but two Divine Beings, the LORD (Jehovah) and His Angel (Son). The Bible clearly teaches that there are two Divine Beings, yet One God. We've established that this is not a contradiction. This is harmonised because there is only One Supreme Ruler and source of all things or One originator (1 Cor 8:6). As has been explained, Biblical monotheism is only One God which is the exclusive sovereign and One source of all things. The Son of God received His existence from Jehovah, the Father. Therefore, when the Bible says that there is One God, it is not saying there is One Divine Being, for clearly there are two. When the Bible says there is One God, it is saying there is one source of all things, only one originator, one ultimate Supreme Sovereign of the universe (See Eph 4:6), and thus, only One True God. All things do not trace back to a triune god, but all back to One Supreme Being/Person. This is why the Bible teaches that there is One God, the Father (1 Cor 8:6), and yet still, Jesus Christ is called God because He has the nature of God, the name of God, and is equal with God, but He is not the One True God. This is why Ellen White said that *'The Lord Jesus Christ, **the only begotten Son of the Father, is truly God in infinity, but not in personality**'* - {UL 367.4} So Christ is God concerning His state, quality, or nature, but as an individual Person, He is distinguished from the One God, for He is not the One True God, but is the Son of the One True God. The Father has no God, but He is the God of Christ. So, only God the Father is God in the absolute sense, 'absolute' meaning: He is the fountainhead, independent, the primaeval, and not subject to qualification. Jesus is God but not in the absolute sense like the Father. This is because Jesus being God is based upon His Sonship to God. When Jesus is called God, it must be qualified by His relation to His Father. Jesus' godhood or divinity cannot be separated from His Sonship to the Father. It is the latter that qualifies the former. It is not incorrect to refer to Jesus as God but it must be qualified. Jesus is God as Son of God, His Divinity is derived from God, for He is from God. But God the Father is God alone, He is ungrounded and uncaused, He is the Infinite and only true God. He is God alone in that sense; The Only True God, and there is none else beside Him, nor is there any like Him. In this sense, The Father is 'the One God', and Jesus is the Son of the One God (1 Cor 8:6).

This is why God sharing His glory with Christ is not giving His glory to another god. *'I am the LORD: that is my name: and **my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images.**'* - (Isa 42:8) We see the distinction between the True God and idols. God will not acknowledge any images, idols, or any false gods. He will not give His glory to another. God's glory is linked to His name, which He won't share with another so-called god. Jesus is not another independent god, but He is actually God's very own Son, He proceeded forth from God's very own Being (See Jhn 8:42). This is why the Bible tells us that Christ bears the glory of God. *'Even he shall build the temple of the LORD; and **he** (Jesus) **shall bear the glory**, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.'* - (Zech 6:13) And the glory of God is seen in the face of Jesus Christ. *'For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the **glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.**'* - (2 Cor 4:6)

Christ has all the brightness of His Father's glory. *'**Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person**, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high:'* - (Heb 1:3) This is why John straight away presents Christ as having the

glory of God. 'And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and **we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,**) full of grace and truth.' - (Jhn 1:14) John beheld Christ's glory 'as of the only begotten of the Father.' Jesus possesses the glory of His Father because He proceeded out of His Father's very own substance, He was begotten. Every miracle that Jesus performed was showing forth His glory, as of the glory of the only begotten of the Father. His miracles were a confirmation and manifestation of His relationship to God; being His only begotten Son. This is why Ellen White tells us that in heaven, the glory of the Father encircled both Him and Christ, His Son.

*'The King of the universe summoned the heavenly hosts before Him, that in their presence He might set forth **the true position of His Son** and show the relation He sustained to all created beings. **The Son of God shared the Father's throne,** and **the glory of the eternal, self-existent One encircled both.**' - {PP 36.2}*

Christ possesses that same glory as the 'the eternal' and 'self-existent One', the Father. Therefore, by natural inheritance, Jesus also possesses this eternal and self-existent life, for He received this life from God His Father, 'For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself;' - (Jhn 5:26)

This is why Jesus declared that God's glory would be seen before He resurrected Lazarus. 'When Jesus heard that, he said, This sickness is not unto death, but **for the glory of God,** that the Son of God might be glorified thereby... Jesus saith unto her, Said I not unto thee, that, if thou wouldest believe, **thou shouldst see the glory of God?**' - (Jhn 11:4, 40)

*'This crowning miracle of Christ caused many to believe on him. But some who were in the crowd about the grave, and heard and saw the wonderful works performed by Jesus, were not converted, but steeled their hearts against the evidence of their own eyes and ears. This demonstration of the power of Christ was the crowning manifestation offered by God to man as a proof that he had sent his Son into the world for the salvation of the human race. If the Pharisees rejected this mighty evidence, no power in Heaven nor upon earth could wrest from them their Satanic unbelief. The spies hurry away to report to the rulers this work of Jesus, and that the "world is gone after him." In performing this miracle, the Saviour took a decisive step toward the completion of his earthly mission. **The grandest evidence of his life was now given that he was the Son of God, and had control of death and the grave.** Hearts that had long been under the power of sin, **in rejecting this proof of the divinity of Jesus,** locked themselves in impenetrable darkness and came wholly under the sway of Satan, to be hurried by him over the brink of eternal ruin. The mighty miracle wrought at the grave of Lazarus intensified the hatred of the Pharisees against Jesus. **This demonstration of divine power, which presented such unquestionable proof that Jesus was the Son of God,** was sufficient to convince any mind under the control of reason and enlightened conscience. But the Pharisees, who had rejected all lesser evidence, were only enraged at this new miracle of raising the dead in the full light of day, and before a crowd of witnesses. No artifice of theirs could explain away such evidence. For this very reason their hate grew deadlier, and they watched every opportunity of accomplishing their secret purpose to destroy him. In heart they were already murderers.' - {3Red 107.2 - 108.2}*



Many Christians teach and believe that Christ's Sonship to God is in relation to His humanity. They believe that in His pre-existent form as a Divine Person, He is God Almighty. And as a man, He is Son of God. But notice that sister white points out that it was His revelation of Divine power that '*presented such unquestionable proof that Jesus was the Son of God.*' As has been shown clearly, His divinity was what pointed to Him being the Son of God, the Divine Son of God.

*'Calmly Christ stands before the tomb. A sacred solemnity rests upon all present. Christ steps closer to the sepulchre. Lifting His eyes to heaven, He says, "Father, I thank Thee that Thou hast heard Me." Not long before this, Christ's enemies had accused Him of blasphemy, and had taken up stones to cast at Him because He claimed to be the Son of God. They accused Him of performing miracles by the power of Satan. But here Christ claims God as His Father, and with perfect confidence declares that He is the Son of God. In all that He did, Christ was co-operating with His Father. Ever He had been careful to make it evident that He did not work independently; it was by faith and prayer that He wrought His miracles. Christ desired all to know His relationship with His Father. "Father," He said, "I thank Thee that Thou hast heard Me. And I knew that Thou hearest Me always: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that Thou hast sent Me." Here the disciples and the people were to be given the most convincing evidence in regard to the relationship existing between Christ and God. They were to be shown that Christ's claim was not a deception.'* - {DA 535.5 - 536.1}

Clearly, understanding the relation between Christ and His Father is of utmost importance, the lines cannot be blurred.

And we've seen that the miracle of raising Lazarus was a manifestation of the glory of God, which is the glory that is in the only begotten Son. This is why Jesus was asking for the glory of the Father's name. '**Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again.**' - (Jhn 12:28)

Jesus was asking for the Father to glorify His (Father's) name. The Father's name is glorified in the Son and through the Son, for the Son has the Father's name and came in the Father's name (Jhn 5:43). His true Sonship is evidence of this, for it is part of His natural inheritance as a Son. In bearing the Father's name, He also bears the Father's glory. This is why Jesus is Divine. As already stated, Jesus is God by nature, but all along Jesus maintained that there is One God, and that is His Father. The Father is the One True God and His Son is God too, but He is not His Father's God. God the Father has no God. However, the Son calls His Father His God (Jhn 20:17 & Rev 3:12). This is why Paul said that we as Christians belong to Christ, and Christ belongs to God. '*Therefore let no man glory in men. For all things are yours;... And ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's.*' - (1 Cor 3:21, 23) And the head of man is Christ, and the head of Christ is God (See 1 Cor 11:3).

Jesus is called the Son of God in the Bible, and if words truly mean anything, it means that Jesus is not the God of the Bible. The Son of God is not a name, it is identifying who Jesus is. The term is telling us that Jesus Christ is the Son of the One True God, the God of the Bible. This is why the Sonship of Christ is so important in the Bible.

Believing that Jesus is truly the Son of God is the foundation of the Christian faith. This is what John wanted us to understand and believe from his Gospel. *‘And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: **But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.**’* - (Jhn 20:30-31)

It is the confirmation of His Sonship that Jesus sought from the healed blind man who had been ex-communicated. *‘Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when he had found him, he said unto him, **Dost thou believe on the Son of God?**’* - (Jhn 9:35)

When the Ethiopian eunuch asked what hinders him from being baptised, Philip said if he believes he can, and it was his affirmation that Jesus is the Son of God that enabled him to be baptised. *‘And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; **what doth hinder me to be baptized?** And Philip said, **If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest.** And he answered and said, **I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.** And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him.* -

(Acts 8:36-38) God dwells in those who acknowledge that Jesus is His Son. *‘And we have seen and do testify that the **Father sent the Son** to be the Saviour of the world.*

***Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.***’ - (1 Jhn 4:14-15) It is by this belief and faith in Christ’s Sonship that we can

overcome the world. *‘Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that **believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?**’* - (Jhn 5:5) It’s this truth that Satan wants us to be blind to. *‘... He (Satan) **hoped that so few would receive Him (Jesus) as the Son of God** that He would consider His sufferings and sacrifice too great to make for so small a company. **But I saw that if there had been but two who would have accepted Jesus as the Son of God and believed on Him to the saving of their souls, He would have carried out the plan.**’* - {EW 159.2}

Is it no wonder that Satan has sought to destroy the true Sonship of Christ? Sister White states that this is exactly what Satan and his angels sought to do in heaven:

*‘Angels were expelled from heaven because they would not work in harmony with God. They fell from their high estate because they wanted to be exalted. They had come to exalt themselves, and they forgot that their beauty of person and of character came from the Lord Jesus. **This fact the angels would obscure, that Christ was the only begotten Son of God,** and they came to consider that they were not to consult Christ. **One angel began the controversy and carried it on until there was rebellion in the heavenly courts among the angels.**’* - {25LtMs. Lt 42, 1910, par. 3}

The Trinity doctrine teaches that Jesus is not the real Son of God, for the Father & Son are just role playing Father & Son. The trinitarian cannot accept the clear Biblical teaching that Jesus is the only real, true, and literal Son of God the Father. Likewise, the modalist can't accept this truth either, for they believe that the Son is a different manifestation of the Father. Moreover, the unitarians can't accept this either, for they believe Jesus was only ever born once from the virgin Mary, and never existed before this. Thus, for unitarians, God cannot have begotten a Son in the truest sense. And nor can any belief that teaches Jesus is created accept His Sonship either, for such a belief holds to the view that God created Christ out of nothing, and therefore denies that He was truly birthed by God, thereby leaving little distinction between Christ and other created beings. If we say that Jesus isn't literally the Son of God as all these doctrines teach, then we're calling God a liar.

*'He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: **he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son.** And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. **He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.** These things have I written unto you that believe on the **name of the Son of God**; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the **name of the Son of God.**' - (1 Jhn 5:10-13)*

Is the Bible really telling us that all these references to Christ's Sonship to the Father are metaphors? Do we really believe God is only play-acting the roles of Father and Son? According to doctrines like the Trinity for example, we are not to take these terms 'Father & Son' literally because this doctrine claims that Jesus is the same age as the Father, having always existed alongside the Father, and is a person of the one God Himself. These are just titles according to the Trinity. The Bible tells us that such teachings that deny the Father & Son are inspired by a spirit of antichrist. *'Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? **He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: **he that acknowledgeth the Son** hath the Father also.**' - (1 Jhn 5:22-23)*

*'For there are **certain men crept in unawares**, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and **denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.**' - (Jude 1:4)*

Doctrines like Modalism, which teaches that God has three manifestations, or Trinitarianism, which teaches that God is a trinity, are antichrist teachings from Babylon, which deny *'the only Lord God'*, our heavenly Father, and His Son Jesus Christ our Lord. They force these Two Divine Beings into being one God, rather than truly being Father & Son. Is it no wonder that the Trinity for example is the central doctrine of the antichrist system itself? *'The Catholic Church teaches that the fathomless **mystery we call God has revealed himself to humankind as a Trinity of Persons**—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit... **The mystery of the Trinity is the central doctrine of Catholic faith. Upon it are based all other teachings of the Church.**'<sup>22</sup> - ('Handbook for Today's Catholic', Fully indexed to the Catechism of the Catholic Church, Revised Edition, p. 19)*

We must ask ourselves and decide which Jesus we confess to believe in. Do we confess to believe in Jesus as the Son of God or second person of the triune god (terms never found in Holy Scripture)? Do we confess to believe in Jesus as a human manifestation of God the Father's very person? Do we confess to believe in Jesus as Son who is truly begotten of God or do we believe in someone who is playing the role of Son? Jesus did not tell us that we stand condemned for not believing in a triune god, or believing in the name of the second co-eternal person of the Godhead. Jesus told us that we stand condemned for not believing in the name of the only begotten Son of God. *'He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of **the only begotten Son of God.**'* - (Jhn 3:18) So where do the dominant churches of today get this authority to make the Trinity a test of orthodoxy and salvation? Quite simply, they don't get it from the Bible. This comes from vain pagan philosophies of men and ancient Catholic creeds, and is just another demonstration of the world wondering after the beast and her strange gods, like ancient Israel did. Our Lord Jesus Christ established the Seventh-day Adventist Church to restore true primitive, biblical Christianity that teaches the truth of who He is, the Son of the Only True God (Jhn 17:3, 1 Thess 1:9-10, Rev 14:6-7). This is why Jesus confirmed that this truth will be the foundation the true Church is built upon. *'He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, **Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.** And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and **upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.**'* - (Matt 16:15-18)

*'Jesus now put a second question, relating to the disciples themselves: "But whom say ye that I am?" Peter answered, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." ... Peter had expressed the faith of the twelve... For a little time their eyes were turned away from "the things which are seen," to behold "the things which are not seen." 2 Corinthians 4:18. Beneath the guise of humanity they discerned the glory of the Son of God. Jesus answered Peter, saying, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven." **The truth which Peter had confessed is the foundation of the believer's faith. It is that which Christ Himself has declared to be eternal life...** For six thousand years, faith has builded upon Christ. For six thousand years **the floods and tempests of satanic wrath have beaten upon the Rock of our salvation; but it stands unmoved. Peter had expressed the truth which is the foundation of the church's faith,** and Jesus now honored him as the representative of the whole body of believers.' - {DA 411.4, 412.1-3, 413.4-5}*

The true remnant of God will retain the same conviction as Peter and uphold the truth that Jesus Christ is truly the Son of the living God.

## Chapter 3: Ellen G. White on the Sonship of Christ

This chapter will analyse what God's prophet, Ellen G. White, actually taught regarding Christ's Sonship. Numerous statements from Sister White have already been shown that clearly demonstrate she taught that God is the Father and Jesus is the literal begotten Son of God, and how she was in harmony with her brethren of the SDA Church of her time. However, many theologians and ministers of the Adventist Church have formulated theories to argue that Ellen White was a trinitarian. Most acknowledge that she was not a trinitarian during her earlier prophetic years, but claim that she became trinitarian during her later years, especially after the publication of the desire of ages in 1898. This would appear to be illogical because it would suggest that Ellen White came out of trinitarianism once she left the Methodist Church and received visions from God, then decades later, God corrected her mistake and she went back into trinitarianism. To get to the bottom of this issue, this chapter will seek to examine Sister White's writings and analyse her supposed trinitarian statements, and allow her to interpret herself to see what she actually taught and believed, and whether she truly ever did change her belief about God and His Son.

Firstly, we've already identified that Sister White believed Jesus is the Son of God. '**God is the Father of Christ; Christ is the Son of God.** To Christ has been **given** an exalted position. He has been **made equal with the Father**. All the counsels of God are opened to **His Son**.' - {8T 268.3}

We've discovered that Ellen White believed Jesus Christ was begotten. '**Who is Christ?—He is the only begotten Son of the living God.** He is to the Father as a word that expresses the thought,—as a thought made audible. Christ is the word of God. Christ said to Philip, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." His words were the echo of God's words. Christ was the likeness of God, the brightness of his glory, the express image of his person.' - {YI June 28, 1894, Par 9} We also saw that Ellen White made a clear distinction between God & Christ in regards to their personalities and affirmed their individualities. '**The Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of the Father, is truly God in infinity, but not in personality.**' - {UL 367.4}

'The Scriptures clearly indicate the relation between **God and Christ, and they bring to view as clearly the personality and individuality of each**... This unity is expressed also in the seventeenth chapter of John, in the prayer of Christ for His disciples: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them; that they may be one, even as We are one: I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them, as Thou hast loved Me." John 17:20-23... **The unity that exists between Christ and His disciples does not destroy the personality of either.** They are one in purpose, in mind, in character, **but not in person. It is thus that God and Christ are one**' - {CCh 76.4, 6, 7}

The previous chapter has already shown that when Ellen White referred to Christ as being begotten of God, she meant just that, that He is a Son of God by birth. *‘Jesus was not turned aside by any influence from the faithful service expected of a son. He did not aim to do anything remarkable to distinguish himself from other youth, or to proclaim **his heavenly birth**.’* - {YI February 1, 1873, par, 7}

Now some argue that Sister White changed her position, and this was shown in her book ‘Desire of Ages’. Let's look at the quote that tends to be used to make this argument.

*‘Jesus declared, “I am the resurrection, and the life.” **In Christ is life, original, unborrowed, underived.** “He that hath the Son hath life.” 1 John 5:12. The divinity of Christ is the believer's assurance of eternal life. “He that believeth in Me,” said Jesus, “though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die. Believest thou this?” Christ here looks forward to the time of His second coming. Then the righteous dead shall be raised incorruptible, and the living righteous shall be translated to heaven without seeing death.’* - {DA 530.3}

The premise from this is that Ellen White said that *‘In Christ is life, original, unborrowed, underived’* and therefore, it is concluded that He couldn't have received His life from His Father. However, by allowing Sister White to interpret herself, we can see what she meant by this statement.

*“I lay it down of myself” (John 10:18), He said. **In Him was life, original, unborrowed, underived.** This life is not inherent in man. **He can possess it only through Christ.** He cannot earn it; **it is given him as a free gift** if he will believe in Christ as his personal Saviour. “This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent” (John 17:3). This is the open fountain of life for the world. - {1 SM 296.2}*

So this original, unborrowed, and underived life can also be given to man as the life of Christ was original, unborrowed, and underived as He received it from His Father *‘Who only hath immortality’* (1Tim 6:16). The life of the Almighty invisible God is underived. God is the source of life and possesses immortality in and of Himself, and by inheritance Christ received this very same life. And Jesus imparts this same everlasting life to those who believe on Him.

*‘Christ proclaimed over the rent sepulcher of Joseph, “I am the resurrection and the life.” [John 11:25.] He, the world's Redeemer, has bruised the serpent's head, depriving him of all power to ever make men feel his scorpion sting, for He has brought life and immortality to light. **The gates of eternal life are thrown open to all who believe on Jesus Christ. All believers who pass through a natural death have, through eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of God, eternal life in them, which is the life of Jesus Christ.** In dying Jesus has made it impossible for those who believe on Him to die eternally.’* - {13LtMs, Lt 97, 1898, par. 12}

Jesus Himself confirmed that He had received this life from His Father. *‘**For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself;**’* - (Jhn 5:26)

Hence, in the desire of ages, Ellen White says:

‘...we behold God in Jesus. Looking unto Jesus we see that **it is the glory of our God to give**. “I do nothing of Myself,” said Christ; “the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father.” “I seek not Mine own glory,” **but the glory of Him that sent Me**. John 8:28; 6:57; 8:50; 7:18. **In these words is set forth the great principle which is the law of life for the universe**. All things Christ received from God, but He took to give. So in the heavenly courts, in His ministry for all created beings: **through the beloved Son**, the **Father's life flows out to all**; through the Son it returns, in praise and joyous service, a tide of love, **to the great Source of all**. And thus through Christ the circuit of beneficence is complete, representing the character of the great Giver, the law of life.’ - {DA 21.2)

Ellen White plainly says that Christ received ‘all’ things from God. She says that the Father’s life flows out to all through His Son, and our praise returns through the Son **‘to the great Source of all’**, the Father.

Now some contend that to refer to Christ as being begotten is to equate Him with being created. It is argued that begotten and created are the same thing, and to deny this is to play semantics. For example, Pastor Doug Batchelor states,

‘Now some are going to pass on argue with the words. They say “well Jesus was not made, He was Begotten, and He came out of the Father.” And they try to make an argument with semantics, but the fact is that if there was a time when Christ Jesus did not exist, and then through some act of the Father, He was brought forth. He was created. That's all you can say, you can't, you know, change the words and try to say, 'well Begotten it's different than being created.' If He's brought forth by the Father, if He goes from being non-being to being by an act of the Father, He's created<sup>23</sup> (‘Was Jesus Created? with Pastor Doug Batchelor’, [Mins - 02:18 - 02:55] )

Again, Pastor Doug Batchelor has put himself at odds with the spirit of prophecy. He has in effect accused Ellen White of playing semantics because she makes a distinction between Christ being created and begotten. Sister White says:

“God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son,”—**not a son by creation**, as were the angels, nor a son by adoption, as is the forgiven sinner, **but a Son begotten** in the express image of the Father's person, and in all the brightness of his majesty and glory, one equal with God in authority, dignity, and divine perfection. In him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.’ - {ST May 30, 1895, par, 3}

We see here that Sister White makes a clear distinction between the word ‘created’ and ‘begotten.’ Why would she make the point that Christ was ‘not a son by creation,’ ‘but a Son begotten’ if they basically mean the same thing as Pastor Doug Batchelor claimed?

Quite simply, it's because Ellen White understood that there is a big difference. The rest of the pioneers understood that there is a difference too. E.J Waggoner makes the same point as Sister White, he states:

*'In arguing the perfect equality of the Father and the Son, and the fact that Christ is in very nature God, **we do not design to be understood as teaching that the Father was not before the Son**. It should not be necessary to guard this point, **lest some should think that the Son existed as soon as the Father, yet some go to that extreme, which adds nothing to the dignity of Christ, but rather detracts from the honor due him**, since many throw the whole thing away rather than accept a theory **so obviously out of harmony with the language of Scripture**, that **Jesus is the only begotten Son of God. He was begotten, not created**. He is of the substance of the Father, so that in his very nature he is God; and since that is so "it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell." Colossians 1:19... Christ is the Son of God. **While both are of the same nature, the Father is first in point of time. He is also greater in that he had no beginning**, while Christ's personality had a beginning.'* - {SITI April 8, 1889, page 201. 41, 42}

*'He is better than the angels, **because He is the uncreated, begotten Son**, the Creator. To Him, and not to the angels, has it been said, "Sit on My right hand, until I make Thine enemies — Thy footstool."* - {PTUK, August 26, 1897, page 531.1}

Ellen White's son understood exactly what she meant as well and was in agreement with the rest of the leading Adventist brethren; that created and begotten are different. He stated:

*'From a reading of John 1 : 1-3, 10, it will be seen that the world, with all it contains, was created by Christ (the Word), for "all things were made by Him ; and without Him was not anything made that was made." **The angels, therefore, being created, are necessarily lower than Christ, their Creator. Christ is the only being begotten of the Father.**'<sup>24</sup> - (James Edson White, 'Past, Present, and Future', 1909, p. 52)*

This statement was published in 1909, which is 11 years after Ellen White's alleged transition to belief in the trinity, yet there is no record of her rebuking her son or telling him that he needs to depart from this belief. Also, notice in sister White's statement above that she makes it clear that Christ is not 'a son by adoption.' We yet again see teachers of the present day SDA Church completely contradict Spirit of Prophecy. Notice what the Sabbath school quarterly taught about Christ's Sonship.

*'**Jesus was begotten in the sense that He was installed, or "adopted," by God as the promised ruler**, the son of David. The concept of the divine adoption of the ruler was common in the Greco-Roman world and the east. It gave the ruler legitimacy and power over the land. God promised to David, however, that his Son would be the true legitimate ruler of the nations. **He would "adopt" David's son as His own Son**. Through this process the Davidic King would become God's protégé and His heir. The covenant is fulfilled in Jesus as the Son of David. God would defeat His enemies and give Him the nations as His inheritance (Ps. 89:27; Ps. 2:7, 8). As we can read in Romans 1:3, 4 and Acts 13:32, 33, Jesus was publicly revealed as God's Son. Jesus' baptism and transfiguration were moments when God identified and announced Jesus as His Son (Matt. 3:17, Matt.*



17:5). Yet, according to the New Testament, Jesus became the “Son of God with power” when He was resurrected and seated at the right hand of God. It was at that moment that God fulfilled His promise to David that his son would be adopted as God’s own Son and His throne over the nations would be established forever (2 Sam. 7:12-14). Thus, Caesar (symbol of Rome) was not the legitimate “son of god,” ruler of the nations. Instead, Jesus Christ was. **The “begetting” of Jesus refers to the beginning of Jesus’ rule over the nations, and not to the beginning of His existence, because Jesus had always existed. There was never a time when Jesus did not exist, because He is God.** In fact, Hebrews 7:3 says that Jesus does not have “beginning of days nor end of life” (cf. Heb. 13:8) because He is eternal. Thus, **the idea of Jesus as God’s “only begotten son” is not dealing with the nature of Christ as deity but with His role in the plan of salvation.**<sup>25</sup> - (SDA Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly, ‘In These Last Days: The Message of Hebrews’, Lesson 3, January 2022)

So according to this Sabbath School quarterly, when the Bible says that Jesus is begotten, it means adopted by God as a ruler over nations, not a literal begetting. And we see that they use a form of higher criticism to get to this conclusion by pointing out that ‘*the concept of the divine adoption of the ruler was common in the Greco-Roman world and the east.*’ They then reinforce this argument by maintaining that ‘*the “begetting” of Jesus refers to the beginning of Jesus’ rule over the nations, and not to the beginning of His existence, because Jesus had always existed.*’ And their reasoning for this is ‘*because He is God.*’ And they believe this is affirmed by Hebrews 7:3. So consequently, ‘*the idea of Jesus as God’s “only begotten son” is not dealing with the nature of Christ as deity but with His role in the plan of salvation.*’ So according to this belief, Jesus is God’s Son by adoption, and Him being begotten has nothing to do with His relation to the Father, but it is just simply a word used to signify ‘*His role in the plan of salvation.*’ This is one of the interpretations of Christ’s Sonship that we saw in the previous chapter, that Christ’s Sonship is not real but just simply a role play for the plan of salvation. Jesus was never really begotten of the Father, brought forth from the Father, or came out of the Father. There is no real relationship between the Father and Son, it is all just metaphorical. Such a concept is at sharp variance from what we’ve read from the pioneers and Ellen White; that He is not a Son by adoption, nor creation, but by birth. This Sabbath School quarterly also marks a difference from the one that was shown from 1936 which taught that ‘*the direct statement of Jesus, “I came forth from the Father,” reads literally.*’ The present day quarterly clearly highlights a departure from the Biblical literalism that the Church once ascribed to.

Moreover, we’ve already seen in the previous chapter that Ellen White maintained that begotten means to be born in the desire of ages when she said: ‘*The dedication of the **first-born had its origin in the earliest times.** God had promised to **give the First-born of heaven** to save the sinner. This gift was to be acknowledged in every household by the consecration of the first-born son. He was to be devoted to the priesthood, as a **representative of Christ** among men.*’ - {DA 51.2}

Jesus was literally born of God in heaven, hence, He’s not a Son by creation, nor adoption, ‘*but a Son begotten.*’ He is the only literal Son of God, and to take away this fact is to bring dishonour to Him.

Furthermore, these statements from Ellen White make it clear that she didn't refer to Christ being begotten at His incarnation, but her statements point to the fact that He was begotten before He ever became Man.

*'In giving His Son, God gave Himself that man might have another trial. If God could have changed this law to meet man in his fallen condition, would He not have done this, and **retained His - only begotten Son in heaven?**—He certainly would. But because His law was as changeless as His character, **He gave His beloved Son**, who was above law, and one with Himself, to meet the penalty which His justice demanded.'* {BEcho February 8, 1897, par, 3}

Here, Ellen White states that if God could have changed His law to save man, He would have certainly '*retained His only begotten Son in heaven.*' God could not retain an only begotten Son in heaven if Christ was not begotten prior to His incarnation.

According to Ellen White, Jesus Christ was the only begotten Son whilst He was still in heaven. '*Christ **was** the majesty of heaven, **the only begotten Son of God**. Yet "God so loved the world that He **gave His only begotten Son**, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."* - {PH020 4.1}

Christ **was** the only begotten Son of God whilst He was the majesty of heaven, and God gave His only begotten Son to redeem mankind.

*'Man is not his own. He has been bought with a price, and what a price! **The only begotten son of God** condescended to live a life of humiliation, self-denial, and self-sacrifice, **divesting Himself of His own majesty** and glory as Commander of the heavenly courts, that He might bring life and immortality to the human race.'* - {BEcho July 20, 1896, par, 2}

The only begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ, became a baby. '***The only begotten Son of God became a helpless babe** in Bethlehem. It was He who was now speaking to the Jewish people, but they knew Him not. From the mount He had spoken, saying, "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." [Exodus 20:2.] He was now standing before them in **His assumed humanity**, giving them a lesson that they would never forget, whether they heeded it or disregarded it.'* - {18LtMs, Ms 17, 1903, par 16}

Jesus Christ who was '*The only begotten Son of God, **became** a helpless babe.*' This couldn't be any clearer that Christ was the only begotten of God before He '**became**' man.

*'We must strive to understand as far as possible the love the Father has bestowed on us. Let no one feel that he is stepping down in becoming a child of God. **It was the only begotten Son of God who stepped down**. He gave himself for us. Leaving his splendor, his majesty, his high command, and clothing his divinity with humanity, that humanity might touch humanity, and divinity lay hold upon divinity, he came to this earth, and in our behalf suffered the death of the cross.'* - {GCB April 23, 1901, par, 3}

We've seen the above 2022 Sabbath School quarterly present the case that Christ being the Son of God has nothing to do with His preexistence, but it was all part of the role He took post incarnation. This is a common belief and argument amongst many. One of the texts in Scripture used to support this argument can be found in the Gospel of Luke when the Angel Gabriel shared the news with Mary about the promised Child she was to bear:

*'And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women. And when she saw him, she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God. And, behold, **thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS.** He shall be great, and **shall be called the Son of the Highest**: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, **The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also** that holy thing which shall be born of thee **shall be called the Son of God.**' - (Luke 1:26-35)*

We see in these texts of Luke chapter 1 that the Sonship of Christ is something that is future tense and is linked to Him being conceived by the Holy Spirit through the virgin Mary. The Angel Gabriel declared to Mary that the Son she will bring forth, named Jesus (v31), '**shall** (future tense) **be called the Son of the Highest**' (v32). We see the angel reiterate this point again in verse 35. He told Mary that '*the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee.*' '**Therefore**' (because of this) the one who '*shall be born of thee shall* (future tense) **be called the Son of God**' (v35). So the argument many use from this text is that Jesus only became the Son of God at His conception. This is a popular argument that is used by unitarians to deny the preexistence of Christ, and also modalists who argue that the Father manifested himself as the son when conceived. And we've seen from the Sabbath School quarterly that this is a belief that is beginning to grow more amongst trinitarians too, including Adventists. For example, in 1982, Adventist publication; ministry magazine, published statements concerning the Sonship of Christ:

*"Any one knows that a father is older than his son. Only the Father is eternal Jehovah God. The Son came into being later and cannot be Jehovah." This objection demonstrates a lack of knowledge about the plan of salvation. **The Father-Son relationship in the New Testament must always be understood in the light of the event of Bethlehem.** The only child born into this world with a divine, rather than a human, father is Jesus. **The title, "Son," refers to His entry into time and does not deny at all His eternal origin. There are references in the Old Testament to Sonship, but these are always in anticipation of the Incarnation.**<sup>26</sup> - (J. R. Hoffman, Ministry Magazine, June 1982, P. 24)*

So again, we see this concept from an SDA publication that the Father-Son relationship has nothing to do with a real relationship during Christ's pre-existence but it '*must always be understood in the light of the event of Bethlehem.*' According to this article, Christ being called the "Son" is just in reference '*to His entry into time.*' and therefore does not reflect any actual relation between Christ and God.

Now concerning Luke 1:35, it is true that it does say Christ became the Son of God at conception. This cannot be denied if one approaches the text honestly. The text says just that and means just that, that the Lord Jesus became the Son of God at His conception. Now should this fact then mean that it must be denied that Christ was the Son of God before His conception? The problem with this logic if one is to follow it all the way is that the Bible also says that Christ became God's begotten Son at the resurrection.

*'And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he **hath raised up Jesus again**; as it is also written in the second psalm, **Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.**' - (Acts 13:32-33)*

*'(Which he had promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures,) Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; And **declared to be the Son of God with power**, according to the spirit of holiness, **by the resurrection from the dead.**' - (Rom 1:2-4)*

Again, an honest reader cannot deny that in Scripture Jesus also became the Son of God at His resurrection. This is true, for the Lord Jesus is the first-begotten of the dead.

*'And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, **the firstborn from the dead**; that in all things he might have the preeminence.'* - (Col 1:18)

*'And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and **the first begotten of the dead**, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood...'* - (Rev 1:5)

So according to Scripture, Jesus became the Son of God at His conception (Luke 1:35) and resurrection (Rom 1:3-4). Does this mean that the Bible is contradicting itself? Only if one insists that only one can be true. If Jesus only became the Son of God at conception, then it must negate that He became Son of God at His resurrection. Likewise, if Jesus only became the Son of God at His resurrection, then it must negate that He became the Son of God at His conception. Of course this is nonsensical. Both are correct and denote that Christ became the Son of God in a different sense. And this is the exact same case for Jesus becoming the Son of God before all ages. The Bible very clearly shows that Jesus was already the Son of God in a greater sense.

*'For God so loved the world, that he **gave his only begotten Son**, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'* - (Jhn 3:16)

*'In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that **God sent his only begotten Son into the world**, that we might live through him.'* - (1 Jhn 4:9)

These verses and others clearly show that Jesus was already the Son of God before His incarnation. Despite this, there should not be any qualms with the fact that Jesus became the Son of God at His conception or resurrection, for both these things are true. The Bible clearly confirms both these points (Luke 1:35 & Rom 1:3-4). But the problem begins to emerge when Christians claim that Jesus was not the Son of God prior to His incarnation, even though the Bible clearly confirms this too. The Bible tells us that Jesus was the Son of God three times. One does not need to use one fact to destroy another clear fact that the Bible tells us. The Bible confirms all three facts.

When Jesus was conceived in Mary's womb, it was the first time in the whole history of the universe that there was somebody born who was both Divine and Man (human). It was the first time ever that such an entity was born. So for the first time ever, God was going to have a Son that was going to be His perfect representative in human flesh. This was the first and only time such a being ever came into existence. He was the first human being who was God's Son in this sense. Jesus was like a new individual when He came to earth. Prior to Christ's incarnation, He was a Divine Person in the form of God only. And when He came down to earth He became man and was thus, both man (human) and divine. He was a new individual in this sense, and it was the first time God ever had a human being who was His Son in this unique sense. So He became the Son of God as a human being when He was conceived in the virgin Mary's womb. So when Luke 1:35 says that '*holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God*', it is pointing to the union of divinity with humanity that took place with this new individual coming into existence as the Son of God. God had a Son who was both human and divine for the first time ever. So Jesus did also become God's Son when He was born of the virgin Mary (Luke 1:35). This is an amazing and beautiful truth, but it must not deny the one that went before, it must not deny His heavenly birth, the truth that He is the only begotten Son from eternity.

And the same goes for His third sense Sonship; becoming the Son of God at His resurrection (Rom 1:3-4). The resurrection of Christ was of extreme vital and utmost importance, it was as equally necessary as His incarnation, birth and crucifixion. If Jesus came down and just lived and died, we would be dead in our sins forever (1 Cor 15:13-14, 16-18). So it was necessary that a man should conquer sin, enter into the grave, and open the doors of the grave; conquering death for humanity, or we could have never been released from the sting of death and out of the gates of hell. A human being had to do this. And so when the Lord Jesus Christ was raised up from the dead and burst out of the grave, He was the first human being who had conquered the grave and who was victorious over all sin (See Rom 8:3), thus conquered sin and death in the flesh.

***'O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.'*** - (1 Cor 15:55-57)

The Lord Jesus Christ became the first human being after the fall who was exactly what God wanted. Satan had control of death until Jesus defeated him.

*'Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, **he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;** And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.'* - (Heb 2:14-15)

And He could thereby have the right to the keys of hell and death: *'**I am he that liveth, and was dead;** and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; **and have the keys of hell and of death.**'* - (Rev 1:18)

We are given the right to become children of God when we believe upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ (Jhn 1:12). So the Christian is a son of God through faith in the Lord Christ Jesus. Yet, the Christian will become a child of God in a new sense when they are raised up from the dead and glorified, hence, Christ is called the firstfruits of those born of the dead.

*'But now is Christ risen from the dead, **and become the firstfruits of them that slept.** For since by man came death, **by man came also the resurrection of the dead.** For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: **Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming.**'* - (1 Cor 15: 20-23)

*'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy **hath begotten us again** unto a lively hope **by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead...**'* - (1 Pet 1:3)

Notice that Peter says that God *'hath begotten us **again***. 'Again' means another time or once more. So Peter is saying that believers are begotten of God twice. This is because we are begotten of God (in a secondary sense) when we are born of the Spirit (See Jhn 1:13, 3:5-8), and Peter tells us that we are born of God again *'by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.'* Neither of these two facts should destroy the other.

So yes, it is true; the Lord Jesus Christ became the Son of God at His resurrection, yet this does not negate the fact that He became the Son of God at His conception, and again, this does not negate the fact that He was the Son of God when He was still up in heaven in His preexistent form. All three are true and Biblical. He became the Son of God in a new sense when born from the virgin Mary, and in another sense when God raised Him from the dead.

Ellen White attests unquestionably that Jesus was the Son of God during His preexistence, and became the Son of God in a new sense at His incarnation:

*'**Before the foundations of the world were laid, Christ, the Only-begotten of God, pledged Himself to become the Redeemer of the human race,** should Adam sin. Adam fell, and He who was partaker of the Father's glory before the world was, laid aside His royal robe and kingly crown, and stepped down from **His high authority to become a Babe in Bethlehem,** that by passing over the ground where Adam stumbled and fell, He might redeem fallen human beings... Christ brought men and women power to overcome. He came to this world in human form, to live a man amongst men. He assumed*

the liabilities of human nature, to be proved and tried. In His humanity He was a partaker of the divine nature. **In His incarnation He gained in a new sense the title of the Son of God.** Said the angel to Mary, “The power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.” **While the Son of a human being, He became the Son of God in a new sense. Thus He stood in our world—the Son of God, yet allied by birth to the human race.**’ - {ST August 2, 1905, par. 1-2}

Ellen White makes it plain that ‘before the foundations of the world were laid’ Christ was ‘the Only-begotten of God’, and He became ‘a Babe in Bethlehem.’ So, when the only-begotten of God was conceived in the womb of the virgin Mary, ‘He gained in a new sense the title of the Son of God.’ The latter does not negate the former, nor the former the latter.

Again, Ellen White stated:

‘Men first beheld Christ as a babe, as a child. His parents were very poor, and he had nothing in this earth save that which the poor have. He passed through all the trials that the poor and lowly pass through from babyhood to childhood, from youth to manhood. Nearly two thousand years ago a voice was heard in heaven from the throne of God saying, “Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire: mine ears hast thou opened: burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required. Then said, I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart.” The more we think about Christ's becoming a babe here on earth, the more wonderful it appears. **How can it be that the helpless babe in Bethlehem's manger is still the divine Son of God?** Though we cannot understand it, we can believe that he who made the worlds, for our sakes became a helpless babe. Though higher than any of the angels, though as great as the Father on the throne of heaven, he became one with us. In him God and man became one, and it is in this fact that we find the hope of our fallen race. Looking upon Christ in the flesh, we look upon God in humanity, and see in him the brightness of divine glory, the express image of God the Father.’ - {YI November 21, 1895, par. 2-3}

So again, notice sister White asks how is it that the helpless Babe ‘**is still** the divine Son of God?’ To still be the Divine Son means He was already the Son of God before His incarnation. This couldn't be any more plain.

‘Christ is the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. The light now shineth, and the spirit of truth is given to every man to profit withal. The wisdom of God will guide every true, every humble, devoted worker. Let the professed followers of Christ behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world. Let them look upon Christ as the Center, the Lifegiver, and then let them arise and shine for the glory of God is risen upon them. The Lord is soon to come, and every soul who would turn from error to truth will have a fierce conflict in order to cut loose from Satan's chariot car and stand free, free indeed in Christ Jesus. O what a gift God has made to our world! The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. God sent His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, liable to physical infirmities, tempted in all points like as we are. **He was the Son of the living God. His personality did not begin with His incarnation in the flesh.**’ - {9LtMs, Lt 77, 1894, par. 8-9}

It is clear that Ellen White was in agreement with the rest of the pioneers as she believed that Christ was the begotten Son of God before His incarnation. *‘He (Jesus) was the representative of God and the exemplar of humanity. He presented to the world what humanity might become when united by faith with divinity. **The only-begotten Son of God took upon Him the nature of man**, and established His cross between earth and heaven.’* - {1SM 349.2}

Also, as I've shown in the previous chapter, Ellen White says: *‘Christ, the Word, **the only begotten of God**, was one with the eternal Father—one in nature, in character, in purpose—the **only being that could enter into all the counsels and purposes of God.**’* - {PP 34.1}

Notice that Sister White says that Christ is the *‘only begotten of God.’* She doesn't say that Christ is the second co-eternal with God as the Trinity doctrine teaches. Neither does she say that Christ was the only-eternally generated of God as ancient trinitarian creeds state in an attempt to harmonise the co-eternal teaching of the Trinity with the scriptural word begotten. Also, notice Ellen White refers to Christ as being one with the *‘eternal Father.’* She pinpoints that the only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, *‘was one with the eternal Father’.* Thus, the Father is the eternal one and Christ is begotten of Him. Moreover, Ellen White states that Christ was the *‘only being that could enter into all the counsels and purposes of God.’* And this is clearly because Christ is *‘the **only** begotten of God.’*

In addition, the previous chapter had already shown in depth that Ellen White's references to Christ being begotten is to be taken literally. Sister White interpreted the word 'begotten' in regards to Christ as a literal event. She believed that Christ literally came out of the Father, which we already saw when she said *‘The Eternal Father, the unchangeable one, **gave his only begotten Son, tore from his bosom** Him who was **made** in the express image of his person, and sent him down to earth to reveal how greatly he loved mankind.’* - {RH July 9, 1895, par, 13} She understood that the gift God sent down was One that came out of His own substance/material. *‘Who can anticipate the gifts of infinite Love. **“God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son**, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.”... Though sin had produced a gulf between man and his God, divine benevolence provided a plan to bridge that gulf and **what material did he use? A part of himself**, the brightness of the Father's glory came to a world all seared and marred with the curse...’* - {1888 711.3}

When Ellen White says Christ is the *‘only-begotten Son of God’*, and *‘First-born of heaven’*, she literally means just that. This is because Sister White took Christ's words literally when He said He was begotten and came out of the Father. As we already discovered, Jesus said several times that He came out of His Father. *‘For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that **I came out from God. I came forth from the Father, and** am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.* - (Jhn 16:27-28)



Jesus claimed He was begotten. *‘For God so loved the world, that he **gave his only begotten Son**, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For **God sent not his Son into the world** to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the **only begotten Son of God.**’* - (Jhn 3:16-18) As Ellen White and the pioneers lived by the Seventh-day Adventist principle of sola scriptura and true biblical literalism, they thereby took these words of Christ literally, just as the disciples did (Jhn 16:29-30). According to Sister White, Jesus Christ is the only-begotten Son of God, torn from the bosom of His Father; God’s own material, and was sent down to earth. This couldn't be made more plain.

Sister White understood that the Bible makes a clear distinction between created and begotten. A man may ‘create’ something, such as a robot, which is a man's invention. However, this creation of man does not partake of the same nature as the man. But if a man ‘begets’ a child, the child then partakes of the exact same nature as their father.

This is why the Bible deliberately uses the word ‘begotten’ to describe how Christ relates with His Father. This is a vital truth of Scripture, that God the Father and His Son are of the same substance. Any attempts made to diminish the divinity of Christ can be overturned by pointing to the fact that He is literally born of God, which no other being can claim the same for their existence. Moreover, John tells us that through Christ (the Word), *‘All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.’* - (Jhn 1:3) Thus, this again rules out any possibility that the only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ, was created, for all things in the category of creation were created through the Son, therefore, the Son cannot be in that category of creation. The pioneers made this point time and time again, yet most in the Christian world can’t seem to get their heads around this clear biblical teaching, and must equate being begotten with being created. If we could just simply stay within the realm of the language Scripture uses; Father & Son, then it’d be clear that Christ is not created, but He’s begotten. That’s what sons are, they’re begotten. That’s what it means to be the son of a father. We make God out to be a bad communicator by spiritualising texts and interpreting them to mean anything else other than what they're clearly saying. Such is confusion, such is babylonian, and the remnant church are called to rectify these intoxicants of Babylon, which is what the SDA Church originally did.

*‘It is the first and highest duty of every rational being to learn from the Scriptures what is truth, and then to walk in the light and encourage others to follow his example. We should day by day study the Bible diligently, weighing every thought and **comparing scripture with scripture**. With divine help we are to form our opinions for ourselves **as we are to answer for ourselves before God. The truths most plainly revealed in the Bible have been involved in doubt and darkness by learned men, who, with a pretense of great wisdom**, teach that the Scriptures have a mystical, a secret, spiritual meaning **not apparent in the language employed**.. **The language of the Bible should be explained according to its obvious meaning**, unless a symbol or figure is employed. Christ has given the promise: “If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine.” John 7:17. **If men would but take the Bible as it reads**, if there were no false teachers to mislead and confuse their minds, a work would be accomplished that would make angels glad and that would bring into the fold of Christ thousands upon thousands who are now wandering in error.’ - {GC 598.2, 3}*

The present SDA Church has departed from these principles laid out by Ellen White concerning taking the 'Bible as it reads.' For example, we see SDA theologians state in their book:

*'Is it not quite apparent that the problem texts become problems only when one assumes an **exclusively literalistic interpretation of such expressions as "Father," "Son," "Firstborn," "Only Begotten," "Begotten,"** and so forth? **Does not such literalism go against the mainly figurative or metaphorical meaning that the Bible writers use when referring to the persons of the Godhead? Can one really say that the Bible writers meant such expressions as "the only true God" and "one God, the Father"** to exclude the full deity of the Son, Jesus Christ?'<sup>27</sup> - (Woodrow W. Whidden, Jerry Moon, John W. Reeve, 'Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships', Review and Herald Publishing Association, (2002), p. 106)*

We see from these authors that the expressions in the Bible used such as "Father," "Son," "Firstborn," "Only Begotten," "Begotten," must only be taken figuratively or metaphorically when applied to the Father and Son. These terms must not be understood as expressing a reality, thereby, we cannot just read the Bible for what it plainly says, for it has 'a secret, spiritual meaning not apparent in the language employed,' we can't just 'take the Bible as it reads.' Also, notice that the authors use assumptive reasonings by implying that if the Bible writers would have truly meant 'such expressions as "the only true God" and "one God, the Father," then this would have excluded 'the full deity of the Son, Jesus Christ.' But it has been established that such is faulty reasoning. It does not have to be one or the other. Christ's full deity can be upheld whilst still recognising the Father as the One and only true God, if His relationship to the Son is understood.

But again, we see from Sister White that creating doubt over the plainness of God's Word began with Satan.

*'It was decided that Satan should assume another form and manifest an interest for man. **He must insinuate against God's truthfulness and create doubt whether God did mean just what He said.'** - (EW 146.2)*

This then leaves the question - why is there so much falsehoods and confusion in regards to Christ's Sonship? The prophet of God, Ellen White, explains in great detail where this attack on Christ's Sonship comes from. God revealed to Sister White that Christ's Sonship was the root of the war in heaven. Satan was jealous of the position of Christ and questioned why He was given such power and authority. Satan questioned why Jesus was able to be in the counsels with God and also receive the same honour as God.

*'All the angels were astir. Satan was warring against the government of God, because ambitious to exalt himself and **unwilling to submit to the authority of God's Son**, Heaven's great commander. At length all the angels are summoned to appear before the Father, to have each case decided. Satan unblushingly makes known to all the heavenly family, his discontent, that Christ should be preferred before him, **to be in such close conference with God**, and he be uninformed as to the result of their frequent consultations. **God informs Satan that this he can never know**. That to his Son will he reveal his secret purposes, and that all the family of Heaven, Satan not excepted, were required to yield implicit obedience. While some of the angels joined Satan in his rebellion, others reasoned with him to dissuade him from his purposes, **contending for the honor and wisdom of God in giving authority to his Son**. **Satan urged, for what reason was Christ endowed with unlimited power and such high command above himself!** He stood up proudly, and urged that he should be equal with God. He makes his boasts to his sympathizers that he will not submit to the authority of Christ... **He** (Satan) **declares he cannot submit to be under Christ's command, that God's commands alone will he obey**. Good angels weep to hear the words of Satan, and to see how he despises to follow the direction of Christ, their exalted and loving commander. '- {3SG 37.1-3}*

We see that Satan began to grow resentment towards Christ because of the position He held next to the Father in heaven. Satan wasn't willing to submit to the authority of God's Son. Notice Sister White says that Satan declared 'God's commands alone will he obey.' Satan acknowledged who the Supreme Ruler is but he had a major issue with submitting to Christ and kept questioning why he should do so and why Christ could 'be in such close conference with God'. Satan wanted to know what the reason was for Christ to be able to be 'endowed with unlimited power and such high command above himself.' This shows that the war in heaven started over Satan's envy of Jesus Christ.

*'Satan, who was once a beautiful angel in the heavenly courts, became a fallen angel because he did not want to occupy a secondary place, but to be next to God. He would have the Lord Jesus become second to him, for his own glory was very precious in his own sight. **He was jealous of Christ**, the Saviour. Study the Word of God, and see what this jealousy led to in the end. There is nothing to be gained by jealousies. Although in the beginning Satan was an exalted angel of great glory in the heavenly courts, that glory became extinguished **through his craving to be the highest one next to God**.'* - {25LtMs, Ms 74, 1910, par 6}

Satan claimed that the position God had exalted Christ to was unjust, and believed that he himself deserved such honour. The holy angels of God sought to rectify Satan's sentiments by explaining to him that the reason Christ was given such power and authority was because He is God's very own Son. Ellen White explains this when she says:

*'There was contention among the angels. Lucifer and his sympathizers were striving to reform the government of God. They were discontented and unhappy because they could not look into His unsearchable wisdom and ascertain **His purposes in exalting His Son**, and endowing Him with such unlimited power and command. **They rebelled against the authority of the Son**. Angels that were loyal and true sought to reconcile*

*this mighty, rebellious angel to the will of his Creator. **They justified the act of God in conferring honor upon Christ**, and with forcible reasoning sought to convince Lucifer that no less honor was his now than before the Father had proclaimed the honor which He had conferred upon His Son. **They clearly set forth that Christ was the Son of God**, existing with Him before the angels were created; and that He had ever stood at the right hand of God...*' - {SR 15.1-2}

God Himself gave Lucifer the answer to his question. Lucifer wanted to know what the reason was for Christ being so highly exalted above himself. Jehovah explained to Lucifer that Christ was exalted to such a position because He was His only begotten Son.

*'All this holding to sentiments of infallibility is a specious device of the angel that was so exalted in the heavenly court. His beauty was so highly exalted that he thought he should be as God, and Christ must be second to him; but **the Lord informed Satan** this could not be possible. **Christ was His only begotten Son.**'* - {25LtMs, Lt 157, 1910, par. 7}

Satan coveted the glory that Christ shared with His Father. *'And coveting the glory with which the **infinite Father had invested His Son**, this prince of angels aspired to power that was the prerogative of Christ alone.'* - {PP 35.2}

We see here again from Ellen White that the Father was the infinite one, and all His glory was invested in His Son, thus, Jesus inherited all the power and glory of the Father, for He was the only literal Son of the Father. No other being could share in this glory, for all other beings are creatures, including the angels of heaven. This is what angered Lucifer, for he sought after the position of Christ, yet Christ rightfully held this position because He was the Son of God and was co-creator with His Father. But *'Lucifer allowed his jealousy of Christ to prevail, and became the more determined. To **dispute the supremacy of the Son of God**, thus impeaching the wisdom and love of the Creator, **had become the purpose of this prince of angels.**'* - {PP 35.3, 36.1}

We see that Satan made it his purpose to dispute *'the supremacy of the Son of God.'* God even organised a meeting to set the record straight to the angels by setting forth the position of His Son.

*'**The King of the universe** summoned the heavenly hosts before Him, that in their presence **He might set forth the true position of His Son** and show the relation He sustained to all created beings. The Son of God shared the Father's throne, and the **glory of the eternal, self-existent One encircled both.**'* - {PP 36.2}

Again, Ellen White explicitly presents the attributes of being eternal and self-existent to the Father, and Christ being His Son was able to partake in this glory and be worshipped alongside His Father by the host of heaven, for the glory of the Father *'encircled both'* (Him & Christ). Jesus inherited all the attributes of His Father, thus, He too is fully God, and worshipped as such. *'About the throne gathered the holy angels, a vast, unnumbered throng—"ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands" (Revelation 5:11.), the most exalted angels, as ministers and subjects, rejoicing in the light that fell upon them from the presence of the Deity.'* - {PP 36.2}

Jesus didn't earn His high position of being equal with the Father in glory, power and honour, but it was part and parcel with His inheritance, for He was born of God and thus, received the inheritance of full divinity and created all things with His Father (See Col 1:16). All the angels were to accept this and acknowledge Christ too as their Creator alongside His Father, and worship Him accordingly (See Heb 1:6). Jesus Christ was the only Being other than God that could be worshipped, for He was the only-begotten Son of God.

*'Before the assembled inhabitants of heaven the King declared that **none but Christ, the Only Begotten of God**, could fully enter into His purposes, and to Him it was committed to execute the mighty counsels of His will. The Son of God had wrought the Father's will in the creation of all the hosts of heaven; and **to Him, as well as to God, their homage and allegiance were due**... The angels joyfully acknowledged the supremacy of Christ, and prostrating themselves before Him, poured out their love and adoration.' - {PP 36.2, 3}*

We must recognise that Satan absolutely hates the fact of Christ's Sonship. Lucifer knew that Christ possessed all the same honour as God because He was the very Son of God. The splendour and majesty that God had blessed him (Lucifer) with was not enough for him.

He wanted to be involved in the counsels and receive worship like God's Son. Lucifer sought to convince the other angels that Christ's exaltation to being equal with God was unjust and unfair. Notice what Ellen White says:

*'His desire for supremacy returned, and envy of Christ was once more indulged. The high honors conferred upon Lucifer were not appreciated as God's special gift... He was beloved and revered by the heavenly host, angels delighted to execute his commands, and he was clothed with wisdom and glory above them all. **Yet the Son of God was exalted above him, as one in power and authority with the Father**... **"Why, questioned this mighty angel, "should Christ have the supremacy? Why is He honored above Lucifer?"**... **The exaltation of the Son of God as equal with the Father was represented as an injustice to Lucifer**... Such were the subtle deceptions that through the wiles of Lucifer were fast obtaining in the heavenly courts. There had been no change in the position or authority of Christ. Lucifer's envy and misrepresentation and his claims to equality with Christ had made **necessary a statement of the true position of the Son of God; but this had been the same from the beginning.** Many of the angels were, however, blinded by Lucifer's deceptions.' - {PP 36.3, 37.1, 38.1}*

We see again that Lucifer kept agitating the question as to why Christ should have the supremacy and be honoured above him. And these urges from Satan *'made necessary a statement of the true position of the Son of God.'* And we've seen that God Himself gave His statement and reason for this, as God *'informed Satan'* that was because Christ is His only-begotten Son. Lucifer's sentiments against Christ's position had seeped into the minds of the other angels who began to follow him.

*'There were some who looked with favor upon Lucifer's insinuations against the government of God... they were dissatisfied with His purpose in exalting Christ. These stood ready to second Lucifer's demand for equal authority with the Son of God.'* - {PP 38.3}

In the midst of this controversy that started to brew amongst the angels over the position of Christ, those who remained loyal to God were assured by the fact that they understood that Christ was the Son of God and had always stood at God's right hand, being equal with Him from eternity. *'But angels who were loyal and true maintained the wisdom and justice of the divine decree... Christ was the Son of God; He had been one with Him before the angels were called into existence.'* - {PP 38.3}

Satan knew that it is Christ's Sonship that equates Him with God, thus, Satan knows that in order to diminish Christ's authority, he must diminish the fact of His Sonship. Ellen White says this is exactly what false teachers have done.

*'...as there were false prophets who led Israel into sin, so there will be false teachers, "who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them.... And many shall follow their pernicious ways." 2 Peter 2:1, 2. Here the apostle has pointed out one of the marked characteristics of spiritualist teachers. They refuse to acknowledge Christ as the Son of God. Concerning such teachers the beloved John declares: "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father." 1 John 2:22, 23. Spiritualism, by denying Christ, denies both the Father and the Son, and the Bible pronounces it the manifestation of antichrist. - {PP 686.1}*

God revealed to Ellen White that Satan sparked war in heaven over the fact that Christ was the only-begotten Son of God.

*'Lucifer, he was striving; he had glory in the heavenly courts, but he was striving for Christ's place next to God. Next he wanted to be God, but he could not obtain that. Christ was the only begotten Son of God, and Lucifer, that glorious angel, got up a warfare over the matter, until he had to be thrust down to the earth. He knows what I am saying today... He knows when we are making efforts in every way possible to reach out to win the minds of the people. He has his agencies appointed so that after this meeting will be over, circumstances will arise and the enemy will try to gain the victory.'* - {25LtMs, Ms 86, 1910, par, 28, 29}

Ellen White made this statement in 1910, 12 years after her alleged change to the trinity. She tells us that Lucifer *'got up a warfare over the matter'* that *'Christ was the Only Begotten Son of God'*. He had a problem with this fact in heaven and still has a problem with this fact today, hence, it was no wonder that God raised up the SDA pioneers, and led them to take the Bible as it reads in regards to the identity of His Son. Ellen White told the church in 1910 that *'circumstances will arise and the enemy will try to gain the victory.'* Satan has waged war on the remnant church by trying to get the church to retract on its belief of Christ's literal Sonship, and now those who hold to this truth are seen as the heretics.

Satan challenged the Sonship of Christ when He was on earth. *'And when the tempter came to him, he said, **If thou be the Son of God**, command that these stones be made bread.'* - (Matt 4:3)

We see here that Satan was trying to tempt Jesus to prove He was the Son of God by performing a divine miracle. Satan was challenging Jesus' claim of being the Son of God.

*'Satan took advantage of the sufferings of the Son of God and prepared to beset Him with manifold temptations, hoping to obtain the victory over Him, because He had humbled Himself as a man. Satan came with this temptation: "**If Thou be the Son of God**, command this stone that it be made bread." He tempted Jesus to condescend to give him proof of His being the Messiah, by exercising His divine power... **Satan was seeking a dispute with Jesus concerning His being the Son of God**. He referred to His weak, suffering condition and boastingly affirmed that he was stronger than Jesus. But the word spoken from heaven, "**Thou art My beloved Son**; in Thee I am well pleased," **was sufficient to sustain Jesus** through all His sufferings... **Satan had sufficient evidence of the exalted station and authority of the Son of God**. His unwillingness to yield to Christ's authority had shut him out of heaven. Satan, to manifest his power, carried Jesus to Jerusalem, and set Him upon a pinnacle of the temple, and there **tempted Him to give evidence that He was the Son of God**, by casting Himself down from that dizzy height.'* - {EW 155.3 - 155.4, 156.1}

This is why the Jews sought to kill Christ. *'Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that **God was his Father**, making himself equal with God.'* - (Jhn 5:18)

Ellen White confirms that Jesus' claim of Sonship to God was one of the main reasons the Jews wanted to kill Him. *'Because He was, and avowed Himself to be, **the Son of God**, they were bent on destroying Him.'* - {DA 470.1}

*'Not long before this, Christ's enemies had accused Him of blasphemy, and had taken up stones to cast at Him **because He claimed to be the Son of God**. They accused Him of performing miracles by the power of Satan. But here Christ claims **God as His Father**, and **with perfect confidence declares that He is the Son of God**.'* - {DA 535.5}

*'Possessing such power, why did not Christ save John's life? This question had often been asked by the Pharisees, who presented it as an unanswerable argument **against Christ's claim to be the Son of God**.'* - {DA 526.3}

“Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him because He not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was His Father, making himself equal with God.” The whole nation called God their Father, and if Jesus had done this in the same sense in which they did, the Pharisees would not have been so enraged. But they accused Jesus of blasphemy, showing that **they understood that Christ claimed God as His Father in the very highest sense.**’ - {RH March 5, 1901, par, 9}

These statements show that Satan's resentment towards Christ and his issue over the fact He is the Son of God was manifested through the people. It was this very declaration that sealed our Lord Jesus Christ's fate. Jesus was accused of many things, but the ultimate thing that the Jewish high priest questioned Him on was whether He was the Son of God, and this stirred up strong anger when Jesus answered that He was.

‘And the high priest stood up in the midst, and asked Jesus, saying, Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? But he held his peace, and answered nothing. Again the high priest asked him, and said unto him, Art thou the Christ, **the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, I am:** and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. **Then the high priest rent his clothes,** and saith, **What need we any further witnesses? Ye have heard the blasphemy:** what think ye? **And they all condemned him to be guilty of death.**’ - (Mark 14:60-64)

‘And the high priest arose, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? But Jesus held his peace, And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, **the Son of God.** Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest **rent his clothes,** saying, **He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses?** behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? They answered and said, **He is guilty of death.**’ - (Matt 26:63-66)

We see clearly that the root of the war in heaven was manifesting through the Jews, this is why they wanted Jesus Christ dead, because He claimed to be the Son of God, the very reason Satan sparked a war. ‘The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, **because he made himself the Son of God.**’ - (Jhn 19:7)

**‘Satan had caused the Jews to rebel against God by refusing to receive His Son,** and by staining their hands with His most precious blood. **No matter how powerful the evidence now produced that Jesus was the Son of God, the Redeemer of the world, they had murdered Him, and would not receive any evidence in His favor.** Their only hope and consolation, like that of Satan after his fall, **was in trying to prevail against the Son of God...** As when the Holy Spirit through Stephen declared **the mighty evidence of Jesus' being the Son of God, they stopped their ears lest they should be convinced...**’ - {EW 208.3}



*To the charge of the high priest, Jesus said, "Thou hast said: Nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven" [Matthew 26:64]. These words were spoken with dignity and assurance. They fell from the lips of One whose Spirit went with the words. Christ, the only begotten Son of God, was the speaker, and His words came with ease, as if from the depths of a soul possessing the testimony to be given on earth... Every word of Christ's reply was an arrow aimed by no uncertain hand. The judges rose up and confronted Christ, and **with angry vehemence one after another asked Him the question, "Art Thou the Son of God?" To all came the answer as to Caiaphas, "I AM."**...The rulers did not yield to the conviction, but decided the matter as Satan hoped they would. They condemned Christ as a blasphemer... This is one of the times when Christ publicly confessed His claim to be the Messiah, the One for whom the Jews had long looked. Weighted with such great results, **it was to Christ one of the most wonderful moments of His life. He realized that all disguise must be swept away.** The declaration that He was one with God must be openly made. His judges looked upon Him as only a man, and they thought Him guilty of blasphemous presumption. **But He proclaimed Himself as the Son of God.** He fully asserted His divine character before the dignitaries who had arraigned Him before their earthly tribunal. His words, spoken calmly, yet with conscious power, showed that **He claimed for Himself the prerogatives of the Son of God.**' - {12MR 400.2, 401.4-402.2}*

Notice Ellen White points out that Christ's true glorious identity was to be revealed before the high priest and judges, '*all disguise must be swept away.*' Christ revealed before them who He is, not just simply as the man Christ Jesus, but who He was in His pre-existent form; '*He proclaimed Himself as the Son of God.*' And this declaration '*was to Christ one of the most wonderful moments of His life.*' Christ was about to face the height of His fiery trials, yet His declaration that sealed His fate was one of the greatest moments of His life, for He could sweep away all disguise and testify that God is truly His Father. This was the full revelation to the Jews of who the Divine One standing before them is; the Divine Son of God. And this ignited '*angry vehemence*' against Him.

Even when the Lord Jesus was on the cross, Satan was still working through the people to challenge His Sonship. '*And they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads, And saying, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself. **If thou be the Son of God**, come down from the cross. Likewise also the chief priests mocking him, with the scribes and elders, said... He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, **I am the Son of God.***' - (Matt 27:39-43)

*'As Jesus hung upon the cross, some who passed by reviled Him, wagging their heads as if bowing to a king, and said to Him, "Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save Thyself. If Thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross."* **Satan used the same words to Christ in the wilderness—"If Thou be the Son of God."**... **The angels who hovered over the scene of Christ's crucifixion were moved to indignation as the rulers derided Him and said, "If He be the Son of God, let Him deliver Himself". - {EW 177.1}**

This shows that the truth of Christ's Sonship is not a side issue. This is at the very core of the great controversy between Christ and Satan, which we are all involved in one way or another.

This is why John so earnestly wanted us to believe that Jesus is truly the Son of God (See Jhn 3:36, 1 Jhn 4:15, 1 Jhn 5:5). We must understand that the price we are bought with is the very blood of God's only begotten Son.

*'The Father, the omniscient One, created the world through Christ Jesus. Christ is the light of the world, the way to eternal life. He, the anointed One, God gave to make an atonement for the sins of the world. You need to understand that unless you believe in that atonement, and know that **you are bought with the price of the blood of the only begotten Son of God**, you will assuredly be bound up with the wicked one. **If you continue to cherish the theories** that you have been cherishing, you will be left to become the sport of Satan's temptations. He is playing the game of life for your soul. Remain for a little longer linked up with him, and be assured that you will lose your soul.... ' - {4MR 59.1}*

This is in fact what some influential Seventh-day Adventist ministers have done. By teaching that the One God is a trinity, they then conclude that God didn't actually send His Son, but He sent Himself. For example, SDA minister, Pastor David Asscherick argued that non-trinitarians are in error because they believe that God actually sent His Son. According to Pastor Asscherick, this was not so, he claims God didn't send anyone. He then further argues that the idea of God sending His Son as a sacrifice is repulsive and would make God guilty of child sacrifice. According to Pastor Asscherick, God sending His Son is not good news at all. He stated:

*'(Reads question) Did our church make a mistake leaving the position of Ellen White and the pioneers regarding God (by) adopting the Catholic position of the Trinity?'*

*(His answer) "Absolutely not. The trinitarian nature of God is not a Catholic position, okay. If you think it's Catholic you're misinformed. It's a biblical position and if you think it's not, you come talk to me afterward and I'll sort you out. The really simple question that you have to ask somebody that claims to be a non-trinitarian, **somebody who says there's only one God and Jesus is His Son**, and the Holy Spirit's just an effervescent power. You just ask them one question, and this is the question; what is the gospel? That's it. Because in a non-trinitarian world, **in a non-trinitarian universe, what is the good news? That God sacrificed His Son?** Let me ask you a question; **is that good news?** We just learned yesterday that God said that child sacrifice didn't even come into God's mind, it's so repulsive, so foreign, so alien to Him. **Friends the good news of the gospel is not that God gave someone else, it's that God gave Himself...** In a non-trinitarian or a Unitarian picture of God, **God has sacrificed His Son? That's not good news. That's child sacrifice.**<sup>28</sup> - ('David Asscherick Answers a Question on SDA trinity'), [Mins 0:03-01:21]*

We see here that David Asscherick believes that those who teach God sent His Son are in error. Here, Pastor Asscherick is being a consistent trinitarian. His trinitarian understanding of God causes him to acknowledge that in this belief, God couldn't truly have sent His Son because the One God is the Trinity. It is just simply one component or member of the One God that came down, hence he says that *'the good news of the gospel is not that God gave someone else, (but) it's that God gave Himself.'* But is this really what the Bible teaches?

Is the good news of the Gospel really not that God gave His Son? Clearly such sentiments are in complete opposition to what the Scriptures tell us.

*'In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that **God sent his only begotten Son into the world**, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and **sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.**' - (1 Jhn 4:9-10)*

*'What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? **He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all**, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?' - (Rom 8:31-32)*

According to David Asscherick, the non-trinitarian understanding of the Gospel is warped and abhorrent because they actually believe that God sent His Son as a sacrifice for mankind. For him, this *'non-trinitarian...picture of God'* that *'God has sacrificed His Son'* is *'not good news'* at all, because it's *'child sacrifice'*. This completely diminishes the great sacrifice God made by giving up His Son to redeem us. The Bible clearly reveals that the great mission Christ undertook and the great sacrifice that He made by giving Himself for our sins was *'...according to the will of God and our Father'* - (Gal 1:4) God made the ultimate sacrifice by giving up His only begotten Son for us. The Lord Jesus Christ was truly God's Son, His only true and literal Son, and God was willing to give Him as a sacrifice for us so that we don't perish forever. This truly displays the magnitude of love that God has for a rebellious and sinful people, *'For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'* - (Jhn 3:16) *'But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we **were reconciled to God by the death of his Son**, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.'* - (Rom 5:8-10)

It was the will of God the Father to send His own Son down to earth for Him to die in our place, hence, He didn't take the cup away from Christ. *'And he was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down, and prayed, Saying, Father, if thou be willing, **remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done.**' - (Luke 22:41-42)*

Jesus followed the will of His Father every step of the way. *'I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, **but the will of the Father which hath sent me.**' - (Jhn 5:30)* It was the will of God to send Christ to die so that we may look upon His crucified Son, our saviour, and believe on Him, so that we may be freed from sin and death, and live forever. *'And **this is the will of him that sent me**, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.'* - (Jhn 6:40) It pleased God to sacrifice His Son for us for the sake of our salvation. *'Yet **it pleased the LORD to bruise him**; he hath put him to grief: **when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin**, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand. **He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied**: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.'* - (Isa 53:10-11)

Jesus Christ giving Himself as an offering and sacrifice to God for us was a sweet-smelling savour for God His Father. *‘Be ye therefore followers of God, as dear children; And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an **offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savour.**’* - (Eph 5:1-2)

This wasn't because God had pleasure in seeing the anguish and suffering of His Son, rather, it is because this offering had restored the broken relationship between God and man. Because of this offering, the separation between God and His creation (man) could be bridged, which is what God desired, hence Christ is that bridge between us and God, He's the one mediator (See 1 Tim 2:5), and this has pleased the Father.

*‘The mystery of the cross explains all other mysteries. In the light that streams from Calvary the attributes of God which had filled us with fear and awe appear beautiful and attractive. Mercy, tenderness, and parental love are seen to blend with holiness, justice, and power. While we behold the majesty of **His** throne, high and lifted up, we see **His** character in its gracious manifestations, and comprehend, as never before, the significance of that endearing title, “Our Father.” **It will be seen that He who is infinite in wisdom could devise no plan for our salvation except the sacrifice of His Son. The compensation for this sacrifice is the joy of peopling the earth with ransomed beings, holy, happy, and immortal.** The result of the Saviour's conflict with the powers of darkness is joy to the redeemed, redounding to the glory of God throughout eternity. **And such is the value of the soul that the Father is satisfied with the price paid;** and Christ Himself, beholding the fruits of His great sacrifice, is satisfied.’* - {GC 652.1-2}

Most parents would understand the difficulty of such a decision. Most parents would not be willing to lose their child for the sake of saving many people, yet the Almighty God of heaven was willing to lose His only Son for the sake of humanity who are in rebellion against Him. This is great love beyond human understanding. Men are just simply creatures, yet God would sacrifice His Son for a mere polluted creation. Pastor David Asscherick and his trinitarian understanding completely obscures this truth and reality of God's love. This was a major tough decision for God to make, and this difficult decision of God's is not acknowledged by those who agree with Asschericks view. Remember, an angel of heaven revealed to Sister White that this decision was extremely difficult for God to make. *‘Said the angel, “Think ye that the Father yielded up His dearly beloved Son without a struggle? No, no.” **It was even a struggle with the God of heaven, whether to let guilty man perish, or to give His darling Son to die for them**’* {EW 127.1} This is why we've seen Ellen White say that *‘the thought that God's eye is watching over us, that he loves us, and **cared so much for us as to give his dearly beloved Son** to redeem us, that we might not miserably perish, **is a great one;**’* - {CE 188.3} And according to Ellen White, God giving His Son shows how much He loves us. *‘**In giving His Son, He gave all heaven, not because of any goodness or righteousness that we possess, but because He loved us.**’* - {18MR 337.3}

‘After the transgression of Adam in Eden it was Christ whom God gave to us, not that we might be saved in our sins, but that we might be saved from our sins, that we should return to our loyalty to God and become obedient children... **It is true that God gave His only-begotten Son to die for us**, to suffer the penalty of the [broken] law of God. **We are to consider this and dwell upon it.** And when our minds are constantly dwelling upon the matchless love of God to the fallen race, we begin to know God, to become acquainted with Him, to have a knowledge of God, and of how Jesus Christ, when He came to our world, laid aside His royal robes and His kingly crown and clothed His divinity with humanity. For our sakes He became poor that we through His poverty might be made rich. **The Father sent His Son here**, and right here on this little atom of a world were enacted the grandest scenes that were ever known to humanity... Satan's power was exercised in such a masterly manner that they would not acknowledge God. Satan wanted that the children of men should get such an idea of his wonderful work that they would talk of his masterly power. **In doing this he was all the time placing God in a false light. He was presenting Him as a God of injustice, and not a God of mercy.** He was constantly stirring up their minds so that they would have an incorrect view of God. How was God to be rightly represented to the world? **How was it to be known that He was a God of love, full of mercy, kindness, and pity? How was the world to know this? God sent His Son**, and He was to represent to the world the character of God.’ - {1888 74.3 - 75.3}

Could it be any plainer that God actually sent His Son and this is not a figure of speech? Ellen White states that ‘**It is true** that God gave His only-begotten Son to die for us’ and Pastor Assecherick says that this is not true. David Asscherick has clearly placed ‘*God in a false light,*’ and presented ‘*Him as a God of injustice, and not a God of mercy,*’ for he has clearly ridiculed the idea of God giving someone else, and branded such a concept as unjust, yet this is what our God did do, ‘*the Father sent His Son here,*’ and it is by this that the world is to know ‘*that He was a God of love, full of mercy, kindness, and pity.*’

This is what the Bible and spirit of prophecy reveal the good news of the Gospel is, yet we've seen from David Asscherick that the consistent trinitarian just can't accept these biblical truths, they can't take it literally that God sent His Son because they believe that Jesus is the the One God Himself in some mysterious way. Therefore, we have well known pastors in the Seventh-day Adventist Church who can boldly proclaim that God didn't really send His Son, that this wouldn't be good news, and that this would be child sacrifice, and no one in the congregation nor the body at large bats an eyelid. This is a bear faced contradiction of foundational truth, the very core of the Gospel. This is how far the belief in the trinity can take you. This highlights that the Trinitarian may profess with their lips that “Jesus is the Son of God” because the Bible clearly says so, however, once you scratch beneath the surface, it is apparent that they don't truly believe this, nor can they believe this because the notion of a trinity god clashes with the reality of God truly having a Son. Jesus can only be a metaphorical Son for the trinitarian, or one who has taken the role of Son in the three in one Godhead. Such is a satanic deception, and this has crept into the SDA Church.

We've already seen that Ellen White said the mark of a spiritualistic teacher is to deny that Christ is the Son of God. Satan sends his agents to destroy our faith in Christ being the Son of God.

*‘The teachers of spiritualism come in a pleasing, bewitching manner to deceive you, and **if you listen to their fables you are beguiled by the enemy of righteousness** and will surely lose your reward. When once the fascinating influence of the archdeceiver overcomes you, you are poisoned, and its deadly influence adulterates and **destroys your faith in Christ's being the Son of God**, and you **cease to rely on the merits of His blood**.’ - {1T 297.2}*

Jesus knew beforehand that only few would truly receive Him as being God's Son. *‘Jesus told them (angels) that He would stand between the wrath of His Father and guilty man, that He would bear iniquity and scorn, and **but few would receive Him as the Son of God**. Nearly all would hate and reject Him.’ - {EW 149.3}*

Is it no wonder that the whore of Babylon and all her daughters deny the literal Sonship of Christ? The fallen churches have all been plagued by the fables of Satan. Those who truly believe that Christ is the literal Son of God are branded as the heretics in the Christian world. And this cause of Satan's rebellion in heaven has found its way into the Adventist Church. Wolves came into the remnant to destroy our faith in Christ being the Son of God.

Notice what SDA theologian, Ángel Manuel Rodríguez who was once director of the Biblical Research Institute, which is the theological consultant to the General Conference said. He stated in 2015:

*‘Christ is the eternal Son of God... We are dealing with a **metaphorical use of the word “son.”** Metaphorical significance:...**the father-son image cannot be literally applied to the divine Father-Son relationship within the Godhead. The Son is not the natural, literal Son of the Father.** A natural child has a beginning, while within the Godhead the Son is eternal. **The term “Son” is used metaphorically when applied to the Godhead.**’<sup>29</sup> - (Ángel Manuel Rodríguez , Bible Institute (BRI) General Conference of Seventh-day Adventist 2015)*

If Jesus' Sonship is a metaphor, then it's not real, and He's not truly the Son of God. Remember, *‘Angels were expelled from heaven because they would not work in harmony with God. They fell from their high estate because they wanted to be exalted. They had come to exalt themselves, and they forgot that their beauty of person and of character came from the Lord Jesus. **This fact the angels would obscure, that Christ was the only begotten Son of God**, and they came to consider that they were not to consult Christ. **One angel began the controversy and carried it on until there was rebellion in the heavenly courts among the angels.**’ - {25LtMs. Lt 42, 1910, par. 3}*

According to Sister White, Christ's Sonship to the Father is not a metaphor but was fact, and it was fact when Lucifer and his angels were rebelling in heaven. One of the issues in Lucifer's rebellion is that they wanted to obscure the fact of Christ's Sonship; that He was truly the only begotten Son of God. When you take a fact and claim it's a metaphor, you're obscuring it, therefore, to claim Jesus' Sonship to the Father is only a metaphor is to obscure the reality, and Satan was behind this from his rebellion in heaven. The fact that the General Conference Churches have duped many into believing that Christ is not the literal Son of God is a sad affair.

Ellen White says that, ‘When I read in the Bible of how many **refused to believe that Christ was the Son of God, sadness fills my heart.** We read that **even His own brethren refused to believe in Him.**’ - {21LtMs, Lt 398, 1906, par 2}

‘The prediction given in Eden refers in a special manner to Christ, **and to all who accept and confess Him as the only begotten Son of God.** Christ has pledged Himself to engage in the conflict with the prince and power of darkness and bruise the serpent's head, and all who are the sons of God are His chosen ones, His soldiers, to war against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. It is an unwearied conflict of which there is to be no end, until **Christ shall come the second time without sin unto salvation to destroy him who has destroyed so many souls through his masterly deceiving power.** “And as soon as it was day, the elders of the people and the chief priests and the scribes came together, and led Him into their council, saying, Art thou the Christ? tell us. And He said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not believe: And if I also ask you, ye will not answer Me, nor let Me go. Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God. Then said they all, **Art Thou then the Son of God? And He said unto them, Ye say that I am.** And they said, What need we any further witness? for we ourselves have heard of His own mouth” [Luke 22:66-71].’ - {19MS 169.2-170.1}

Ellen White believed that Christ is truly the Son of God, and this is no metaphor.

‘The Bible to me is the voice of God. I have the witness in myself that **the word of God is true,** and that **Jesus Christ is the divine Son of God. I am following no cunningly devised fable.**” - {ST September 3, 1894, par.4}

Any teaching that claims Christ's Sonship isn't literal stems from the spirit of Satan.

Overall, this chapter has shown that Ellen White was in full agreement with the rest of the pioneers, that Christ is truly the only-begotten Son of God. Ellen White believed this was a fact and not a metaphor, for nowhere in Scripture does it even hint that Christ meant this as a metaphor. Jesus Christ being the only-begotten Son of God is the sole evidence of His equality with the Father, and is why He also receives worship and adoration. Satan hates this fact, and the war has continued through to our time. This is a dividing line. We must decide whether we'll stand with the words of Jesus Christ, His apostles, and the true remnant who Christ raised up, or stand with Satan, Rome, and her daughters. Either we believe Christ's Sonship is real or not. The true Seventh-day Adventist remnant will stand upon the truth that the Lord Jesus Christ is truly the Son of the living God. This is the affirmation that the true Church is built upon. ‘He (**Jesus**) saith unto them, *But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, **the Son of the living God.** And Jesus answered and said unto him... upon this rock **I will build my church;** and the **gates of hell shall not prevail against it.**’ - (Matt 16:15-18)*

## Chapter 4: Who is The Holy Spirit?

We've now discovered that according to the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy, there are two Divine Beings, God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ. We also see from Scripture that there's a Holy Spirit. Now we saw that Paul warned the Church about receiving a different Jesus to the one revealed in the Bible. In that same verse, Paul also warns us about receiving a different spirit. *'But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if **ye receive another spirit**, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him.'* - (2 Cor 11:3-4) Therefore, we must again take heed to this warning and investigate who the Holy Spirit is according to the Holy Bible.

Firstly, the word 'spirit' in the Old Testament is translated from the Hebrew word **'rûah'**<sup>Strong's H7307</sup>. This word can also be translated to say 'breath.' For example, in Genesis 1 we see this word **'rûah'** used. *'And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the **Spirit (rûah)** of God moved upon the face of the waters.'* - (Gen 1:2)

We see this exact same word being used when describing creation in Psalms, and the word is translated to 'breath.' *'By the word of the LORD were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the **breath (rûah)** of his mouth... For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast.'* - (Ps 33:6, 9) So we see that 'spirit' from the Hebrew **'rûah'** can mean breath. So this is God's breath, and is a marker of His spoken Word and creative power, hence, God just speaks, and it is (Ps 33:9). This is why Gen 1:2 says spirit (rûah) of God, as it is a possessive form. So this verse is saying that the breath (rûah) of God moved or hovered upon the face of the waters. This is why we see Job equate the Spirit (rûah) of God with the breath of God. *'The spirit of God hath made me, and **the breath** of the Almighty hath given me life.'* - (Job 33:4) This is why David said that God's Word was in his tongue when the Spirit of God spoke through him. *'Now these be the last words of David. David the son of Jesse said... **The Spirit of the LORD spake by me**, and **his word was in my tongue.**'* - (2 Sam 23:1-2) We also see from Scripture that the Spirit of God is His personal presence. *'Cast me not away from **thy presence**; and **take not thy holy spirit from me.**'* - (Ps 51:11)

*'Whither shall I go **from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?** If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;'* - (Ps 139:7-9)

We also see that the Spirit of God is the mind of God. *'Who hath directed the Spirit of the LORD, or **being his counsellor** hath taught him?'* - (Isa 40:13)



*'For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or **who hath been his counsellor?**' - (Rom 11:34)*

We see here in Romans 11:34 that Paul quotes Isaiah 40:13, but he changes the word 'spirit' to 'mind'. This is because the word '**rûah**' can also be translated to 'mind'. *'And the **Spirit (rûah)** of the LORD fell upon me, and said unto me, Speak; Thus saith the LORD; Thus have ye said, O house of Israel: for I know the things that come into your **mind (rûah)**, every one of them' - (Ezek 11:5).* We see in this passage that the Hebrew word '**rûah**' is translated to 'spirit' in one place and 'mind' in another. This is because the spirit of an individual is not an independent entity but it is the very mind of that individual. For example, in the book of Exodus it says:

*'...And Pharaoh awoke, and, behold, it was a dream. And it came to pass in the morning that **his spirit (rûah) was troubled**; and he sent and called for all the magicians of Egypt, and all the wise men thereof: and Pharaoh told them his dream; but there was none that could interpret them unto Pharaoh.'* - (Ex 41:7-8) We understand from this text that Pharaoh being troubled in his spirit meant that he himself was troubled, not somebody else other than him.

We see this same thing apply in the Book of Daniel when it says:

*'And in the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams, wherewith **his spirit (rûah) was troubled**, and his sleep brake from him. Then the king commanded to call the magicians, and the astrologers, and the sorcerers, and the Chaldeans, for to shew the king his dreams. So they came and stood before the king. And the king said unto them, I have dreamed a dream, and **my spirit (rûah) was troubled** to know the dream.'* - (Dan 2:1-3) Again, we understand from this text that King Nebuchadnezzar being troubled in his spirit meant that he himself was troubled, not somebody else other than him.

We see this same thing apply with Daniel. *'I Daniel was **grieved in my spirit (rûah)** in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me.'* - (Dan 7:15)

This is what the spirit of someone is, it's their own spirit. For instance, in Genesis it says concerning Jacob: *'And they told him all the words of Joseph, which he had said unto them: and when he saw the wagons which Joseph had sent to carry him, **the spirit of Jacob** their father revived.'* - (Gen 45:27) 'The spirit of Jacob' revived when he discovered that his son Joseph was still alive. The 'spirit of' denotes a possessive form, thus we understand from this verse that Jacob himself was revived when he heard the great news, not some other separate entity apart from Jacob, it was his very own spirit which was revived, hence, Moses called it '**the spirit of Jacob**'.

This is why Paul liken's man's spirit to God's in that only a man's spirit can know his own thoughts, likewise, only God's Spirit can know His. *'But God hath revealed them unto us by **his Spirit**: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, **save the spirit of man which is in him? even so** the things of God knoweth no man, **but the Spirit of God.**' - (1 Cor 2:10-11)* Paul clearly makes a parallel between the relationship that is found between a man and his spirit and the

relationship that is found between God and His Spirit. Therefore, we find that the Spirit of God is the breath, presence, mind, and power of God.

This is why this breath (**rûah**) of God has power to destroy. *'By the blast of God they perish, and by the **breath (rûah)** of his nostrils are they consumed.'* - (Job 4:9)

It was prophesied that God would anoint Jesus Christ with His own Spirit. *'**The Spirit of the LORD GOD is upon me; because the LORD hath anointed me** to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound;'* - (Isa 61:1)

*'And **the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him**, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD;'* - (Isa 11:2)

*'Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put **my spirit upon him**: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.'* - (Isa 42:1)

John the Baptist exclaimed that God gave His Spirit to Christ without measure.

*'He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all. And what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth; and no man receiveth his testimony. He that hath received his testimony hath set to his seal that God is true. For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: **for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him.**'* - (Jhn 3:31-34)

We see this fulfilled at Jesus' baptism. *'And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw **the Spirit of God descending like a dove**, and **lighting upon him**.'* - (Matt 3:16)

This was the very presence of the Father ministering to His Son, not somebody else. Ellen White says in regards to the baptism:

*'Never had angels listened to such a prayer. They were solicitous to bear to the praying Redeemer messages of assurance and love. But no; the **Father himself will minister to his Son. Direct from the throne proceeded the light of the glory of God.** The heavens were opened, and beams of light and glory proceeded therefrom and **assumed the form of a dove**, in appearance like burnished gold. The **dove-like form was emblematical of the meekness and gentleness of Christ.**'* - {YI March 1, 1874, par.4}

So Ellen White tells us that the 'dove-like form' was an emblem. The Father Himself was the one who came and ministered to His Son, not someone other than the Father. Notice what Jesus says. *'And the **Father himself**, which hath sent me, **hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape.**'* - (Jhn 5:37) Jesus here is referring to an event where the Father spoke with a voice and there was a shape. Jesus is clearly speaking about the event of His baptism. Jesus pinpoints that the one

responsible for the voice and the shape was God the Father. So the voice was God the Father's and the shape was from God the Father, as it was the Spirit of God.

Moreover, the Holy Spirit which proceeds from the Father is shared by Jesus Christ and thus, we can receive the presence of Jesus Christ Himself through this same Spirit. This is shown in John chapter 14 when Jesus promised to send the Holy Spirit. In this chapter we can see exactly who/what the Holy Spirit is.

*'And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you **another Comforter**, that he may abide with you for ever; Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: **but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.**'* - (Jhn 14:16-17)

Jesus proclaimed that the world cannot receive the Spirit of truth because they don't know Him, but the disciples know Him. So the Holy Spirit would be someone that the disciples already knew. Jesus said that this person dwells with them. He then declares that He Himself will come to them. *'I will not leave you comfortless: **I will come to you.**'* - (Jhn 14:18)

The comforter is somebody they already knew and had spent time with. He is called the comforter and Spirit of truth. The only one that was always a comforter for the disciples, always truthful to the disciples, who the disciples had already known personally, and dwelt with the disciples was Jesus Christ (v17). This is why Ellen White said that *'**Jesus comes to you as the Spirit of truth; study the mind of the Spirit, consult your Lord, follow His way.**'* - {2MR 337.1} Ellen White also further affirms that Christ was speaking about Himself in John 14:17 when she says,

*'The honored men of the world, the so-called great and wise men, with all their boasted wisdom, could not comprehend the character of Christ. They judged Him from outward appearance, from the humiliation that came upon Him as a human being. But to fishermen and publicans it had been given to see the Invisible... Jesus rejoiced that though this knowledge was not possessed by the wise and prudent, it had been revealed to these humble men. Often as He had presented the Old Testament Scriptures, and showed their application to Himself and His work of atonement, they had been awakened by **His Spirit**, and lifted into a heavenly atmosphere. Of the spiritual truths spoken by the prophets they had a clearer understanding than had the original writers themselves. Hereafter they would read the Old Testament Scriptures, not as the doctrines of the scribes and Pharisees, not as the utterances of wise men who were dead, but as a new revelation from God. **They beheld Him "whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you."** John 14:17' - {DA 494.3}*

So we see here that Sister White is speaking about Christ, and in John 14:17, it is speaking about the *'the Spirit of truth.'* She quotes John 14:17 to apply it to Christ. Therefore, this implies that the Spirit of truth is in reference to Jesus Christ, and that's according to Ellen White.

Many get caught up with the word 'Another', but 'Another' doesn't always mean somebody else. For example, the prophet Samuel said to Saul, *'And the Spirit of the LORD will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into **another man**'*. - (1

Sam 10:6) Jesus was coming back to the disciples in another form. He was leaving them physically, but was to come back to dwell in them in the form of a Spirit. Hence, He says, **'I will come to you'** (v18) and **'shall be in you'** (v17).

This is why Jesus said He would manifest Himself to those who love Him. *'He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and **will manifest myself to him.**'* - (Jhn 14:21) The disciples understood exactly what Jesus meant. They didn't understand how Jesus would manifest Himself to the brethren but they knew He was going to do it. *'Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot, Lord, **how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?**'* - (Jhn 14:22) Clearly in the full context of this chapter, we can see that the Comforter is the presence of Jesus Christ Himself. The same author of this Gospel (John) confirms that the Comforter is Jesus Christ. The Greek word for 'Comforter' is **'paraklētos'**<sup>Strong's G3875</sup>. This Greek word can also be translated as intercessor or advocate. John uses this same Greek word again in his first epistle. *'My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an **advocate (paraklētos)** with the Father, **Jesus Christ the righteous:**'* - (1 Jhn 2:1)

So John tells us that this **'paraklētos'** is *'Jesus Christ the righteous.'* Ellen White says **'Christ is our Advocate, pleading in our behalf. The Spirit pleads within us.'** - {9LtMs, Ms 41, 1894, par.42}

This is why in John 14, Christ told His disciples: *'I will come to you'* (v18), *'I in you'* (v20), and *'I will love Him and manifest myself to Him'* (v22). The Comforter is the presence of Jesus Christ and He is able to be present with His Church whilst He is up in heaven through His Spirit. This enables Christ to be omnipresent.

*'It is not essential for you to know and be able to define just what the Holy Spirit is. Christ tells us that the Holy Spirit is the Comforter, and the Comforter is the Holy Ghost, "the Spirit of truth, which the Father shall send in My name." "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him, for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you" [John 14:16, 17]. **This refers to the omnipresence of the Spirit of Christ, called the Comforter.** Again Jesus says, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth" [John 16:12, 13].'* - {14 MR 179.1}

Ellen White makes it plain that our Saviour Jesus Christ is our Comforter.

*'When danger approaches, shall we seek for help from those as weak as ourselves, or shall we flee to Him who is mighty to save. His arms are open wide, and He utters the gracious invitation, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." [Matthew 11:28.] **The Saviour is our Comforter. This I have proved Him to be.**'* - {7LtMs, Ms 20, 1892, par. 5-6}

*'I urge our people to... go to God in earnest prayer... Let them link up with one another and with Christ. Let them study the seventeenth of John, and learn how to pray and how to live the prayer of Christ. **He is the Comforter. He will abide in their hearts,** making their joy full.'* - {RH January 27, 1903, Art, A, par, 13}

*'How essential that we have the enlightenment of the Spirit of God; for thus only can we see the glory of Christ, and by beholding become changed from character to character in and through faith in Christ. We turn from the picture of our shortcomings to behold the atonement made for us, and we rejoice as we know that we may be clothed with Christ's righteousness. In Him all fulness dwells. He has grace and pardon for every soul. As by faith we look to Jesus, our faith pierces the shadow, and we adore God for His wondrous love in **giving Jesus the Comforter.**'* - {19MR 297.3}

People think that the Comforter is someone other than Christ because Jesus spoke in the third person. But Jesus referred to Himself in third person many times, even in His prayer to the Father.

*'These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee: As thou hast **given him** power over all flesh, that **he** should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given **him.**'* - (Jhn 17:1-2)

Here Jesus refers to Himself as 'Him & 'He.' Christ often switched from first to third person when He spoke about Himself. For example, when speaking about His Second Coming, He said: *'Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when **he** cometh in the glory of **his** Father with the holy angels.'* - (Mark 8:38)

Yet, we don't then conclude from this verse that the Son of Man here is referring to someone else other than Christ Jesus. Ellen White mentions that Christ could appear to be speaking about someone else when speaking about Himself.

*'Thus Christ discoursed to His disciples... But little did they yet suspect who their traveling companion was. They did not think that the subject of their conversation was walking by their side; for **Christ referred to Himself as though He were another person.**'* - {DA 800.1}

As I mentioned, we see from Scripture that Jesus received the Holy Spirit from God the Father. *'This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having **received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost,** he hath **shed forth this,** which ye now see and hear.'* - (Acts 2:32-33)

Jesus confirmed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. *'But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you **from the Father,** even the Spirit of truth, **which proceedeth from the Father,** he shall testify of me.'* - (Jhn 15:26).

“Abide in Me, and I in you.” Abiding in Christ means a constant **receiving of His Spirit**, a life of unreserved surrender to His service. The channel of communication must be open continually between man and his God. As the vine branch constantly draws the sap from the living vine, so are we to cling to Jesus, and receive from Him by faith the strength and perfection of His own character. **The root sends its nourishment through the branch to the outermost twig. So Christ communicates the current of spiritual strength to every believer.** So long as the soul is united to Christ, there is no danger that it will wither or decay. The life of the vine will be manifest in fragrant fruit on the branches. “He that abideth in Me,” said Jesus, “and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without Me ye can do nothing.” When we live by faith on the Son of God, the fruits of the Spirit will be seen in our lives; not one will be missing... With the golden chain of His matchless love Christ has bound them to the throne of God. It is His purpose that the **highest influence in the universe, emanating from the source of all power**, shall be theirs.’ - {DA 676.2 - 676.4, 679.3}

Ellen White refers to the Holy Spirit as an influence, even ‘*the highest influence in the universe*,’ and it emanates (issues/flows) ‘*from the source of all power*,’ the Father.

Jesus is the one with the Holy Spirit which He has received from God the Father, hence, it is the Spirit of God and Spirit of Christ. And so the Holy Spirit is the presence, power, and life of Christ, which He received from His Father, ‘*the source of all power*.’

‘Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: **as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.** And when he had said this, **he breathed on them**, and saith unto them, **Receive ye the Holy Ghost:**’ - (Jhn 20:21-22)

Ellen White confirms that the Holy Spirit is the breath and life of Christ when she says,

‘The outpouring of the Spirit in apostolic days was the “former rain,” and glorious was the result. But the “latter rain” will be more abundant. Joel 2:23. All who consecrate soul, body, and spirit to God will be constantly receiving a new endowment of physical and mental power. The inexhaustible supplies of heaven are at their command. **Christ gives them the breath of His own spirit, the life of His own life.** The Holy Spirit puts forth **its highest energies to work in heart and mind.**’ - {DA 827.2-3}

Moreover, Paul tells us that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ. ‘And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth **the Spirit of his Son** into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.’ - (Gal 4:6)

‘For I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the **Spirit of Jesus Christ**,’ - (Phili 1:19)

Paul plainly states that the Lord (Jesus Christ) is that Spirit. ‘Now **the Lord is that Spirit**: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, **there is liberty.**’ - (2 Cor 3:17) The Lord Jesus Christ ‘is that Spirit’. So by having that Spirit, we have the very presence of Christ Himself, hence, where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty, for it’s the Son Jesus Christ who sets us free. ‘If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.’ - (Jhn 8:36)

Ellen White being in full harmony with Paul also plainly states that the Holy Spirit is Jesus Christ.

*'The Lord is soon to come. We want that complete and perfect understanding which the Lord alone can give. It is not safe to catch the spirit from another. **We want the Holy Spirit, which is Jesus Christ**' - {9LtMs, Lt 66, 1894, par. 18}*

Like Paul, Ellen White warns of receiving a different spirit, the Spirit we want is Jesus Christ Himself.

Furthermore, in the book of Revelation, John is given a vision..

*'And I saw in the right hand of him that sat on the throne a book written within and on the backside, sealed with seven seals. And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof? And no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon. And I wept much, because no man was found worthy to open and to read the book, neither to look thereon. And one of the elders saith unto me, Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof. And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, **which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth.** And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne.'* - (Rev 5:1-7)

John only sees Two Divine Beings, God the Father on the throne and the Lamb (Jesus Christ) in the midst of the throne (v6). Here Jesus has the Holy Spirit. John sees the Holy Spirit as being a part of Jesus Christ Himself (v6). Jesus is represented as a Lamb having seven horns and seven eyes which are the seven Spirits of God. This is the Holy Spirit and is part of Christ's own being. Now notice in Revelation chapter 1 it says:

*'And I turned to see the voice that spake with me. And being turned, I saw seven golden candlesticks; **And in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man**, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle... And he **had in his right hand seven stars**:... ' - (Rev 1:12-13, 16)*

Jesus Christ is the one walking in the midst of the candlesticks with the seven stars in His right hand and speaking to the churches.

*'Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus write; **These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks**;... Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent... He that hath an ear, **let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches**; To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.'* - (Rev 2:1, 5, 7)

Jesus Christ is the Spirit speaking to the churches. *‘He that hath an ear, **let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches...** - (Rev 2:7) Thus, Christ fulfills His promise to the church, *‘I will not leave you comfortless: **I will come to you.**’ - (Jhn 14:18) ‘...and, lo, **I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.** Amen. - (Matt 28:20)**

John confirms again that the seven spirits are part of Christ. *‘And unto the angel of the church in Sardis write; **These things saith he that hath the seven Spirits of God, and the seven stars; I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead.**’ - (Rev 3:1) We know that Jesus is the Spirit that speaks to the churches. *‘He that hath an ear, let him hear what **the Spirit saith unto the churches.**’ - (Rev 3:13) Jesus Himself confirmed that He’d be among His church, *‘For where two or three are gathered together in my name, **there am I in the midst of them.**’ - (Matt 18:20)***

Jesus tells us that it is God the Father that dwells in Him through the Father’s own Spirit, and Christ dwells in us Himself through that same Spirit. *‘And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you. Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also. At that day ye shall know that **I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.**’ - (Jhn 14:16-20) We’ve seen that Christ told His disciples that He would pray the Father to send the Comforter (Jhn 14:16). Many aren’t aware that Jesus did this exact thing in John 17 when He prayed to His Father. We can see exactly what Jesus meant by this from the words of His prayer.*

*‘That they all may be one; as thou, **Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us:** that the world may believe that thou hast sent me... **I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one;** and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.’ - (Jhn 17:21, 23)*

Jesus prayed to His Father for the Church to be one in Him and God. How is this union achieved? Christ says as the Father is in Him, and He in the Father, that *‘that they also may be one in us.’ **‘I in them’, and thou in me.*** We become one in the Father & Son as Christ dwells in us, and the Father dwells in Christ. This is beautiful. This is exactly what Christ said in John 14, which we’ve already discussed. Christ said to the disciples that the Spirit of truth *‘shall be in you.’* (Jhn 14:17) He then told them in the verse directly after that *‘I will come to you.’* (Jhn 14:18), and then Christ says to them exactly what He said to His Father in His prayer. Christ told them how they’ll all be one. *‘At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.’ - (Jhn 14:20)* When we put all these verses into their full context and analyse it through Christ’s prayer in John 17, we can clearly see this beautiful image that is presented between Christ and His bride, and how this deep intimate union takes place between the Father, Son, and Church. There is one Divine Spirit which proceeds from the Father through His Son to us all, and this is what unites us, thus, by having Christ dwell in us through His Spirit, we have the Father dwell in us also, hence, the Father is in all of us believers through that one Spirit. *‘There is one body, and **one Spirit,** even as ye are*



called in one hope of your calling; One Lord, one faith, one baptism, One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and **in you all.**' - (Eph 4:4-6)

This is the beautiful truth that Satan wants the church to be ignorant of. The Holy Spirit is not some third being completely independent from the Father & Son that we don't know. The Holy Spirit is the presence of Jesus Christ Himself.

*'Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: **but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.** I will not leave you comfortless: **I will come to you...** At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and **I in you.** He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and **will manifest myself to him...** Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and **we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.**' - (Jhn 14:17-18, 20-21, 23)*

It is important to understand that it is Christ who dwells in our hearts, not somebody else, *'that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might **by his Spirit** in the inner man; **That Christ may dwell in your hearts** by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love,' - (Eph 3:16-17)*

Again, Paul confirmed that it was Christ Himself who lived in Him, therefore, it is Christ Himself who lives in us, not someone else. *'I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but **Christ liveth in me:** and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.'* - (Gal 2:20)

It is Christ's Spirit that gives us life, for Jesus Christ Himself is the life. *'And **if Christ be in you,** the body is dead because of sin; but **the Spirit is life** because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by **his Spirit that dwelleth in you.**' - (Rom 8:10-11)* This is why the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of truth (Jhn 14:17) and is called life. Jesus Christ Himself is the truth and the life. *'Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, **the truth,** and **the life:** no man cometh unto the Father, **but by me.**' - (Jhn 14:6)*

Thus, we receive the truth and this life by Christ's very own Spirit. This is the mystery that Paul speaks of which had been hidden in times past and is now manifested. This mystery is Christ in us. This is the hope of glory. *'Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints: To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; **which is Christ in you, the hope of glory:**' - (Col 1:26-27)*

This is the beautiful truth and hope that Scripture reveals. We can have our Lord Jesus Christ dwell in us and live through us. We truly partake of His life when He abides in us by His very own Spirit. This is what every believer should want and hope for. *'**We want the Holy Spirit, which is Jesus Christ**' - {9Lts, Lt 66, 1894, par 18}*

Satan wants us to perceive the Holy Spirit as some ambiguous being who we don't really know, and doesn't even have a name like the Father & Son. Satan doesn't want us to know that the Holy Spirit is in fact the very presence of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Jesus Christ conquered sin in the flesh, and experienced everything we experience as human beings, thus, we have Him to come live in us and help us. Yes, we know that the Holy Spirit can be lied to. *'But a certain man named Ananias, with Sapphira his wife, sold a possession, And kept back part of the price, his wife also being privy to it, and brought a certain part, and laid it at the apostles' feet. But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart **to lie to the Holy Ghost**, and to keep back part of the price of the land? Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? **thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.**'* - (Acts 5:1-4)

We also know that the Holy Spirit speaks and instructs us. *'**Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot.**'* - (Acts 8:29)

This is because it is God's own Divine Spirit which He shares with His Son Jesus, and is imparted to us. *'And I will put **my spirit within you**, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.'* - (Ezek 36:27)

Therefore, if we lie to the Holy Spirit, we are of course lying to God Himself because it is His own Spirit. And as has been shown already through Scripture, the Spirit which speaks to us, comforts us, and lives in us is Christ Himself. Remember, we have been warned about receiving a different spirit. *'**It is not safe to catch the spirit from another. We want the Holy Spirit, which is Jesus Christ**'* - {9Lts, Lt 66, 1894, par 18.} As shown already, this mirrors Paul's warning (2 Cor 11:3-4). It is Christ Himself that was made a life giving Spirit. *'And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam (Jesus) was **made a quickening spirit.**'* - (1 Cor 15:45)

So we see that the Spirit Paul preached is the Spirit of God. *'Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the **Spirit of God dwelleth in you?**'* - (1 Cor 3:16) And this Spirit is the Lord Jesus Christ (2 Cor 3:17), for He is the one Lord (Eph 4:5, 1 Cor 8:6). We've seen that Paul preached that Jesus was made a life giving Spirit (1 Cor 15:45). We've seen that Paul told us that *'God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son'* (Gal 4:6) into our hearts. It doesn't make sense to conclude that the very Spirit of God's Son is someone else entirely. For example, in the Gospel of Mark it says, *'And immediately when Jesus **perceived in his spirit** that they so reasoned within themselves, he said unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts?'* - (Mark 2:8) We understand here that when it says Jesus perceived in His Spirit, it was Jesus who perceived, not somebody else. This is why receiving the Holy Spirit is receiving the very life of Christ, because it is His life. This is why when Jesus died, He commended His Spirit (His life). *'And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands **I commend my spirit**: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost.'* - (Luke 23:46)

Jesus commended His spirit to the One He received it from, the Source of life.

This is why when Jesus resurrected the dead girl, it tells us that her spirit returned to her. *‘And he put them all out, and took her by the hand, and called, saying, Maid, arise. And **her spirit came again**, and **she arose straightway**: and he commanded to give her meat.’* - (Luke 8:54-55)

A person's spirit is their very own life, and our only assurance of eternal life is to receive the very life of our Lord Jesus Christ, hence, He gives us His very own Spirit (His life).

Now where Paul warned us of receiving another spirit, he also warned us of receiving another gospel (2 Cor 11:3-4). The gospel that Paul preached is that all nations in Christ are blessed. *‘And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, **In thee shall all nations be blessed.**’* - (Gal 3:8) We are complete in Jesus Christ. *‘And **ye are complete in him**, which is the head of all principality and power:’* - (Col 2:10) We see that it is only in Christ that we are blessed, chosen, and adopted. It is only in Christ that we have redemption and our sins forgiven.

*‘Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, to the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus: Grace be to you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, **who hath blessed us** with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places **in Christ**: According as he hath chosen us **in him** before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: Having predestinated us unto the **adoption of children by Jesus Christ** to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved. In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; -* (Eph 1:1-7)

It is by the righteousness and obedience of one (Jesus Christ) that we receive the free gift of salvation. *‘For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of **the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.**’) Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so **by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all** men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so **by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.**’* - (Rom 5:17-19)

The centre of the Gospel Paul preached and taught all goes back to Jesus Christ. In the Lord Jesus is found everything we need. We are saved by the very life of Jesus Christ. *‘For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved **by his life.**’* - (Rom 5:10) We see from Paul that the very essence and foundation of the Gospel is found in the life of the Son of God. It is Christ Himself who is made unto us righteousness, justification, and sanctification, not somebody else. *‘But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is **made unto us** wisdom, and **righteousness**, and **sanctification**, and **redemption**: That, according as it is written, **He that glorifieth, let him glory in the Lord.**’* - (1 Cor 1:30-31) God enabled us to attain justification through His Son Jesus Christ, and it's Jesus Christ who sanctifies us by living in us, not somebody else. Jesus Christ gets all the glory, and to accredit these roles to anyone else brings dishonour to our Lord Jesus Christ. How can we receive Christ if we don't even

believe that the Spirit in us comes from Christ Himself? Remember, it is Christ in us that is the hope of glory (Col 1:27). When we're joined to the Lord Jesus, we become one life with Him as we become one with His Spirit. *'But he that is joined unto the Lord **is one spirit.**'* - (1 Cor 6:17) It is because Christ lives that we can live too. *'Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: **because I live, ye shall live also.**'* - (Jhn 14:19)

This is because the very life of the Son of God is manifested in our mortal flesh. *'Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that **the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body.** For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the **life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh.**'* - (2 Cor 4:10-11) It is the very life of Christ that is manifested in our bodies, not somebody else's life, which is why we receive the very Spirit of Christ which is His life. This is why we saw that Paul stated it is Christ that lived in Him, not somebody else. *'I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, **but Christ liveth in me:** and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.'* - (Gal 2:20) This is why we see the Bible tell us continuously that Christ is our life, not somebody else other than Christ. *'For ye are dead, and your **life is hid with Christ** in God. When Christ, **who is our life,** shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.'* - (Col 3:3-4) Christ is literally our life. It is Jesus Christ alone who reconciles us back to God our Father. There is no second mediator. This is why it's only by believing in God's Son, Jesus Christ, that we can attain eternal life. This eternal life can only be found in the Son of God. *'And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and **this life is in his Son.** He that **hath the Son hath life;** and he that **hath not the Son of God hath not life.**'* - (1 Jhn 5:11-12)

It is clear from Scripture that the Holy Spirit is the life and power of Jesus Christ Himself. Plus it makes logical sense. It's Jesus Christ that took on the same flesh as us (See Heb 2:11-14). It's Jesus Christ that experienced what we experience, and was tempted like as we are (See Heb 4:15). It's Jesus Christ that conquered sin in the same flesh as us (See Rom 8:3). How can we then conclude that Christ went through all of this just to end up sending someone else that never experienced what it's like to be man to help us? It's Christ Himself that can help us in our battle against our flesh because He gained the victory over sinful flesh. This is why Jesus told us to be of good cheer, because He overcame the world. *'These things I have spoken unto you, that **in me ye might have peace.** In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; **I have overcome the world.**'* - (Jhn 16:33) Therefore, we have great hope and can rejoice because we too can overcome the world through Jesus Christ who gained the victory for us. *'**Who is he that overcometh the world,** but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?'* - (1 Jhn 5:5)

And this is because those who believe that Jesus is the Son of God will have Him inside of them, and there is no greater power to have in us than that of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Hence, John says, *'Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them: because greater is **he that is in you,** than he that is in the world.'* (1 Jhn 4:4)

The Bible plainly teaches that it is Jesus who lived a sinless life and thus, condemned sin in the flesh. *‘For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, **condemned sin in the flesh: That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us**, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.’* - (Rom 8:3-4)

Jesus then imparts that sinless life through His Spirit to us. Therefore, we can partake of that same life of righteousness. *‘But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And **if Christ be in you**, the body is dead because of sin; but the **Spirit is life because of righteousness.**’* - (Rom 8:9-10) Paul tells us that *‘if Christ be in you, the body is dead.’* We die to ourselves and have the very life of Christ transfused in us when He Himself dwells in us through His very own Spirit. Ellen White beautifully illustrates this point when she states:

**‘Only the covering which Christ Himself has provided can make us meet to appear in God’s presence... Christ in His humanity wrought out a perfect character, and this character **He offers to impart to us.** “All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags.” Isaiah 64:6. Everything that we of ourselves can do is defiled by sin. But the Son of God “was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin.” Sin is defined to be “the transgression of the law.” 1 John 3:5, 4. But Christ was obedient to every requirement of the law.... **By His perfect obedience He has made it possible for every human being to obey God’s commandments.** When we submit ourselves to Christ, the heart is united with His heart, the will is merged in His will, the mind becomes one with His mind, the thoughts are brought into captivity to Him; **we live His life.** This is what it means to be clothed with the garment of His righteousness... We are not to be anxious about what Christ and God think of us, but about what God thinks of **Christ, our Substitute.** - {FLB 113.2 - 113.6}**

She also said:

*‘For we have not an high priest which can not be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.’* **The Lord will not leave his afflicted, tried children to be the sport of Satan’s temptations.** It is our privilege to trust in Jesus. The heavens are full of rich blessings, and it is our privilege to have the joy of Christ in us that our joy may be full. We have not because we ask not, or because we do not pray in faith, **believing that we shall be blessed with the special influence of the Holy Spirit.** To the true seeker through the mediation of Christ **the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit are imparted in order that the receiver may impart a knowledge of saving truth.** Why do we not believe the plain “Thus saith the Lord”? Do not cease to pray under any circumstances. The spirit may be willing but the flesh may be weak, but Jesus knows all about that. In your weakness you are not to be anxious; for anxiety means doubt and distrust. You are simply to believe that Christ is able to save unto the uttermost all who come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for us. **What does intercession comprehend?—It is the golden chain which binds finite man to the throne of**

**the infinite God.** *The human agent whom Christ has died to save importunes the throne of God, and his petition is taken up by Jesus, who has purchased him with his own blood. Our great High Priest places his righteousness on the side of the sincere suppliant, and the prayer of Christ blends with that of the human petitioner. Christ has urged that his people pray without ceasing. This does not mean that we should always be upon our knees, but that prayer is to be as the breath of the soul. Our silent requests, wherever we may be, are to be ascending unto God, and Jesus, our Advocate, pleads in our behalf, bearing up with the incense of his righteousness our requests to the Father. The Lord Jesus loves his people, and when they put their trust in him, depending wholly upon him, **he strengthens them. He will live through them, giving them the inspiration of his sanctifying Spirit, imparting to the soul a vital transfusion of himself. He acts through their faculties, and causes them to choose his will and to act out his character.** With the apostle Paul they then may say. "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but **Christ liveth in me**; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Christ impresses upon the mind of believers the fact that **they are to have the glory which the Father has given him, in order that all who love and serve him may be one with God.** "For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.... **And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me**, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory [character], which thou hast given me; for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." - {SSW February 1, 1896, par. 2 - 3}*

Ellen White gives great assurance by stating that '*the Lord will not leave his afflicted, tried children to be the sport of Satan's temptations.*' How does the Lord Jesus help His elect? He intercedes on their behalf to the Father, binding '*finite man to the throne of the infinite God*'. And '*He strengthens them*' by living '*through them, giving them the inspiration of his sanctifying Spirit.*' Christ sanctifies His elect by His spirit, which Ellen White says is '*a vital transfusion of himself.*' The Holy Spirit is the mind of Christ and life of Christ, thereby, when believers have the Spirit of Christ dwelling in them, it is Christ Himself who '*acts through their faculties, and causes them to choose his will and to act out his character.*' And they can then echo Paul in saying '*nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.*' Sister White also goes on to state that this glory the believers receive from Christ is '*the glory which the Father has given him.*' Notice Ellen White reiterates what has already been discussed, by linking the prayer of Christ in John 17 to the impartation of His spirit to the believer. This is because Ellen White understood that the union between the Father, Son, and believer is connected by the spirit of Christ, that this is how '*they may be one, even as we are one: I (Christ) in them (believers), and thou (Father) in me.*'

As has already been stated, receiving the Holy Spirit is receiving the very life of Jesus Christ Himself. By Christ giving us His own Spirit, He gives us His very own righteous life. Jesus imparts the breath of His own Spirit. '*And when he had said this, **he breathed on them,***

and saith unto them, **Receive ye the Holy Ghost:**' - (Jhn 20:22)

Ellen White says:

*'The record declares, "He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Jesus is waiting to **breathe upon all his disciples**, and give them the inspiration of **his sanctifying spirit**, and **transfuse the vital influence from himself to his people**. He would have them understand that henceforth they cannot serve two masters. Their lives cannot be divided. **Christ is to live in his human agents**, and **work through their faculties, and act through their capabilities**. Their will must be submitted to his will, they must act with **his spirit**, that it may be no more they that live, but **Christ that liveth in them**. Jesus is seeking to impress upon them the thought that in giving his Holy Spirit he is giving to them the glory **which the Father has given him, that he and his people may be one in God.**' - {ST October 3, 1892, par, 3, 4}*

So again, according to Ellen White, Jesus is waiting to 'breathe upon all his disciples, and give them the inspiration of his sanctifying spirit', which is an 'influence from Himself'. According to Sister White, it is Christ that 'is to live in His human agents'. And when Christ gives the believer His Holy Spirit, He is giving them the glory which He received from His Father.

The trinitarian cannot accept that the Holy Spirit comes from Jesus Christ, they must believe it is someone else. Yet, Scripture tells us that it proceeds from the Father through the Son to us (Jhn 15:26). It is His breath, power, and His very life.

*"And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." The Holy Spirit was not yet fully manifested; for Christ had not yet been glorified. **The more abundant impartation of the Spirit did not take place till after Christ's ascension**. Not until this was received could the disciples fulfill the commission to preach the gospel to the world. But the Spirit was now given for a special purpose. Before the disciples could fulfill their official duties in connection with the church, **Christ breathed His Spirit upon them**. He was committing to them a most sacred trust, and He desired to impress them with the fact that without the Holy Spirit this work could not be accomplished. **The Holy Spirit is the breath of spiritual life** in the soul. The impartation of the Spirit is the **impartation of the life of Christ. It imbues the receiver with the attributes of Christ**. Only those who are thus taught of God, those who possess the inward working of the Spirit, and in whose life the **Christ-life is manifested**, are to stand as representative men, to minister in behalf of the church. - {DA 805. 2, 3}*

*'Christ took human nature that men might be one with him as he is one with the Father, that God may love man as he loves his only begotten Son, that men may be partakers of the divine nature, and be complete in him. **The Holy Spirit, which proceeds from the only begotten Son of God**, binds the human agent, body, soul, and spirit, to the perfect, divine-human nature of Christ. This union is represented by the union of the vine and the branches. **Finite man is united to the manhood of Christ**. Through faith human*

*nature is assimilated with Christ's nature. **We are made one with God in Christ.**' - {RH April 5, 1906, par, 15, 16}*

Notice the continuous theme in all this; we are made one with God in Christ, we are connected to God in Christ, our fellowship is with God and Christ. There are just two Divine beings that we are connected with. We have been separated from God the Father, and Christ His Son is the one connection we have to the Father, there is nobody else there.

The 'Holy Spirit' isn't a name, it's a description of what it is and who it belongs to. It is God's Spirit, hence, it is a 'Holy Spirit' because God is Holy. This is why nowhere in the Bible does it say 'God the Holy Spirit.' This term is unscriptural. Instead, you'll find over and over again the Bible uses the terms, 'the Spirit of God', 'God's Spirit' or 'Spirit of Christ.' It is Christ's Spirit that inspired the Bible writers. *'Of which salvation the prophets have enquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: Searching what, or what manner of time **the Spirit of Christ which was in them** did signify, when **it** testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.'* - (1 Pet 1:10-11) Ellen White being in harmony with Peter says, *'**It was Christ that spoke to His people through the prophets.** The apostle Peter, writing to the Christian church, says that the prophets "prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when **it** testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow."* 1 Peter 1:10, 11. **It is the voice of Christ that speaks to us through the Old Testament.** "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Revelation 19:10. - {PP 366.3} All the Bible writers were consistent with the terms they used to refer to the Holy Spirit. Why should we then depart from those terms in exchange for language that was used by Romish church fathers that Babylon reveres?

There are only two Divine Beings that are involved in our salvation, which is why we only ever see two Divine Beings worshipped in heaven. This is why we see in Paul's salutations over and over again him greeting in the name of God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. Now trinitarians like to use 2 Cor 13:14 to argue that the Holy Spirit is a third independent member of the trinity alongside the Father & Son person, another being. Paul says, *'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the **communion of the Holy Ghost**, be with you all. Amen.'* - (2 Cor 13:14) Now we must allow Paul to interpret himself in light of the rest of this epistle alongside his other epistles to actually understand what he meant and believed. Paul says *'the communion of the Holy Ghost'* because it is the Holy Spirit that enables us to have fellowship with Christ and His Father, which has already been shown and explained in depth, especially in light of John 14 & 17.. It is Christ's Spirit that connects us together. And as we've already seen in the very same letter, Paul specified who the Holy Spirit is. *'Now **the Lord** (Jesus) **is that Spirit:**...'* - (2 Cor 3:17)

So the church of Corinth, who this epistle was written to, would have understood exactly what Paul meant by the Holy Spirit. They would have already seen earlier in the letter that *'the Lord is that Spirit.'* So we see from Paul that it is the love of God the Father, the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the fellowship of the Spirit of Christ among believers that unites them. By having Christ live in us by His own Spirit, we too can be children of God. *'And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth **the Spirit of his Son** into your hearts, crying, **Abba, Father.**'* (Gal 4:6) That's why we saw that Jesus said both Him and His Father will



come to make their abode with us if we love Him and keep His words. *'Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and **we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.**'* - (Jhn 14:23)

Jesus gives us His very own Spirit, which is why the believer receives His very own righteous life, as has already been discussed. We've seen that Jesus imparts the breath of His own Spirit (Jhn 20:22). It is Christ's own Spirit that connects us to the Father, which is why Jesus is the only mediator between man and God the Father. *'For there is one God, and **one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;**'* - (1 Tim 2:5)

Jesus hadn't ever become a man until His incarnation, and so it was through His experience here on earth that He was able to enter into the right to be our intercessor and mediator. So according to the Bible, we have one intercessor which is Christ Jesus. Paul, the same author, says that Jesus makes intercession for us. *'Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, **who also maketh intercession for us.**'* - (Rom 8:34) Earlier in the same chapter, Paul says it's the Spirit that makes intercession for us. *'Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: **but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.**'* - (Rom 8:26) So in this context (v26), the Spirit is referring to the Spirit of Jesus Christ. *'For I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the **Spirit of Jesus Christ**'* - (Phili 1:19) That's why in the exact same chapter (2 Cor 13), Paul says it is Jesus Christ that is in you, not somebody else.

*'Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that **Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?**'* - (2 Cor 13:5) So when we allow Paul to interpret himself, it is clear that he taught the Holy Spirit was Jesus Christ, and the church of Corinth would have understood this. Once again, the trinitarian cannot accept that it is Jesus Christ Himself who truly dwells in the believer, they must believe that it is somebody else.

Another verse that tends to be used to argue that the Holy Spirit is someone else other than Jesus Christ is found in John chapter 16. It says, *'Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for **he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak:** and he will shew you things to come.'* - (Jhn 16:13) The argument made is that if the Holy Spirit does not *'speak of Himself'* then it can't be Christ because it's the Holy Spirit that comes to reveal the knowledge of Christ to us. However, notice that Jesus says after this that *'whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak.'* Clearly the one who the Holy Spirit would hear from is referring to God the Father. We know therefore that this is Christ speaking about Himself because Christ never spoke of Himself. Everything that Jesus spoke was what He heard from His Father. Jesus maintained this fact throughout. *'**For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he***

*gave me a commandment, **what I should say**, and **what I should speak**.*' - (Jhn 12:49)

In John 16:13, Jesus says that the Spirit of truth *'shall not speak of Himself.'* Earlier in the same book in John 12:49, Jesus says *'I have not spoken of myself.'* Again, in John 16:13, Jesus says the Spirit of truth shall only speak what He hears. In John 12:49, Jesus says that He only speaks what the Father tells Him to. These are exactly the same descriptions! Jesus had spoken in first person in John 12:49 and switched to third person in John 16:13.

We've already seen that this was a continuous trend from Christ throughout the gospel of John and the other gospels. This is how Jesus spoke. Two chapters before John 16:13, we see Christ say the exact same thing in the first person. *'Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you **I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me**, he doeth the works.'* - (Jhn 14:10) In the exact same chapter (14), Jesus repeats this same thing. *'He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings: and **the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me**.'* - (Jhn 14:24)

Jesus always told us that He never spoke of Himself nor did anything of Himself. Everything He spoke and did was commanded by the Father. *'Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, **The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do**: for what things soever he doeth, **these also doeth the Son likewise**.'* - (Jhn 5:19) God the Father dwelt in Christ, and Christ remained in full harmony with the will of His Father, never following His own will. This is the experience we as Christians are to strive for. We have Christ dwelling in us, and we want to reach a point where we do nothing of ourselves but remain in full harmony with His will and do what He tells us. Hence, we are to follow or walk in the Spirit just as Christ followed His Father. *'This I say then, **Walk in the Spirit**, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.'* - (Gal 5:16) This is why we are called followers of Christ. God the Father dwelt in Christ as Christ followed Him, and we are called to follow Christ as He dwells in us. Jesus stayed consistent throughout the Gospel of John, and that consistency was maintained when He spoke about the Spirit of truth which is Himself. Jesus Christ is the truth (Jhn 14:6), therefore, the Spirit of truth (Jhn 16:13) is the Spirit of Jesus Christ. Jesus told us He never spoke of Himself, hence, the Spirit of truth doesn't speak of Himself as it's the very Spirit of Jesus Christ.

Moreover, trinitarians like to point to Matthew 28:19 as evidence for the trinity doctrine. The text says, *'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of **the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost**.'* - (Matt 28:19)

It is then concluded that the One God of the Bible is triune: 'God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit.' Firstly, nowhere in this verse nor in the overall context of these passages surrounding this verse does it say that God is triune or that the One God is Father, Son and Holy Spirit.. We must remember that the doctrine of the trinity doesn't just simply mean three. So whenever we see three, we shouldn't just conclude 'trinity,' as that's not what the doctrine of the trinity is. The Trinity is the doctrine that teaches that the One God of the Bible is made up of three, co-eternal, individual persons who are distinct from each other. So the One God is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Jesus here wasn't teaching that the One God is a

trinity of three co-eternal persons who are one in essence or anything along those lines. Such isn't even hinted, nor is the identity of God even a theme of what Jesus was saying here. Jesus didn't say at all that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one God. We must not add our own words and ideas into Scripture that aren't there. We've seen that the Bible already tells us who the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are. It is through these that we attain salvation. The Father is God the Father, and He saves us through His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ (See Jhn 3:16-17 & Rom 5:8-11). We are justified by the death and resurrection of the Son (See Rom 4:25, & Phili 3:10-11), and are sanctified by the Holy Spirit of God which He gave to His Son, and is manifested through His Son (See Acts 2:32-33, Rom 15:16-17, 2 Thess 2:13-14, & 1 Pet 1:2). Throughout the gospels, Jesus referred to the One God as His Father, hence He kept saying that He was the Son of that One God. To then isolate a single verse right at the end of a Gospel after everything Christ revealed about God in light of the rest of the New Testament, and then jump to such a conclusion that this verse is telling us that God is a tripersonal being, is the epitome of shoving cherished presupposed theories into the text. We don't need to interpose our ideas to fill in what the text doesn't say or even convey. The Bible alone is sufficient to tell us who God is, we don't need to imply ideas that God hasn't said about Himself, nor His Son.

Now it is also very important to understand that the Holy Spirit is not just some mere 'wind' or 'force'. No one can understand the nature of the Holy Spirit, but we have to accept that the original meaning of the word and the way Scripture identifies the Spirit does not reveal that it is a third distinct and separate person/being like the Father & Son.. The Holy Spirit is also not some impersonal force or idea. The Holy Spirit is the very presence of Jesus Christ, which is why we can grieve the Spirit (Eph 4:30). The Holy Spirit has personality, for it is the personal presence of Christ who comes and dwells in the believer and thus, He fulfils His promise to the church. *'I will not leave you comfortless: **I will come to you**. Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also. At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and **I in you**. He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will **manifest myself to him**.'* (Jhn 14:18-21)

God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself. *'And all things are of God, who hath **reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ**, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; To wit, that **God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself**, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.'* - (2 Cor 5:18-19)

*'The Lord God omnipotent is the God of his people. He is also a tender, loving Father, ready to hear their prayers; **for God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself**, not imputing their trespasses unto them. **God sent forth his Son to be the propitiation for them through faith** in his atoning blood.'* - {ST December 23, 1897, par, 5}

Therefore, it is the Father & Son that come to make their abode with those that love them. *'Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my*

*Father will love him, and **we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.***' - (Jhn 14:23)

It is Jesus who stands at the door and knocks to enter our hearts and abide in us, not somebody else. *'Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, **I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.***' - (Rev 3:20)

When we have the Holy Spirit dwelling in us and in our midst, we are truly having fellowship with Christ and His Father. *'That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and **truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.***' - (1 Jhn 1:3) Our fellowship is with two Divine Beings, the Father and Son. This is what life eternal is, to know these two Divine Beings, namely the Only True God and His Son Jesus Christ our Lord (Jhn 17:3). Nowhere does the Bible suggest that any other being is involved in this fellowship.

In conclusion, we've seen that the Bible clearly reveals that the Holy Spirit is the very presence, power, and mind of Christ, which is why Paul tells us that we (believers) have the mind of Christ (See 1 Cor 2:16), for we have His Spirit which is His life in us. The doctrine of the Trinity can't be proven from Scripture without stringing together isolated verses and forcing our own presupposition into it. As Seventh-day Adventists, we of all people should be most aware of how the fallen churches latch onto unbiblical doctrines by stringing together isolated texts to prove their beliefs, such as Sunday keeping, doing away with dietary laws, and immortality of the soul amongst many more. Also, the Trinity makes God an impersonal substance that is divided. The concept of 'One being' in the Trinity is meaningless because it doesn't refer to anybody as the 'one being' because Father, Son, and Holy Spirit make up the one being. This makes God an impersonal substance that is made up of three. Where is the Biblical evidence for such an assertion? Moreover, even to say that the One God is made up of three co-eternal and distinct beings that are one in purpose is to make the word 'God' meaningless, for God then doesn't refer to an actual being, but rather is just a word to describe a unison. Again, where does the Bible define or describe the One God in such a manner? The doctrine of the Trinity cannot be formulated from Scripture alone. In order to define it, we have to use ancient Catholic church creeds that explain what it is. The terms that are used in these creeds and in our own fundamental beliefs, like 'triune God', 'three co-eternal persons' and 'God the Holy Spirit' are foreign to the holy prophets and apostles. The SDA General conference themselves acknowledged that not a single Scriptural passage can be used to support the doctrine of the Trinity after it became an official belief of the church in 1980, but they just assumed that this is what the Bible writers meant, believed, and implied.

*'While **no single scriptural passage states formally the doctrine of the Trinity, it is assumed** as a fact by Bible writers and mentioned several times. **It is implied** in Genesis 1, where God and the Spirit of God are portrayed acting in Creation.<sup>30</sup> - (Adventist Review, 'What Seventh-day Adventists Believe Brief discussions of 27 fundamental beliefs' Vol. 158, No. 31, p. 4, [1981])*

How could such an important doctrine; the very identity of our God, be not explicitly taught by the Bible writers? The very identity of our God was just ‘*assumed as a fact by (the) Bible writers.*’ To assume that the Bible writers held a concept about who God is, even though they didn’t actually state it is just presumptuous. This conclusion is reached due to having a presupposed notion fixed, and it’s thereby meant to be a given that the Bible writers just meant this. This is interjecting the trinity into Scripture. In order to even understand what the Trinity is we have to turn to uninspired ‘church fathers’ that came about centuries after the apostles.

This isn’t what true Seventh-day Adventism is. As Adventists, we are to be true fundamentalists, and live by the Bible and Bible alone. This is why the founders of our church were led by Christ to come out of the daughters of Rome. The pioneers upheld the principle of sola scriptura and retained the true spirit of Protestantism. Anything that can’t be proved from Scripture must be cast out no matter how unpopular it would make us. ‘Assuming’ doctrines without clear scriptural authority is to tread on dangerous ground. **‘Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.’** - (Prov 30:6)

## **Chapter 5: Ellen G. White on The Holy Spirit**

This chapter will focus on Ellen White’s position regarding the Holy Spirit and what she believed and taught. The previous chapter showed many statements from Sister White that show she was in harmony with Scripture by teaching that the Holy Spirit was the presence and power of the Lord Jesus Christ, a transfused influence from Himself to the believer. However, there are quotes from Sister White that tend to be used by trinitarians to prove their case that Sister White shifted in her position and took the stance that the Holy Spirit was another distinct being independent from the Father & Son. This chapter will analyse these statements by allowing Sister White to interpret herself and see what she actually meant by these statements in light of all her other writings.

Firstly, Ellen White consistently taught that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ. Paul told us that there is one Spirit. *‘There is one body, and **one Spirit**, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; One Lord, one faith, one baptism, One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.’* - (Eph 4:4-6) Ellen White tells us that this one

Spirit is the Spirit of Christ. *Those who believe the truth should remember that they are God's little children... They have one God and one Saviour; and **one Spirit—the Spirit of Christ**—...* - {9T 180.3}

*“When the Holy Spirit was **poured out** upon the early church, ‘The whole multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul.’ **The Spirit of Christ** made them one. This is the fruit of abiding in Christ.”* {February 6, 1893, par. 14}

*‘The Holy Spirit is **the Spirit of Christ**, which is sent to all men to give them sufficiency, that through His grace we might be complete in Him.’* - {14MR 84.3}

*‘Brethren, will you carry the **spirit of Christ** with you as you return to your homes and churches?... What we want is **the spirit of Jesus**. When we have this, we shall love one another. Here are the credentials that we are to bear: “By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another. We need to pray more; and when we have **Christ abiding in the soul**, **his spirit** in me will harmonize with **his spirit** in you; and **he who controls our minds**, controls also the heavenly intelligences, and they co-operate with us.’* - {The Ellen G. White Materials, 1888, 903.9, 10}

*‘We need, my sister, greater benevolence, greater humility first, then the simplicity of Christ will appear; contention will cease, because it is an offensive thing and grieves the Holy Spirit of God. No one who truly enjoys **the Spirit of Jesus Christ** will be fractious, suspicious, criticizing, accusing. Why? Because **Christ is abiding in the soul temple**. **Under the influence of the Holy Spirit**, the whole multitude of them that believed were of “one heart and of one mind.” **The Spirit of Christ animated the whole** and became the whole heart of the whole community.’* - {21MR 155.6}

*‘Baptized with **the Spirit of Jesus**, there will be a love, a harmony, a meekness, a hiding of the self in Jesus that the wisdom of Christ will be given, the understanding enlightened; that which seems dark will be made clear.’* - {CW 81.1}

*‘Each separate word and action is to show consecration not to ourselves, but to God. We are fitting up for heaven. **The Spirit of Jesus dwells in us** richly by faith.’* - {21MR 306.5}

*‘When one is fully emptied of self, when every false god is cast out of the soul, the vacuum is filled by the inflowing of **the Spirit of Christ**. Such a one has the faith that purifies the soul from defilement. He is conformed to the Spirit, and he minds the things of the Spirit. He has no confidence in self. **Christ is all and in all**.’* - {GW 287.1}

As we already established in the previous chapter, Jesus told us that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father (Jhn 15:26) and was given to Him. Ellen White also confirmed this. *‘The Father **gave his Spirit** without measure **to his Son**, and we also may partake of **its** fulness.’* - {RH November 5, 1908, par. 4}

Now most Christians, if not all, are fine with referring to the Holy Spirit as the 'Spirit of Christ'. There's no contention within Christendom over this term because the Bible clearly uses it. However, most Christians believe that the term 'Spirit of Christ' is in reference to another independent being that's not Jesus Christ, called 'God the Holy Spirit. Thus, many Seventh-day Adventists will conclude that Ellen White's references to the 'Spirit of Christ' points to someone else other than Christ. For example, Seventh-day Adventist author and minister, Pastor Max Hatton stated in his book 'Understanding the Trinity' that *'The Holy Spirit is a Person of the Trinity; He is not the Father, neither is He the Son. He is One of the co-eternal three.'*<sup>31</sup> - (Max Hatton, 'Understanding the Trinity', p. 11)

This completely contradicts the Spirit of Prophecy. We've already seen that Ellen White clearly stated that the Holy Spirit is in fact Jesus Christ. **'We want the Holy Spirit, which is Jesus Christ'** - {9LtMs, Lt 66, 1894, par 18.} Ellen White tells us that there is no other comforter like Jesus Christ, thus, it is His own Spirit that speaks to our hearts.

*'The words spoken to the disciples come to us through their words. The Comforter is ours as well as theirs, at all times and in all places, in all sorrows and in all affliction, when the outlook seems dark and the future perplexing, and we feel helpless and alone. These are times **when the Comforter will be sent** in answer to the prayer of faith... **There is no comforter like Christ**, so tender and so true. **He is touched with the feeling of our infirmities. His Spirit speaks to the heart.**'* - {RH October 26, 1897, par. 13, 14}

Ellen White says 'the Comforter will be sent in answer to the prayer of faith', and she then states that 'there is no comforter like Christ'. Clearly the Comforter can't be somebody else if there is no 'Comforter like Christ'. It is Christ who is 'touched with the feelings of our infirmities,' therefore, it is only Him that can truly comfort us and help us, for He experienced what we experience as humans, hence, 'there is no comforter like Christ.' By having the Comforter, we have the very presence of Jesus Christ.

*'The work of the holy Spirit is immeasurably great. It is from this source that power and efficiency come to the worker for God; and the holy Spirit is the comforter, as the **personal presence of Christ to the soul**'* - {RH November 29, 1892, par. 3}

When Ellen White refers to the Holy Spirit as being Jesus Christ, she meant just that. According to Ellen White, the Holy Spirit dwelling in the believer is the presence of Jesus Christ Himself.

*'The difference between believers and unbelievers should be as great as the difference between light and darkness. When God's people take the position that they are the **temple of the Holy Ghost, Christ Himself abiding within**, they will so clearly reveal Him in spirit, words and actions, that there will be an unmistakable distinction between them and Satan's followers.'* - {17 LtMs, Ms 100, 1902, par. 24}

When one is drawn by the Holy Spirit, it is Jesus Christ Himself drawing the individual, not somebody else. *'...the grace of Christ, through His atoning sacrifice, can alone renew the heart and make our service acceptable to God. This grace had moved upon the heart of Cornelius. **The Spirit of Christ had spoken to his soul; Jesus had drawn him**, and he had yielded to the drawing.'* - {AG 86.4}

In order for one to truly confess Christ, Jesus has to give them His mind and Spirit. *'In order to confess Christ, **we must have Him** to confess. No one can truly confess Christ **unless the mind and spirit of Christ are in him.**'* - {1T 303.2}

When one has the Holy Spirit speaking through them, it is Jesus Christ speaking through the individual.

*'Do not stop to try to convert the one who is speaking words of reproach against your work; but let it be seen that you are inspired by **the Spirit of Jesus Christ**; and angels of God will put into your lips words that will reach the hearts of opposers. If these men persist in pressing their way in, those who are of a sensible mind in the congregation will understand that yours is the higher standard. So speak that it will be known that **Jesus Christ is speaking through you.**'* - {GCB May 18, 1909, par.12}

Both Scripture and Spirit of prophecy tell us that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Holy Spirit, that the Holy Spirit is Christ's very own Spirit, and that the believer has Jesus Christ dwelling in them. How can we then interpret all these statements to mean that the Holy Spirit is someone else other than the presence of Christ Himself that dwells in us?

Many see statements from Sister White where she refers to the Holy Spirit as one of the three powers of heaven, and they then interpret this to mean that she believed the Holy Spirit is a third distinct member of the Godhead/Trinity independent from the Father & Son, a third divine being in heaven. For example, Ellen White said, *'Our sanctification is the work of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. It is the fulfilment of the covenant that God has made with those who bind themselves up with Him, to stand with Him, with His Son, and with His Spirit in holy fellowship. Have you been born again? Have you become a new being in Christ Jesus? **Then co-operate with the three great powers of heaven** who are working in your behalf.'* - {ST June 19, 1901, par. 4} She also said, *'The coming of the Lord is nearer than when we first believed. What a wonderful thought it is that the great controversy is nearing its end! In the closing work we shall meet with perils that we know not how to deal with; but let us not forget that the **three great powers of heaven are working**, that a divine hand is on the wheel, and that God will bring his purposes to pass. He will gather from the world a people who will serve him in righteousness.'* - {RH May 5, 1903, par. 8} And *'The presence of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, **the three highest powers** in the universe and those in whose name the believer is baptized, is pledged to be with every striving soul.'* - {PUR July 2, 1908, par.4}

Such statements from Sister White do appear to sound trinitarian especially when one has trinitarian lenses on, however, when we analyse her statements in light of each other, we don't have to form our own conclusions as to what she actually meant by these statements, for she interprets herself. Firstly, Ellen White identifies who the 'third power' of heaven is. She says that:

*'It is by the Spirit that the heart is made pure. Through the Spirit the believer becomes a partaker of the divine nature. **Christ has given his Spirit as a divine power to***



overcome all hereditary and cultivated tendencies to evil, and to impress his own character on his church.’ - {RH November 19, 1908, Par. 5}

According to Ellen White, this third power is Christ's own spirit. Also, Ellen White says that *‘The prince of the power of evil **can only be held in check by the power of God in the third person of the Godhead, the Holy Spirit.**’* - {SpTA10 37.1}

Ellen White here says that the power of the evil one *‘can only be held in check by the power of the third person’*, the Holy Spirit. So the Holy Spirit is the only power we have to combat the attacks of Satan and temptations of sin. Yet, Ellen White also says that *‘**Jesus alone has power to save from sin, to free from the power of evil;** and to doubt him who has laid down his life for us, is to grieve and insult the Father, who has in one gift poured out all heaven to a lost world.’* - {RH February 10, 1891, Par. 5}

According to Ellen White, it is Jesus Christ *‘alone’* that has the power to save us from sin and free us from the power of evil. Yet, Sister White says that the power of evil can only be held in check by the Holy Spirit. This shouldn't cause confusion as we've seen that Ellen White refers to the Holy Spirit as the power of Christ. Jesus Christ is physically in heaven, and He is able to send us a power to guide us. This other power is His very own spirit. The Holy Spirit is essentially another power as it is no longer Christ physically here on earth, but rather, it is His presence in a different form, an immaterial form, a spirit. The Holy Spirit is what took the place of Christ's physical presence on earth. This is why it could appear that Christ was speaking about somebody else in one breath when speaking about the Comforter, and yet still appear as though He was speaking of Himself. Likewise, this is why it can appear that Sister White was speaking about someone else when referring to the Holy Spirit in one instance, and in another, she'd explicitly be saying that the Holy Spirit is Christ Himself.

*‘Christ declared that after his ascension, he would send to his church, as his crowning gift, the Comforter, **who was to take his place.** This Comforter is the Holy Spirit,—**the soul of his life,** the efficacy of his church, the light and life of the world. **With his Spirit Christ sends a reconciling influence and a power that takes away sin.**’* - {RH May 19, 1904, Par. 1}

It's through this third power that comes directly from Christ, as it's His own Spirit that empowers us to gain victory over sin. Jesus overcame Satan (Jhn 14:30), and He comes to abide in us so that we can partake in that same victory through the power of His Spirit. Hence, Jesus is our only defence against evil.

*‘When the soul surrenders itself to Christ, **a new power** takes possession of the new heart. A change is wrought which man can never accomplish for himself. It is a supernatural work, bringing a supernatural element into human nature. The soul that is yielded to Christ **becomes His own fortress,** which He holds in a revolted world, and He intends that **no authority shall be known in it but His own...** But unless we do yield ourselves to **the control of Christ,** we shall be dominated by the wicked one... **The only defense** against evil is the **indwelling of Christ** in the heart through faith in His righteousness.’* - {DA 324.1}

Ellen White is telling us that when we die to ourselves and completely yield ourselves to Christ, it's He who takes control of us and shields us from the attacks of the enemy, not

somebody else other than Christ. Notice she says that 'a new power takes possession'. This 'new power' proceeds directly from Him, His very own Spirit. There is not somebody else that dwells in us but that of Christ's own power. Hence, Ellen White says:

***'There is no power in you apart from Christ, but it is your privilege to have Christ abiding in your heart by faith, and he can overcome sin in you, when you cooperate with his efforts, putting your will on the side of God's will. He says, "I have overcome the world." In him you lift up the banner as one who conquers. "We are more than conquerors through him (Jesus) that loved us." - {YI June 29, 1893, Par. 8}***

Christ conquered sin in the flesh (See Rom 8:3), thus, it's Him who conquers sin in our flesh when He dwells in us. Righteousness by faith makes no sense if we are to believe that the Holy Spirit isn't Jesus Christ. It's righteousness by faith because we don't look to our own righteousness, for we have none (See Rom 3:10 & Phili 3:9), but we trust and put our faith in the righteousness of our Lord Jesus Christ. As has already been stated, by giving us His Spirit, Christ gives us His very own righteous life. It cannot be some other being. Jesus Christ is the life (Jhn 11:25, 14:6) and it's His life we receive when He comes and lives in us by His Divine Spirit, hence, we receive the Spirit of life that frees us from the bondage of sin and death. ***'For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.'*** - (Rom 8:2) ***'And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness.'*** - (Rom 8:10) Why is the 'Spirit life because of righteousness?' Because the Spirit is Christ's very life, which is a righteous life. We receive Christ's life, which is a righteous life, His righteousness by faith, not the life of another.

However, many also see statements from Ellen White where she calls the Holy Spirit a person. For example, she said *'Christ determined that when He ascended from this earth He would bestow a gift on those who had believed on Him and those who should believe on Him. What gift could He bestow rich enough to signalize and grace His ascension to the mediatorial throne? It must be worthy of His greatness and His royalty. He determined to give His representative, the third person of the Godhead. This gift could not be excelled. He would give all gifts in one, and therefore the divine Spirit, that converting, enlightening, and sanctifying power, would be His donation.... It came with a fullness and power, as if for ages it had been restrained, but was now being poured forth upon the church....'* - {ML 36.3}

Again, when one has a presupposed trinitarian mindset, it can be easy to read the trinity into this statement of Sister White's because the doctrine is assumed. But approaching inspired texts with presuppositions is not the correct way to read and understand them unless the author has confirmed that assumption themselves. Firstly, we see here and in many other statements that Ellen White referred to the Holy Spirit as an 'it', which is also what John, Paul, and Peter referred to the Holy Spirit as. For example, the book of John records the words of John the Baptist concerning the Holy Spirit: ***'And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him.'*** - (Jhn 1:32) We see the same word applied to the Spirit by Paul when he says that ***'The Spirit itself beareth***

witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God:’ - (Rom 8:16)

And we see this same word been used in reference to the Spirit by Peter also; ‘Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when **it** testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.’ - (1 Pet 1:11) If we are to believe that the Holy Spirit is a third separate Divine member upon the throne with the Father and Son, how could inspired writers refer to this Divine being as an ‘it’? We never see these writers refer to The Father and Son as an ‘it’, such would surely be blasphemous. This clearly demonstrates that these writers had an understanding that the Holy Spirit was something that belonged to God, and is not a god itself.

Now we must also understand that Ellen White had to rectify false beliefs in regards to what the Holy Spirit is. There were beliefs circulating that the Holy Spirit is just an impersonal force, which is an incorrect assertion as I already explained in chapter 4. The question then is; what did Ellen White mean when she referred to the Holy Spirit as a person? Ellen White being consistent when under inspiration provides the answer for us, for she interprets herself. Let’s analyse another statement from Ellen White where she uses this terminology.

*‘The Lord says this because He knows it is for our good. He would build a wall around us, to keep us from transgression, so that His blessing and love may be bestowed on us in rich measure... We have been brought together as a school, and **we need to realize that the Holy Spirit, who is as much a person as God is a person, is walking through these grounds, unseen by human eyes...**’ - {2SAT 136.6}*

Here Ellen White again says that the Holy Spirit is a person, and ‘*is walking through these grounds, unseen by human eyes.*’ Sister White tells us who this unseen Person is:

She says, *‘**How few realize that Jesus, unseen, is walking by their side!** How ashamed many would be to hear His voice speaking to them, and to know that He heard all their foolish, common talk! And how many hearts would burn with holy joy if they only knew that **the Saviour was by their side**, that the holy atmosphere of **His presence was surrounding them...**’ - {14MR 125.3}*

As has already been stated, the Holy Spirit is not an impersonal force. The Holy Spirit is very much a person, it is the personal presence of Jesus Christ Himself! We may not see Him because He is physically in heaven, yet we can rest with the great comfort that our Saviour is still with us by His Spirit.

*‘Today no curious multitudes flock to the desert places to see and hear the Christ. His voice is not heard in the busy streets. No cry sounds from the wayside, “Jesus of Nazareth passeth by.” Luke 18:37. Yet this word is true today. **Christ walks unseen through our streets.** With messages of mercy **He comes to our homes.** With all who are seeking to minister in His name, He waits to co-operate. **He is in the midst of us**, to heal and to bless, **if we will receive Him.**’ - [MH 107.2]*

When our Lord Jesus Christ promised that He’d come and make His abode with those that love Him (Jhn 14:21-23), He truly meant that. Christ fulfils that promise when He comes in

the person of the Holy Spirit, which is His unseen presence independent from His physical self. Again, notice what sister White says in regards to the Holy Spirit being a person in light of John 14.

*‘What saith our Saviour? “I will not leave thee comfortless; I will come unto you.” “He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him.” When trials overshadow the soul, remember the words of Christ, **remember that He is an unseen presence in the person of the Holy Spirit**, and He will be the peace and comfort given you, **manifesting to you that He is with you**, the Sun of Righteousness, chasing away your darkness.*

*“If a man loves me,” Christ said, “he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and **we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.**” [John 14:18, 21, 23.] Be of good cheer; light will come, and your soul will rejoice greatly in the Lord.’ - {12LtMs, Lt 124, 1897, par.10} (DG 185.2)*

So again, Ellen White tells us that Christ is an ‘unseen presence’ as He comes in the form of His Holy Spirit. Sister White here is only reiterating what Christ had already told His disciples in John 14, that *‘I will come to you’* (Jhn 14:12) and will *‘manifest myself to him’* (Jhn 14:21.) How can this be interpreted in any other way?

Ellen White does not contradict herself. We’ve seen repeatedly that she explicitly said the Holy Spirit is Jesus Christ Himself. Therefore, when we see her say things like *‘Christ gave His representative, **the third person of the Godhead**, the Holy Spirit... Christ gave His disciples the Holy Spirit as their Comforter. **It was ever to abide with His church.**’* - {13LtMs, Ms 44, 1898, par 11, 12} (CTr 301.5)

We can know that this ‘third person’ is Jesus Christ in a different form, as His Spirit works independently from His humanity. We don’t need to jump to conclusions. Again, Ellen White says in regards to the third person.

*“I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life,” Christ declares; “no one cometh unto the Father, but by me.” Christ is invested with power to give life to all creatures. “As the living Father hath sent me,” he says, “and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me....It is **the spirit** that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, **they are spirit**, and **they are life.**” Christ is not here referring to his doctrine, **but to his person, the divinity of his character.**’ - {RH April 5, 1906, par 12}*

So when Christ spoke about the Holy Spirit, He was talking about ‘His Person’ and ‘the divinity of his character,’ which is distinct from his humanity. Hence, Ellen White says:

*‘With pen and voice proclaim that Jesus lives to make intercession for us. Unite with the great Master-worker, follow the self-denying Redeemer through his pilgrimage of love on earth. **The same Jesus that walked with his disciples, that taught them upon earth**, that toiled and suffered in his human nature, **is with us in his divine power. He is at our right hand to help in every emergency.** Let us lift up Jesus, and reveal the Bible foundation for our faith. We are all to proclaim the commandments of God and the*

*faith of Jesus. Jesus came to magnify the law, and make it honorable. He died to exalt the law of God, testifying of its changeless character; and as we proclaim God's law, we may look unto Jesus and be comforted with the assurance, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."* - {RH January 24, 1893, par. 3}

Ellen White plainly presents that the very 'same Jesus that walked with his disciples, that taught them upon earth' is with us, but not physically in His human Person like He was with the disciples, but rather, He 'is with us in his divine power,' which is separate from His humanity, yet still with His personality.

*'Christ was filled with sorrow and anguish. This was represented as the bruising of His heel. A pain, heavier than ever oppressed another, was weighing down His humanity. But although Christ's divine glory was for a time veiled and eclipsed by His assuming humanity, yet He did not cease to be God when He became man. The human did not take the place of the divine, nor the divine of the human. This is the mystery of godliness. The two expressions human and divine were, in Christ, closely and inseparably one, and yet they had a distinct individuality. Though Christ humbled Himself to become man, the Godhead (Divine nature) was still His own. His Deity could not be lost while He stood faithful and true to His loyalty. Surrounded with sorrow, suffering, and moral pollution, despised and rejected by the people to whom had been intrusted the oracles of heaven, Jesus could yet speak of Himself as the Son of man in heaven. He was ready to take once more His divine glory when His work on earth was done.'* - {ST May 10, 1899, par. 10 - 11}

Ellen White makes the point that when Christ became man, He did not cease from being God. His human nature did not supersede His Divine nature, He still remained fully God. But yet, Christ isn't any less human than us because of this, He is still fully man also. The 'human and divine were, in Christ, closely and inseparably one, and yet they had a **distinct individuality.**'

Also, notice that Sister White says that Christ 'was ready to take once more His divine glory when His work on earth was done.' Christ was to ascend to heaven and receive the glory from the Father that He had before His incarnation.

*'I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.'* - (Jhn 17:3-4)

And we've seen that Christ wanted to impart this glory to His followers (See Jhn 17:20-22), and He does this through the power of His sanctifying spirit, which Ellen White says is 'the divinity of his character.' This then makes sense as to why Jesus couldn't impart the Holy Spirit in its fullness to His disciples until He Himself had been gloried again by the Father in heaven.

*'In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they*

**that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)'** - (Jhn 7:37-39)

Only then could Jesus blow His Holy Spirit in its fullness of Divine power upon those that believed upon Him. And then Christ could dwell with His people by His Divine spirit, whilst as a human He is still up in heaven. We receive the very presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, even though we don't have Him here as a human, but we still have Him with us by '*the divinity of his character*', which is distinct from His humanity.

*'Christ's perfect humanity is the same that man may have through connection with Christ. As God, Christ could not be tempted any more than He was not tempted from His allegiance in heaven. But as Christ humbled Himself to the nature of man, He could be tempted. He had not taken on Him even the nature of the angels, but humanity, perfectly identical with our own nature, except without the taint of sin. A human body, a human mind, with all the peculiar properties, He was bone, brain, and muscle. A man of our flesh, He was compassed with the weakness of humanity... He trod our earth as man. He had reason, conscience, memory, will, and affections of **the human soul which was united with His divine nature**. Our Lord was tempted as man is tempted. He was capable of yielding to temptations, as are human beings. His finite nature was pure and spotless, but the divine nature that led Him to say to Philip, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father" also, **was not humanized; neither was humanity deified by the blending or union of the two natures; each retained its essential character and properties.**'*  
- {16 MR 181.4 - 182.1}

*'Although our Lord ascended from earth to heaven, the Holy Spirit was appointed as His representative among men... **Cumbered with humanity, Christ could not be in every place personally**; therefore it was altogether for their advantage that He should leave them, go to His Father, and send the Holy Spirit to be His successor on earth. **The Holy Spirit is Himself, divested of the personality of humanity, and independent thereof. He would represent Himself as present in all places by His Holy Spirit, as the Omnipresent.**'* - {10LtMs, Lt 119, 1895, par.18}

So the Holy Spirit is the very presence of Jesus Christ Himself but without the human form. Also, notice that Sister White says that the Holy Spirit is Jesus, but '*divested of the personality of humanity*' and is thus, '*independent thereof*.' This is why she calls the Holy Spirit a third power and a third person. The Holy Spirit comes directly from Christ and enables Him to be '*omnipresent*' so He can be present with His church, and His Spirit works independently from His physical self whilst He's up in heaven. So Christ as a human is bound to one place, however, He is still able to be omnipresent by His Divine Spirit, which is able to work and be active independently from His Human Person, hence Ellen White says that the Holy Spirit is '*the divinity of his character*'. So the Spirit of Christ is His power and presence, and it can function independently of Himself, thus, it is essentially a 'third', even a representative, for it represents Christ Himself where He is not personally present in the literal physical sense.

*'Though the ministration was to be removed from the earthly to the heavenly temple; though the sanctuary and our great high priest **would be invisible to human sight**, yet*

the disciples were to suffer no loss thereby. They would realize no break in their communion, and no diminution of power because of the Saviour's absence. **While Jesus ministers in the sanctuary above, He is still by His Spirit the minister of the church on earth. He is withdrawn from the eye of sense, but His parting promise is fulfilled, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."** Matthew 28:20. While He delegates His power to inferior ministers, **His energizing presence is still with His church.**' - {DA 166.2}

It is the Holy Spirit of Jesus Christ here on earth working in us and for us, not some other separate divine being. The Holy Spirit is Christ's 'energizing presence,' 'withdrawn from the eye of sense.' So in this sense, the Holy Spirit works as an active independent agent as a person, as it works independently from Christ's human person. The Bible is silent on how this works, but this must not then lead us to conclude that the Spirit of Christ is a person in the sense of being a completely self-existent independent being. To reach this conclusion is to completely misunderstand Ellen White and take her way out of context, especially considering the fact that she clearly says many things that are blatantly contradictory to this idea.

'Christ therefore is a personal Saviour... Wherever we go, **we bear the abiding presence of One so dear to us;** for we abide in Christ by a living faith. **He is abiding in our hearts** by our individual, appropriating faith. **We have the companionship of the divine Jesus, and as we realize his presence,** our thoughts are brought into captivity to him.' - {ST September 3, 1896, par.4}

How this works is something we cannot know or comprehend. This is where the nature of the Spirit comes into play, and it's not something that is for us to know or attempt to delve into. The Bible doesn't reveal how Jesus is able to do this, and how His Spirit can work in such a way. This is why even the disciples were curious as to how Jesus would be omnipresent.

'Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot, Lord, **how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?**' - (Jhn 14:22) '...man can keep the commandments of God only as he is in Christ, and **Christ in him...** None will keep the law of God unless they love Him who is the only-begotten of the Father... And all who love Christ will be loved of the Father, and **he will manifest himself to them...** **But it was difficult even for the disciples to understand the words of Christ. That Christ should manifest himself to them, and yet be invisible to the world, was a mystery to them.** They could not understand the words of Christ in a spiritual sense. They were thinking of the outward, visible manifestation. **They could not take in the fact that they could have the presence of Christ with them, and yet he be unseen by the world.**' - {ST November 18, 1897, par, 5, 6}

This is a natural question for all of us to ponder upon, however, the Scriptures are silent on this, thus we aren't to conjecture. What the Bible does reveal to us is that the Holy Spirit is Christ's own Spirit and it is He who comes to us as the Comforter. ***The Saviour is our Comforter.*** *This I have proved Him to be.*' - {8MR 49.3}

Exactly how the Holy Spirit works and what exactly it is is something we must not take upon ourselves to inquire. All we know is that it is Christ's omnipresence, for that's what inspiration reveals to us, and to conclude that it's another divine being is completely presumptuous, and this would be a complete disregard of the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy.

*'It is not essential for you to know and be able to define **just what the Holy Spirit is.** Christ tells us that the Holy Spirit is the Comforter, and the Comforter is the Holy Ghost, "the Spirit of truth, which the Father shall send in My name." "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him, for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you" [John 14:16, 17]. **This refers to the omnipresence of the Spirit of Christ, called the Comforter.** Again Jesus says, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth" [John 16:12, 13]... **There are many mysteries which I do not seek to understand or to explain;** they are too high for me, and too high for you. On some of these points, silence is golden...' - {14MR 179.2, 3}*

Why would Sister White say that we aren't able to define or know '**just what the Holy Spirit is**' if it is a third divine being? If it is a third being, then we would know exactly what it is, just like we know that the Father and Son are literal physical Divine Beings who sit on a throne. The Holy Spirit has personality and brings the personal presence of the Father and Son, but the Bible does not reveal how this is exactly so. Ellen White never said we can't know just what the Father and Son are, that would be a very strange thing to say, but it makes sense concerning the Holy Spirit. And if someone says that it is a third god/being, they're very much saying exactly what it is.

So it is clear when we allow Ellen White to interpret herself that when she referred to the Holy Spirit as the 'third person of the Godhead', she didn't mean somebody else, but rather, the 'third person of the Godhead' is Christ's own Spirit, and it's that power that enables us to overcome sin.

*'Sin could be resisted and overcome only through the mighty agency of the **Third Person of the Godhead**, who would come with no modified energy, **but in the fullness of divine power**... Through the Spirit the believer becomes a **partaker of the divine nature.** **Christ has given His Spirit as a divine power to overcome** all hereditary and cultivated tendencies to evil, and to impress His own character upon His church.'* - {DA 671.2}



The Lord Jesus Christ is our only hope of overcoming the world and being completely sanctified. Satan knows that by shutting out our only source of power (Jesus Christ), we are hopeless. What better way to do this than to deceive the Church into rejecting the Lord Jesus as our Comforter, and accrediting the role to somebody else? Ellen White tells us that this is exactly why the churches are in such a weak state.

*'I feel sad when I think how for long years there has been a gradual lowering of the standard. **I have been shown that very few realize the constant presence of the divine Watcher** who declares, "I know thy works."... What kind of faith is it that overcomes the world?—It is that faith which makes Christ your own personal Saviour,—that faith which, recognizing your helplessness, your utter inability to save yourself, **takes hold of the Helper** who is mighty to save, **as your only hope**. It is faith that will not be discouraged, that hears the voice of Christ saying, "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world, and **my divine strength is yours**." It is the faith that hears him say, "**Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world**."... **The reason why the churches are weak and sickly and ready to die**, is that the enemy has brought influences of a discouraging nature to bear upon trembling souls. **He has sought to shut Jesus from their view as the Comforter**... Christ has all power in heaven **and in earth, and he can strengthen the wavering**... However clear and convincing the truth is, it will fail to sanctify the soul, fail to strengthen and fortify it in its conflicts, unless it is brought in constant **contact with life**. **Satan has achieved his greatest success through interposing himself between the soul and the Saviour.**' - {RH August 26, 1890, par, 8 - 11}*

We always speak about how the Church of today is weak, lukewarm, and full of compromise. We say that we long to see the Church emulate the primitive godliness, power, and purity we saw in the Apostolic church. As Adventists, we see how our church has become softened from the church of the pioneers day. This is because the Christian world has shut Christ out as our only source of divine power and replaced Him with somebody else. The Seventh-day Adventist Church restored the truth of who the Holy Spirit is, however, the church abandoned this truth to follow the daughters of the great whore. As Protestants, we rightly condemn the Roman Catholic doctrine of placing other intercessors between us and Christ. The Catholic Church teaches that they can go to Christ through Saints and Mary. We counter these unbiblical practises by firmly stating that the Word of God declares Christ as our only mediator, and that there is no one in between. *'For there is one God, and **one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus**;*' - (1 Tim 2:5)

There is not somebody else other than Christ that we need to go through. Yet, Satan through his institution (Rome) has given the Church another intercessor in the way of Christ, and has just named it, 'God the Holy Spirit', and the Protestant world has fallen for this deception of the antichrist system. How can we proclaim Jesus as our only mediator when at the same time we proclaim that there is somebody else who comes down to mediate between us and Christ? This is a contradiction. We don't want somebody else in us, we want the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Remember, *'**We want the Holy Spirit, which is Jesus Christ**'* - {9LtMs, Lt 66, 1894, par 18.} *'Now **the Lord is that Spirit**...*' - (2 Cor 3:17) This is the hope of glory

for the Church. *'Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints: To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; **which is Christ in you, the hope of glory:**'* - (Col 1:26-27)

Moreover, we should also take note that Ellen White referred to the Holy Spirit as a person and personal presence. And we've established that this is because it is the personal presence of Jesus Christ in the form of a Spirit, and works independent from His physical self, as Sister White herself explained. We can see from Ellen White's writings that she never referred to the Holy Spirit as a third being. She never wrote that the Holy Spirit is a third being. We've seen explicitly time and time again that Ellen White wrote and believed that the Father & Son are two separate Beings, not one single being as trinitarians believe, nor did she write down that the Holy Spirit is a third being as some Adventists believe. She only ever wrote that there are Two Divine Beings: God the Father, and Jesus Christ His Son. There is never mention of a third divine being in her writings. This is apparent not only from Ellen White, but also others who beheld God's throne in vision. For example, before Ellen White received her visions from God, a man called William Foy *'had... visions and shared them at Millerite gatherings from 1842-1845... **He was the first** of three individuals to receive divine visions during this period, followed by Hazen Foss and Ellen G. White.'*<sup>32</sup> (Benjamin Baker, *'Foy, William Ellis (1818-1893)'*. ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS, (2021)

Describing what he saw in vision, he stated:

*'There was arrayed before me in the spirit an innumerable multitude, which had not passed through death; their crowns were like the brightness of the stars; and in their right hand they held cards... I then beheld in the midst of this boundless place a high mountain like unto pure silver. It appeared perfectly round, and although I was unable to see through it, yet my vision extended around it... At the right side of the mountain appeared a mighty angel, with raiment like unto burnished gold, his legs were like pillars of flaming fire, his countenance was like the lightning, and his crown gave light to this boundless place, and those that had not passed through death, could not look upon his countenance. I then beheld upon the side of this mount, letters like pure gold which said, **THE FATHER, AND THE SON.**'* ...'- {CEWF 11.1, 12.1}

Ellen G. White also had a vision beholding God's throne in 1845, and she said this when describing it.

*'In February, 1845, I had a vision of events commencing with the Midnight Cry. **I saw a throne and on it sat the Father and the Son.** I gazed on Jesus' countenance and admired his lovely person. The Father's person I could not behold, for a cloud of glorious light covered him. I asked Jesus if his Father had a form like himself. He said he had, but I*

*could not behold it, for said he if you should once behold the glory of his person you would cease to exist.*' - {1EGWLM 105.2}

Sister White beheld a throne in vision and she saw *'the Father and the Son'* sat upon it. This shows a consistency following what William Foy saw in his vision when he beheld the mountain with the letters saying *'THE FATHER, AND THE SON.'* Revelations from God can never contradict revelations that precede them.

Furthermore, we see throughout Ellen White's writings that she only ever saw Two Divine Beings. She remained consistent because she was a prophet of God. She only ever mentioned Two Divine Beings being present during creation.

*'The Father and the Son engaged in the mighty, wondrous work they had contemplated, of creating the world. The earth came forth from the hand of the Creator exceedingly beautiful... After the earth was created, and the beasts upon it, the Father and Son carried out their purpose, which was designed before the fall of Satan, to make man in their own image. They had wrought together in the creation of the earth and every living thing upon it. And now God says to his Son, "Let us make man in our image."* - {1SP 24.1, 2}

Ellen White clearly reveals here that only Two Divine Beings were present during creation; *'God says to His Son.'* It was God and His Son who engaged in the work. There wasn't a third being that God spoke to, but He spoke to His Son only. Including a third divine being completely contradicts Spirit of Prophecy, which is what we are forced to do when we adopt the trinitarian belief. For example, General Conference President, Pastor Ted Wilson contradicts this Spirit of Prophecy statement. He said *'Let me also indicate that God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Spirit all participated in the literal creation of this world; they are the Godhead three in one.'*<sup>33</sup> - (Trinity Truth - 'Ted Wilson stating the Catholic Trinity')

Such is not revealed from inspiration. *'The work of God in the creation of man needed no undoing... The very dust of the ground from which man was formed was pure, and the breath of life which God breathed into his nostrils was holy. He was placed in Eden, the garden of God,... all was holy, all was clothed with spotless purity and unexcelled loveliness, and was in harmony with the character of the Father and the Son, by whom the worlds were made.'* - {ST December 12, 1895, par, 6}

Spirit of Prophecy also reveals that the plan of salvation was planned and executed by Two Divine Beings, not three. Ellen White says in her book, 'the Desire of Ages' that *'Before the foundations of the earth were laid, the Father and the Son had united in a covenant to redeem man if he should be overcome by Satan. They had clasped Their hands in a solemn pledge that Christ should become the surety for the human race. This pledge Christ has fulfilled. When upon the cross He cried out, "It is finished," He addressed the Father. The compact had been fully carried out. Now He declares: Father, it is finished. I have done Thy will, O My God. I have completed the work of redemption. If Thy justice is satisfied, "I will that they also, whom Thou hast given Me, be with Me where I am."* John

19:30; 17:24.’ - {DA 834.2}

The Father and the Son ‘*had clasped Their hands*’ in agreement that if man would fall, Christ the Son would die in their place. Only Two Beings were involved in this agreement. Ellen White makes this clear again when she says, ‘*The great plan of redemption was laid before the foundation of the world. And Christ, our Substitute and Surety, **did not stand alone** in the wondrous undertaking of the ransom of man. In the plan to save a lost world, the **counsel was between them both**; the covenant of peace was **between the Father and the Son**. “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” The Majesty of heaven, the King of glory, would become a servant. The only-begotten Son, in whom the Father delighted, was given for the ransom of a fallen race.*’ - {ST December 23, 1897, par, 2} Here Sister White says that Christ wasn’t alone in His work of saving man, but ‘*the counsel was between them both*’. The word ‘*both*’ can only ever refer to exactly two things, so Christ’s counsel was with one other Being, and this was with His Father, hence, ‘*the covenant of peace was between the Father and the Son*’. This is 100% consistent and in harmony with what the Prophet Zechariah revealed. ‘*And speak unto him, saying, Thus speaketh the LORD of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is **The BRANCH** (Jesus); and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the LORD: Even he shall build the temple of the LORD; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and **the counsel of peace shall be between them both**.*’ - (Zech 6:12-13) Ellen G. White was truly a prophet of God, and thereby consistently remained in harmony with the prophets of Scripture when she was under inspiration.

According to Sister White, transgression of God’s holy law dishonours Two Divine Beings. ‘*But in the transgression of man **both the Father and the Son** were dishonored.*’ - {ST December 12, 1895, par, 7}

‘*But the Son of God, who was with the Father before the world was, took pity upon us in our lost condition, and **offered to step in between us** and the wrath of an offended God. Said Jesus, I will give my life for them. I will take the burden of the sins of the world upon men, and will make a way possible for these transgressors to find pardon and enjoy **thy** favor again, that they may repent and keep **thy** commandments, and again have access to the tree of life. **God consented to give his only Son** to die for lost man.*’ - {YI August 1, 1852, par, 6}

‘*We can not understand the mystery of redemption. It is enough for us to know that God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son to die for us. The penalty of our transgression fell upon a pure, holy, innocent Substitute, even the Son of God... The plan of salvation **devised by the Father and the Son** will be a grand success.*’ - {ST June 17, 1903, par, 1, 2}

This is why the great cost it took to redeem lost souls cannot truly be understood by any beings in the universe, except Two, God and His Son Jesus Christ. ‘***God and Christ alone know** what the souls of men have cost.*’ - {ST January 13, 1909, par, 8}

*'Can anyone consider the condescension of God in preparing the gospel feast, and its great cost, and treat the invitation slightly? No man, nor even the highest angel, can estimate the great cost; it is **known only to the Father and the Son**. The love of God for sinful man is beyond computation. It is the wonder of all heaven, but none can comprehend it.'* - {BEcho October 28, 1895, par, 4}

None in all of heaven can comprehend the great cost of Christ's sacrifice for us, except the Father & the Son. This mystery of God's love is **'known only to the Father and the Son.'** Surely if there was a third divine being, they too would be included in this knowledge? But there isn't a third divine being, Christ alone is equal to God, no one else. This is why only Christ could step in to redeem mankind and bridge the separation between us and God, there was no other being that could fulfil this role.

*'The Son of God, heaven's glorious Commander, was touched with pity for the fallen race... divine love had conceived a plan whereby man might be redeemed. The broken law of God demanded the life of the sinner. **In all the universe there was but One** who could, in behalf of man, satisfy its claims. Since the divine law is as sacred as God Himself, **only one equal with God** could make atonement for its transgression. **None but Christ** could redeem fallen man from the curse of the law, and bring him again into harmony with Heaven. Christ would take upon Himself the guilt and shame of sin—sin so offensive to a holy God that it must separate **the Father and the Son.**'* - {ST November 4, 1908, par, 2}

Ellen White tells us that in *'all the universe there was but one'* that could pay the ransom, for there was *'only one equal with God'*, and she identifies that this one was **'none but Christ.'** The trinitarian cannot accept this for they must believe that there is a third divine member in heaven that is equal with God the Father. But inspiration clearly shows us that there is only one equal with God, and that's His Son Jesus Christ, there is no other being that shares equality with God. This is exactly why we see from the pen of inspiration that only the Lord Jesus Christ could be involved in the counsels of God, no one else.

*'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.** "By Him were all things created, that are in heaven, ... whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers" (Colossians 1:16); **and to Christ, equally with the Father, all heaven gave allegiance.**'* - {GC 493.1}

Sister White here tells us that Christ is **'the only being in all the universe that could enter into all the counsels and purposes of God.'** There is no other being that is allowed to enter. Again, surely if there was a third divine being, they too would be allowed to enter this? But no, it is Christ only, thus, we see that *'all heaven gave allegiance'* to Two Beings only: the Lord Jesus Christ and God His Father.

It was just Two Beings who devised the plan of salvation, therefore, it'll just be Two Beings who are vindicated for their master plan of salvation; God and His Son, no one else.

*'The act of Christ in dying for the salvation of man would not only make heaven accessible to men, but **before all the universe it would justify God and His Son** in their dealing with the rebellion of Satan.'* - {PP 68.2}

*'And as Christ in His expiring agony upon the cross cried out, "It is finished" (John 19:30), a shout of triumph rang through every world and through heaven itself. The great contest that had been so long in progress in this world was now decided, and Christ was conqueror. His death had answered the question **whether the Father and the Son** had sufficient love for man to exercise self-denial and a spirit of sacrifice.'* - {PP 69.3}

This is why Ellen White only ever mentions Two Divine Beings that receive worship in heaven: God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. *'All the heavenly angels are at the service of the humble, believing people of God; and as the Lord's army of workers here below sing their songs of praise, the choir above join with them in ascribing praise to **God and to His Son**.'* - {AA 154.1}

*'God wants you to receive the wisdom that He has for you. He wants you to be Bible students and Bible believers, living in obedience to the words, "Thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength..." "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." In your hands will be placed a golden harp, and touching its strings, you will join with the redeemed host in filling all heaven with songs of praise to **God and His Son**.'* - {AUCR January 15, 1903, par.14}

*'In the beginning **the Father and the Son** had rested upon the Sabbath after Their work of creation. When "the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them" (Genesis 2:1),... A restored creation, a redeemed race, that having conquered sin could never fall,—this, the result to flow from Christ's completed work,... When there shall be a "restitution of all things,... Heaven and earth will unite in praise, as "from one Sabbath to another" (Isaiah 66:23) the nations of the saved shall bow in joyful **worship to God and the Lamb**.'* - {DA 769.2} So 'in the beginning' it was 'the Father and the Son' who created the world together, and it was Them who instituted the Sabbath, and after the new earth is created, the redeemed will still be observing the Sabbath giving praise to the same Two Divine Beings that instituted the Sabbath from the beginning: 'God and the Lamb'. This picture Ellen White gives us is in complete harmony with the picture the prophet John gives us of the new earth where God and the Lamb are worshipped by the saints of God forever (See Rev 21:22-24, 22:1, 3).

In the garden of Eden, Adam & Eve were in fellowship with only Two Divine Beings.

*'After the earth was created, and the beasts upon it, **the Father and Son** carried out their purpose... And now **God says to his Son**, "Let us make man in our image." ... Adam and Eve were charmed with the beauties of their Eden home. They were delighted with the little songsters around them, wearing their bright yet graceful plumage, and warbling forth their happy, cheerful music. The holy pair united with them and raised their voices in*

harmonious songs of love, **praise and adoration, to the Father and his dear Son,** for the tokens of love which surrounded them.’ - {1SP 24.2, 26.3}

Two Beings were involved in the creation of Adam & Eve, therefore, Adam & Eve praised and worshipped just these Two Beings, which are *‘the Father and Son’*. The married couple didn’t worship a third being, neither did the angels, and neither should we. This is why inspiration tells us that we are to worship the Father and the Son **alone**, no one else. Ellen White says *‘Let the brightest example the world has yet seen be your example, rather than the greatest and most learned men of the age, **who know not God, nor Jesus Christ whom he has sent. The Father and the Son alone are to be exalted.**’* - {YI July 7, 1898, par.2} We are to exalt *‘The Father and the Son **alone**’*.

If there was a third divine being that was involved in our creation beside the Father & the Son, surely they too would be worthy of exaltation? This belief in a third divine being has once again forced many to practise things contrary to inspiration, for it has led people to worship somebody else other than God and His Son. For example, Adventist pastor, Pastor Roy Ice, taught his congregation at Loma Linda University (a Seventh-day Adventist university) that they shouldn’t only pray to the Father & the Son, but they should pray to ‘God the Spirit’ too. He stated:

*‘When’s the last time you prayed to Jesus? Probably today. When’s the last time you said our Father? Within a day. **When’s the last time you said dear Holy Spirit,** I’ve got a prayer for you today? **I know you’re the one** (addressing the Holy Spirit) *that’s working on this earth right now, **I know you’re the one in control, I know you’re the one bringing power, bringing knowledge, bringing wisdom, bringing comfort, bringing peace.** I know you’re the one that’s right here interactive with us right now. **You are God, God the Spirit, I want to talk to you right now...** I need a partner with you on this.**

**When’s the last time you said dear Holy Spirit and set a prayer?**<sup>34</sup> - (‘Adventist pastor teaches his church to pray directly to the Holy Spirit!’), [Mins 00:09-00:45]

Pastor Roy Ice here is speaking completely contrary to the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy. He urges his congregation to pray to somebody else other than the Father & Son. He states that it’s somebody else other than Christ that is *‘working on this earth right now’* and is *‘the one in control’*. He’s taking all the glory from Jesus Christ and accrediting it to someone else called *‘God the Spirit’*. Satan is the author of such practices and teachings for **‘He has sought to shut Jesus from their (the Church) view as the Comforter... Satan has achieved his greatest success through interposing himself between the soul and the Saviour.’** - {RH August 26, 1890, par, 10, 11} Teaching people that we should pray to a third mysterious being called ‘God the Holy Spirit,’ which doesn’t even have a name, is completely erroneous. And as we’ve seen from Pastor Roy Ice, many are being led astray to follow this deception of the enemy. Satan’s sole goal is to take our eyes off Jesus Christ our Lord, our only hope and source of life. Satan will put anything in our way to take our eyes off Christ, and give worship to someone else, and he doesn’t care what name it’s called, even if it has an unbiblical ‘pious’ title like ‘God the Holy Spirit.’ As long as Jesus is shut from our view as the comforter, Satan is satisfied.

Moreover, God the Father is the Ultimate Supreme Lawgiver, and His Son Jesus Christ is next in authority to Him. **'God is a moral governor as well as a Father. He is the Lawgiver. He makes and executes His laws. Law that has no penalty is of no force.'** - {12MR 208.2}

**'The Son of God was next in authority to the great Lawgiver. He knew that his life alone could be sufficient to ransom fallen man. He was of as much more value than man as his noble, spotless character, and exalted office as commander of all the heavenly host, were above the work of man. He was in the express image of his Father, not in features alone, but in perfection of character.'** - {RH December 17, 1872, par. 1}

Now if we are to believe that there is a third divine being, then common sense would have it that 'God the Holy Spirit' would be next in authority after the Son of God. However, the Lord revealed to His prophet that before the fall of Satan in heaven, Lucifer was the one that was next in authority after Jesus Christ, and he grew envious because he too wanted to receive the same honour as God's Son.

**'The Lord has shown me** that Satan was once an honored angel in heaven, **next to Jesus Christ...** And I saw that when **God said to his Son,** Let us make man in our image, **Satan was jealous of Jesus. He wished to be consulted concerning the formation of man.** He was filled with envy, jealousy and hatred. He wished to be the highest in heaven, **next to God, and receive the highest honors.** Until this time all heaven was in order, harmony and perfect subjection to the government of God.' - {1SG 17.1}

Again, we also see that it was just two beings involved in the creation of man. It was God and His Son who devised the plan to create man, there was no third being. Satan wished to be that third being involved in the creation of man, and 'he was filled with envy, jealousy and hatred' because of this. When we insist that there was someone else besides the Father & Son involved in creation, who are we truly trying to place in that council besides God and Christ?

We must remember that Satan longed to also be involved in the Divine counsels, and he was envious of the position and authority that Christ held. Satan also wanted to be equal in authority to God, yet he was a creature. Satan had coveted after the glory and honour that was given to Christ, and he made efforts to place himself in the position of Christ and also receive adoration. Let's look further at what was revealed to Sister White in regards to Satan's rebellion in heaven.

**'Satan in Heaven, before his rebellion, was a high and exalted angel, next in honor to God's dear Son...** yet Jesus, God's dear Son, had the pre-eminence over all the angelic host. He was one with the Father before the angels were created. **Satan was envious of Christ, and gradually assumed command which devolved on Christ alone...** The great Creator assembled the heavenly host, that he might in the presence of all the angels confer special honor upon his Son. **The Son was seated on the throne with the Father,** and the heavenly throng of holy angels was gathered around them. The Father then made known that it was ordained by himself **that Christ, his Son, should be equal with himself;** so that wherever was the presence of his Son, it was as his own presence. The word of the Son was to be obeyed as readily as the word of the Father. His



Son he had invested with authority to command the heavenly host. **Especially was his Son to work in union with himself** in the anticipated creation of the earth and every living thing that should exist upon the earth. His Son would carry out his will and his purposes, but would do nothing of himself alone. The Father's will would be fulfilled in him... **Satan was envious and jealous of Jesus Christ... Christ had been taken into the special counsel of God** in regard to his plans, **while Satan was unacquainted with them**. He did not understand, **neither was he permitted to know, the purposes of God**. But Christ was acknowledged sovereign of Heaven, his power and authority to be the same as that of God himself... Satan thought that he was himself a favorite in Heaven among the angels... Why should Christ thus be honored before himself? He (Satan) left the immediate presence of the Father, **dissatisfied, and filled with envy against Jesus Christ...**

As one aggrieved, he related the preference God had given Jesus to **the neglect of himself**... he (Satan) **would take the honor upon himself** which should have been conferred upon him... There was contention among the angels. Satan and his sympathizers were striving to reform the government of God. They were discontented and unhappy because they could not look into his unsearchable wisdom and ascertain his purposes in exalting his Son Jesus, and endowing him with such unlimited power and command. **They rebelled against the authority of the Son...** All the heavenly host were summoned to appear before the Father, to have each case determined. Satan unblushingly made known his dissatisfaction that Christ should be preferred before him. He stood up proudly and urged that he should be equal with God, and **should be taken into conference with the Father** and understand his purposes. God informed Satan that to **his Son alone he would reveal his secret purposes**, and he required all the family in Heaven, even Satan, to yield him implicit, unquestioned obedience; - {1SP 17.1, 2, 18.1, 2, 22.2}

This revelation given to Ellen White gives us deep insight into the great controversy that started in heaven. Firstly, we yet again see a third divine being completely absent from any of this. There was no third divine being next in authority to Christ and His Father. Rather, we see that it was Satan who was 'next in honor to God's dear Son.' Also, notice Sister White says that Satan 'gradually assumed command which **devolved** on Christ alone.' According to Webster's 1828 dictionary, the definition of '**devolved**' is 'rolled down' or 'passed over to another.' So again, Ellen White expresses the fact that Christ's authority and command was transmitted to Him from God. And Satan grew envious of this. God had blessed Lucifer with magnificent beauty and gave him the highest position amongst the angels (See Ezek 28:13-15). However, this wasn't enough for Lucifer. He wanted to be like the Most High (See Isa 14:12-14). But only Jesus Christ was like the Most High, for He was equal to the Most High, because He was the only-begotten Son of the Most High, whereas Lucifer was just a created angel, unlike Christ (See Heb 1:5-6). Hence, we see from the above Spirit of Prophecy paragraph that only Two Beings sat on the throne. It was '*The Son (who) was seated on the throne with the Father,*' no other being is mentioned. And we see that Satan felt that he was left out and felt that this was a '*neglect of himself*'. Satan wanted to include himself on God's throne, therefore, he '*gradually assumed command which devolved on Christ alone*', and '*he would take the honor upon himself*'. Satan was envious of the position that was held by only Two Beings. God would only reveal His secret purposes to '*His Son alone*', nobody else.

*‘Speaking of Satan, our Lord says that “he abode not in the truth.” He was once the covering cherub, glorious in beauty and holiness. **He** (Satan) **was next to Christ** in exaltation and character. It was with Satan that self-exaltation had its origin. He became jealous of Christ, and falsely accused him, and then laid blame upon the Father. He was envious of the **position that was held by Christ and the Father**... Though the angels had a knowledge **of God and of Jesus Christ**, though they were happy in the glorious service which they did for the King of heaven, yet, through his crooked representations of **Christ and the Father**, the evil one deceived a great company of angels, drew them into sympathy with himself, and associated them with himself in rebellion.’ - {RH October 22, 1895, par.1}*

*‘Christ’s humiliation is not understood and not appreciated. Forty days and nights Jesus was subjected to the temptations of the enemy—**the one who was once an angel next to Christ in majesty and glory in the heavenly courts**. It is stated, Thou wast exalted because of thy beauty, et cetera. But he wanted to have the place of Christ, and Christ was one with the Infinite God; and because this was not accorded him, **he became jealous, and he was the originator of sin**. Satan wished to change the government of God, to fix his own seal to the rules of God’s kingdom. Christ would not be brought into this desire, and **here the warfare against Christ commenced and waxed strong**. Working in secrecy but known to God, **Lucifer became a deceiving character. He told falsehood for truth.**’ - {16 MR 180.1 - 180.2}*

We see unequivocally that there was never a third divine member on the heavenly throne, but Satan wanted to be that third member. Satan wanted the same authority as the Son. Satan wanted to be involved in the Divine counsels. Satan wanted to be like God, and he still does. For thousands of years, Satan has worked on developing deceptions for God’s people to pay him homage, and through his prized and treasured institution: The Roman Catholic Church, Satan has deceived the Christian world into placing a third ‘divine’ member in the counsels of God, and paying this third being homage. Anyone who doesn’t pay homage to this third person or being called ‘God the Holy Spirit’ is seen as a heretic and blasphemer in the ‘orthodox’ Christian world, yet inspiration reveals that the angels of God never paid homage to a third being in heaven. Satan wants worship, and he’ll go by any name to receive that worship, whether it’s pagan idols, Mary, saints, or ‘God the Holy Spirit’. And ministers in our very own church are teaching that we can pray to and worship this third member. The deception is so strong that the professed churches of Christ including our own church will ardently fight against the truth that the Holy Spirit is the very presence of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Himself, and not somebody else. Such is the strength and potency of the wine of Babylon.

Now let’s see what Rome says in regards to the Holy Spirit.

*The doctrine of the Catholic Church concerning the Holy Ghost forms an integral part of her teaching on the mystery of the Holy Trinity,... The Holy Ghost is the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity. Though really **distinct, as a Person, from the Father and the Son,** He is consubstantial with Them; **being God like Them,** He possesses with Them one and the same Divine Essence or Nature... **Such is the belief the Catholic faith demands.**<sup>35</sup>*  
 - (Catholic Answers, 'Holy Ghost The Third Person of the Holy Trinity', Catholic Encyclopedia)

Since the Holy Spirit is a separate divine member of the Godhead/Trinity according to Rome, she follows the next logical step, which is giving this third member worship, just like to the Father & Son. The 'Catechism of the Catholic Church' states:

*To believe in the Holy Spirit is to profess that the Holy Spirit is one of the persons of the Holy Trinity, consubstantial with the Father and the Son: **"with the Father and the Son he is worshipped and glorified."**... "Holy Spirit" is the proper name of the one whom **we adore and glorify with the Father and the Son.**<sup>36</sup>* - (Catechism of the Catholic Church, 'I BELIEVE IN THE HOLY SPIRIT', No. 685, 691)

Jesuit priest, Kenneth Baker S.J, also expounds on this line of reasoning in regards to worshipping somebody else besides Christ and His Father. Let's analyse what he says.

*In the early history of the Church, the question arose about the nature and place of the Holy Spirit... When theological reflection on **Christian revelation began to develop in the third century and afterwards,** there was some question as to the divinity and the personality of the Holy Spirit. In order to affirm both of these points of the Creed states: **"With the Father and the Son he (the Holy Spirit) is worshipped and glorified."** **So, just as worship and glory are offered by Christians to the Father and the Son, so also are they with perfect right offered to the Holy Spirit. This means then that the Holy Spirit is co-equal with the Father and the Son in divinity and majesty...** We say in the Creed that we "worship" and "glorify" the Holy Spirit... **Thus worship and glory are offered to the Holy Spirit in the same sense as they are offered to the Father and the Son.** Thus a number of Catholic truths are expressed in the statement of the Creed. **We are proclaiming that the Holy Spirit is truly God...** Likewise we are stating that **the Holy Spirit is co-equal with the Father and the Son. He is the third Person in the Blessed Trinity...** It used to be said that the Holy Spirit was the "forgotten Person" of the Trinity. The reason for this was that most of the prayers of the Church are directed **to either the Father or the Son,** Also, the faithful seemed to prayer **primarily to Jesus or to the Father.** Since Vatican Council II there has been a significant change in this regard. More and more Catholics are speaking about the Holy Spirit, **praying to him and calling upon him...** At this period in the history of the Church, the Holy Spirit has come into his own. No longer can he be referred to as the "forgotten Person" of the Blessed Trinity.<sup>37</sup> - (Kenneth Baker, S.J., 'Worship of the Holy Spirit', Catholic Education Resource Center, (1995)*

Firstly, this Jesuit priest himself acknowledges that the separate deification of the Holy Spirit as a third distinct member of the Godhead had only *began to develop in the third century*

*and afterwards*’. This is no issue for Catholics because they place ‘church fathers’ and traditions on equal footing with the Bible. But for true Protestants, this should raise alarm bells, especially as it was only in the 4th century that the Nicene creed (AD 325) had been formulated to begin laying the foundations for the churches’ newly developed beliefs on the trinity, and Holy Spirit in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed of AD 381. As Adventists, we know that this was the century of the great apostasy where the Emperor Constantine I had changed the Sabbath to Sunday in AD 321. Moreover, the Jesuit goes on to say *‘with the Father and the Son he (the Holy Spirit) is worshipped and glorified.’* ‘God the Holy Spirit’ is worshipped *‘with the Father and the Son.’* Does this reflect what Christ revealed to Ellen White in regards to how many beings were worshipped in heaven? Have we seen at all from Sister White’s revelations that there was somebody else who the angels of God in heaven worshipped and gave glory to *‘in the same sense as they are offered to the Father and the Son?’*

The answer is we don’t, but we do see a third being who wished to be involved in the Divine counsels and receive worship like the Father & Son: Satan. And the church of Satan is telling us that there is a third divine member of the Godhead who *‘is co-equal with the Father and the Son. He is the third Person in the Blessed Trinity’.*

Also, we must take special note that this Jesuit has reiterated the exact same point that Adventist minister Pastor Roy Ice made in regards to the Holy Spirit being left out by the church in our worship and prayers. Remember, we’ve just seen Roy Ice pose the question earlier; *‘When’s the last time you said dear Holy Spirit and set a prayer?’* to make the point that the church had been only focusing on the Father and Son, and neglected this third divine member. And we’ve now seen the Jesuit say that *‘the Holy Spirit was the “forgotten Person” of the Trinity,’* because *‘most of the prayers of the Church are directed to either the Father or the Son, Also, the faithful seemed to prayer primarily to Jesus or to the Father.’* Both this Jesuit priest and this Adventist pastor are in agreement that worshipping the Father & Son alone is an error because somebody else needs to be worshipped alongside them. Such is not in harmony with inspiration, for we’ve seen the prophet proclaim that *‘The Father and the Son alone are to be exalted.’* - {YI July 7, 1898, par.2} Yet, the Christian world sees no issue with paying homage to someone else other than God and His Son. This is a masterpiece of deception from the enemy to *‘take the honor upon himself’* whilst disguising himself in righteous garbs, and leading the church to believe that it’s not just *‘Christ (who) had been taken into the special counsel of God’*, but there was somebody else *‘equal in dignity and majesty with the Father and the Son’*, (called God) *The Holy Spirit... (a) member of the Holy Trinity.*<sup>38</sup> - (John Paul Thomas, *‘My Catholic Faith!’*, (2019), Ch.6,)

The Christian world and our current General Conference SDA Churches may teach that *‘God the eternal Spirit was active with the Father and the Son in Creation...’*<sup>39</sup> (‘Seventh-day Adventist 28 Fundamental Beliefs’, (2015 Edition), No. 5, p, 4,) But we’ve affirmed from inspiration that only the Son of God was in communion with the Father from eternity, and no one else.

*'From eternity there was a complete unity **between the Father and the Son. They were two**, yet little short of being identical; two in individuality, **yet one in spirit**, and heart, and character.'* - {YI December 16, 1897, par, 5}

The prophet says there are **Two** Divine Beings (Father & Son) 'little short of being identical', but they are 'one in spirit'. This is why even after Lucifer's fall in heaven, there had been another angel (Gabriel) who had replaced him to be next in authority to the Son of God.

*'The Saviour had spoken through all the prophets. "The Spirit of Christ which was in them" "testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." 1 Peter 1:11... **It was Gabriel, the angel next in rank to the Son of God**, who came with the divine message to Daniel.'* - {DA 234.1, 2}

Again, as has kept being repeated, shouldn't the Holy Spirit be next in rank to the Son of God if it was another separate being? It is clear that there are only Two Divine Beings, and this is why life eternal is to know just Two Divine Beings, not three.

*"This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent."... And this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ... And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, **the only true God, and Jesus Christ**, whom thou hast sent." The sum and substance of the whole matter of Christian grace and experience is comprised in believing on Christ,—**in knowing God, and his Son**, whom he hath sent.'* - {BEcho, April 15, 1892, par.3, 4}

*'Christ prayed, "And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." Do we not all wish to know how to gain life eternal? It is gained by **knowing God and Jesus Christ**. We are to make our teaching in regard to this as plain and clear as possible, and then students will fall in love with it.'* - {AUCR July 26, 1899, Art A, par.23}

*"Now as never before we need to understand the true science of education. **If we fail to understand this, we shall never have a place in the kingdom of God.** "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, **the only true God, and Jesus Christ** whom thou hast sent.' If this is the price of heaven, **shall not our education be given on these lines?**"—P.C. July 8, 1897. - {PH140 6.2} True education stands firmly on knowing the Father & the Son, there is no third divine member that features in this. Our fellowship is with God and Christ (See 1 Jhn 1:3). John 17:3 would make no sense if we were to believe that the Only True God is a trinity, for we would then have to interpret Jesus' words as saying that 'this is life eternal to know thee, the Triune God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.' But such would clearly be illogical and a butchering of our Lord's Words. To believe such a thing would not be true understanding, for *'True education is the inculcation of those ideas which will impress the mind with the knowledge of **God the Creator, and Jesus Christ the only begotten Son of God.***' - {10LtMs, Ms 20, 1895, par.1}*

Moreover, as was briefly discussed, God's revelations are always consistent, and we touched briefly on the fact that William Foy and Ellen White's visions were consistent with the Apostle John, because John also saw just Two Divine Beings on the throne in the new earth.

*'And I saw no temple therein: for **the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb** are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of **God did lighten it, and the Lamb** is the light thereof... And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the **throne of God and of the Lamb**... And there shall be no more curse: but the **throne of God and of the Lamb** shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him:'* (Rev 21:22-23, 22:1, 3)

Ellen White understood and affirmed that when John saw the *'the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb'*, it was just Two Divine Beings he saw: The Father & The Son.

*'I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. Revelation 21:22. The people of God are privileged to hold open communion **with the Father and the Son**. "Now we see through a glass, darkly." We behold the image of God reflected, as in a mirror, in the works of nature and in His dealings with men; but then we shall see **Him** face to face, without a dimming veil between.*

*We shall stand in **His** presence and behold the glory of **His** countenance. We may address **Him** by the endearing name, "**Our Father,**" which is a sign of our affection for **Him** and a pledge of **His** tender regard and relationship to us. **And the Son of God**, beholding the heirs of grace, "is not ashamed to call them brethren." - {ML 365.1, 2, 3}*

Ellen White here gives us a beautiful insight into the communion we'll have with Two Divine Beings for all eternity. We'll finally be able to behold the very face of our God who is "**Our Father,**" and our Lord Jesus Christ, **'the Son of God'**. For all eternity we'll be growing in our knowledge of God and His Son.

*'And as the years of eternity roll, they will bring richer and more glorious revelations of **God and of Christ**. As knowledge is progressive, so will love, reverence, and happiness increase... "And every creature which is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto **Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb** for ever and ever." Revelation 5:13. - {SR 432.3, 433.1}*

Before the Second Advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, there will be two spiritual revivals. The remnant of God will have the Holy Spirit of Jesus Christ poured upon them, and there will be a counterfeit revival where the lost souls will be deceived into receiving a counterfeit spirit, which they will think is the Holy Spirit, when in reality it will be the spirit of Satan. The prophet Ellen White gives us great detail of this event.

*'Before the throne I saw the Advent people, the church, and the world. I saw a company, bowed down before the throne, deeply interested, while the most of them stood up disinterested and careless. Those who were bowed before the throne would offer up their prayers and look to Jesus; then he would look to his Father, and appeared to be pleading with Him. **A light would come from the Father to the Son, and from the Son to the praying company. Then I saw an exceeding bright light come from the***

**Father to the Son, and from the Son it waved over the people before the throne. But few would receive this great light; many came out from under it and immediately resisted it;** others were careless and did not cherish the light, and it moved off from them; some cherished it, and went and bowed down with the little praying company. This company all received the light, and rejoiced in it, as their countenances shone with its glory. And I saw the Father rise from the throne, and in a flaming Chariot go into the Holy of Holies, within the veil, and did sit. There I saw thrones that I had never seen before. Then Jesus rose up from the throne, and the most of those who were bowed down arose with Him; and I did not see one ray of light pass from Jesus to the careless multitude after he arose, and they were left in perfect darkness. Those who rose up when Jesus did, kept their eyes fixed on Him as He left the throne and led them out a little way.—Then He raised His right arm and we heard his lovely voice saying, **“Wait here—I am going to my Father to receive the Kingdom; keep your garments spotless, and in a little while I will return from the wedding and receive you to myself.”** And I saw a cloudy chariot, with wheels like flaming fire, and Angels were all around it as it came where Jesus was. He stepped into the chariot and was borne to the Holiest where the Father sat. There I beheld Jesus, as He was standing before the Father, a great High Priest. On the hem of His garment was a bell and pomegranate. Then Jesus shew me the difference between faith and feeling. And I saw those who rose up with Jesus send up their faith to Him in the Holiest, and pray—**my Father give us thy Spirit. Then Jesus would breathe upon them the Holy Ghost. In the breath was light, power, and much love, joy and peace.** Then I turned to look at the company who were still bowed before the throne; they did not know that Jesus had left it.—**Satan appeared to be by the throne, trying to carry on the work of God;** I saw them look up to the throne and pray, **my Father give us thy Spirit; then Satan would breathe upon them an unholy influence; in it there was light and much power, but no sweet love, joy and peace. Satan's object was to keep them deceived,** and to draw back and deceive God's children. I saw one after another leave the company who were praying to Jesus in the Holiest, and go and join those before the throne, **and they at once received the unholy influence of Satan.**' - {1EGWLM 105.2}

Unfortunately, the majority of God's professed people will think God is with them when in actual fact, they'll be left with the 'unholy influence of Satan' because they loved not the truth, and would insist on believing a lie (See 2 Thess 2:9-12). Great light would 'come from the Father to the Son, and from the Son to the praying company', but 'few would receive this great light', for many will resist it and choose the comfort of holding onto the deceptions of the enemy, and receive the spirit he offers. As we've seen, Paul had warned us about receiving a different spirit (See 2 Cor 11:4). We want the very Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, for it's in His own breath that we can receive 'light, power, and much love, joy and peace', which are the fruits of the Spirit. And again, the same point will be repeated because it's so important, **'It is not safe to catch the spirit from another. We want the Holy Spirit, which is Jesus Christ'** - {9LtMs, Lt 66, 1894, par 18.} We should take heed to the warnings of God's inspired writers.

Overall, we've seen that when we allow Sister White to interpret herself and not interpose our own presupposed beliefs into her statements, she did not write nor believe in a third

divine being called 'God the Holy Spirit', but rather she declared that it is Jesus Christ Himself who comes in the Person of the Holy Spirit. She taught that the Holy Spirit is Christ's own personal '*energizing presence*' whilst still an independent power from His physical self or humanity, thus, enabling Him to be omnipresent and still be with His Church as He promised (See Matt 28:20, Jhn 14:18, 21). We've now seen that by receiving this, we're receiving the '*breath of His own spirit (and) the life of His own life*', and we don't receive somebody else. This truth is essential for understanding the message of righteousness and sanctification by faith, for we need to understand that it is literally the righteous life of Christ that's imparted to us when He gives us His own Spirit to live in us and through us, this cannot be somebody else. We've seen that there was never a third divine being next to God and Christ in the divine counsels, but Lucifer who was next in authority to Christ wished to be a member in the divine counsels and also receive worship and adoration like the Father & Son. This isn't a side issue, but this is yet another attack on the authority of Jesus Christ, just like the attack on His true Sonship. When we refuse to accept that '*the Lord is that Spirit*' (2 Cor 3:17), we are essentially accrediting His role to somebody else and are thus aligning ourselves with Satan, and partaking in his rebellion to place him in the divine Counsels of God which belongs to Christ alone. Jesus Christ alone is equal with God, no one else. When we stop holding onto a handful of cherry picked verses that are strung together to formulate a spiritualised philosophical god, it is clear that the Bible doesn't reveal to us a multipersonal god that's made up of three, but rather, it reveals to us One Personal God, the Father, and One Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, for '*to us there is but **one God, the Father**, of whom are all things, and we in him; **and one Lord Jesus Christ**, by whom are all things, and we by him.*' - (1 Cor 8:6)

*'In the Bible every duty is made plain. Every lesson given is comprehensible. **Every lesson reveals to us the Father and the Son**' - {8T 157.2} When we abide in the true doctrine of Christ, we abide in Two Divine beings. '*Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.*' - (2 Jhn 9)*



## Chapter 6: The Pioneers on the Godhead

In this next chapter we will look at what the Seventh-day Adventist pioneers believed concerning the ‘Godhead’, and what their understanding of the identity of God and Christ actually were (albeit we’ve already seen many statements from them in regards to this). Moreover, we will see if their beliefs could be harmonised with the notion of a triune God, modalistic God or any other belief.

Firstly, it is important to know that the pioneers were not given the gift of prophecy, and thus, their writings are not inspired like the writings of Ellen G. White. However, it’s still important for us as Adventists to acknowledge that God’s hand was leading the pioneers at the start of the Advent movement out of the fallen churches, and He led them into greater understanding and truths of Him and His Word. In fact, God revealed to Ellen White that the generations of believers after the pioneers (us) were to keep their publications and repeat their words, for God blessed them with great truth that enabled them to lay the foundations for our church.

*‘By some, the truths that lie at the very foundation of our faith are being sacrificed. **God has given me light regarding our periodicals. What is it?**—He has said that the dead are to speak. How?—Their works shall follow them. **We are to repeat the words of the pioneers in our work**, who knew what it cost to search for the truth as for hidden treasure, and **who labored to lay the foundation of our work. They moved forward step by step under the influence of the Spirit of God.** One by one these pioneers are passing away. **The word given me is, Let that which these men have written in the past be reproduced...**We are now to understand what the pillars of our faith are,—the truths that have made us as a people what we are, leading us on step by step.’ - {RH May 25, 1905, par. 20-21, 23}*

This is a message we are to take heed to. Ellen White received the word from God that ‘we are to repeat the words of the pioneers’ and reproduce their publications because ‘they moved forward step by step under the influence of the Spirit of God’, and thus received great light that would be for our own benefit. Clearly then, we are not to just discard the pioneers’ writings, but it is our responsibility to examine them and compare them with Scripture and Spirit of Prophecy, and take hold of that which is in harmony with inspiration. And what could be more important than examining what the early men of influence and founders of our Church believed about the very identity of our God? Therefore, examine the pioneers’ writings we will do, and see if they line up with what we’ve examined through Scripture and Spirit of Prophecy throughout this document so far.

Beginning with Alonzo T. Jones, we see that he too believed and taught that Christ was truly born from God in heaven, just like Ellen White did, as was shown in chapters 2 and 3 of this document. He stated:

*'He (Jesus) was born of the Holy Ghost. In other words, Jesus Christ was born again. He came from heaven, God's first-born, to the earth, and was born again. But all in Christ's work goes by opposites for us: He, the sinless one, was made to be sin in order that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. He, the living One, the Prince and Author of life, died that we might live. He whose goings forth have been from the days of eternity, the first-born of God, was born again in order that we might be born again.'<sup>40</sup> - (A.T Jones, E.G Waggoner, 'Lessons on Faith', p. 101)*

A.T Jones was also in agreement with Ellen White that Christ was the only Being that could fully reflect the Father's image, and that He is the only one equal with God because He is the only-begotten Son of God, and thus partakes of God's exact nature.

*'A mirror gives no light of its own. A mirror reflects the light that shines upon it. We all, with open face, behold in the face of Jesus Christ, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord; therefore, Christ is the one through whom the Father is reflected to the whole universe. He alone could reflect the Father in His fullness, because His goings forth have been from the days of eternity, and as it says in the eighth of Proverbs, "I was with him, as one brought up with him." He was one of God, equal with God and His nature is the nature of God. Therefore one grand necessity that He alone should come to the world and save man was because the Father wanted to manifest Himself fully to the sons of men, and none in the universe could manifest the Father in His fullness except the only begotten Son, who is in the image of the Father. No creature could do it, because He is not great enough. Only He whose goings forth have been from the days of eternity could do it; consequently, He came and God dwelt in Him. How much? "All the fullness of the Godhead bodily" is reflected in Him. And this is not only to men on the earth, but it is that in the dispensation of the fullness of times He might gather together in one—in Christ—all things which are in heaven and which are on earth. In Christ God is manifested to the angels and reflected to men in the world in a way in which they cannot see God otherwise.' - {GCB/GCDB 1895, p. 378.4 - 5}*

This mirrors what we've seen repeatedly from Ellen White in the previous chapter. A.T Jones is reiterating the point that none in the universe could reflect the Father 'except the only begotten Son'. There's no third divine being that also reflects the Father's image according to A.T Jones, it's none but Christ that does in all the universe. God never had a second begotten son, He had one and only one truly begotten Son, hence, this only begotten Son bears the image of God, for God is literally His Father. As we've discussed earlier, that's how God has set it forth in nature. We bear the image and nature of our parents, we inherit their humanity, likewise Christ inherited His Father's Divinity. Christ is fully God by nature because He is the Son of God. Can we not see why Christ being truly begotten is so important, and why the pioneers kept stressing this point? Can we not see why Satan has been so hard bent on obscuring this fact from his rebellion in heaven?

A.T Jones is also in agreement with the statements we've seen from Sister White where she says that the Holy Spirit is the personal presence of Christ Himself. He said:

*'We receive the promise of the Spirit through faith; but what brings it? The Spirit of God; and when we have that, Christ dwells in the heart. Then it is the Holy Spirit that brings the **personal presence of Jesus Christ**, and in bringing His personal presence to us, **He brings Himself. Then it is the mind of Christ**, by which we may comprehend, investigate, and revel in, the deep things of God which He reaches down and brings forth to our understanding and sets them before us in their plainness. That is what we must have, in order to have the **presence of Christ**, in order to have the righteousness of Christ, in order that we may have the latter rain, in order that we may give the loud cry.'*<sup>A1</sup> (A.T Jones, '1893 GC Bulletin – A.T Jones Sermons on the Third Angels Message', NO.11, p.110/246)

So according to A.T Jones, the Holy Spirit is the 'personal presence of Jesus Christ', and 'the mind of Christ'. This mirrors what Ellen White said. And it's the Holy Spirit we as believers need because we must have the 'presence of Christ', and 'righteousness of Christ' according to A.T Jones. To have the righteousness of Christ means we need to literally have the very Spirit of Christ in us, which is His life.

Furthermore, we can find even more evidence that Ellen White shared these sentiments and approved of them. For example, in 1888, A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner presented a series of presentations on Christ and His righteousness at the General Conference Session, and Sister White wrote concerning this:

*'I call upon God's people to open their eyes. When you sanction or carry out the decisions of men who, as you know, are not in harmony with truth and righteousness, you weaken your own faith and lessen your relish for communion with God... **The Lord in His great mercy sent a most precious message to His people through Elders Waggoner and Jones. This message was to bring more prominently before the world the uplifted Saviour**, the sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. It presented justification through faith in the Surety;... This is the message that God commanded to be given to the world. It is the third angel's message, which is to be proclaimed with a loud voice, and attended with the outpouring of His Spirit in a large measure.'* - {1888 1336.1-2}

Clearly, Ellen White approved of the 1888 presentations that were given by A.T Jones and E.J Waggoner, and she even reveals that God Himself had given the approval of these messages, for it's He who 'sent a most precious message to His people through Elders Waggoner and Jones'. Thankfully, E.J Waggoner compiled the notes from the presentation into a book which is titled 'Christ and His Righteousness'. A handful of quotes from this book has already been used in the previous chapters of this document. Again, Ellen White said concerning the teachings of this presentation that, 'I know it would be dangerous to denounce Dr. Waggoner's position as wholly erroneous. **This would please the enemy.** I see the beauty of truth in the presentation of the righteousness of Christ in relation to the

law as the doctor has placed it before us... ***That which has been presented harmonizes perfectly with the light which God has been pleased to give me during all the years of my experience.***' - {5LtMs, Ms 15, 1888, par.7}

Ellen White tells us that 'it would be dangerous to denounce Dr. Waggoner's position as wholly erroneous', and that the messages of his 1888 presentation were in perfect harmony with the light that God had given her 'during all the years' of her experience. We would thus do well to investigate what this presentation said concerning our Lord Jesus Christ.

Firstly, we'll look at a statement that's already been shown in this document from the book 'Christ and His Righteousness', which tells us that at some point in eternity past, Christ proceeded forth from the Father. The book states,

*"The Word was "in the beginning." The mind of man cannot grasp the ages that are spanned in this phrase. **It is not given to men to know when or how the Son was begotten**; but we know that He was the Divine Word, not simply before He came to this earth to die, but even before the world was created... more than seven hundred years before His first advent, His coming was thus foretold by the word of inspiration: "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto Me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from the days of eternity." Micah 5:2, margin. **We know that Christ "proceeded forth and came from God" (John 8:42), but it was so far back in the ages of eternity** as to be far beyond the grasp of the mind of man."<sup>42</sup> (E. J. Waggoner, 'Christ and His Righteousness', p. 10/9)*

The book also emphatically stresses the point that Christ is not a creature. E.J Waggoner is in complete agreement with what has been presented in this document thus far, that Jesus Christ was not created, but He was begotten, which is entirely different according to the book. We see in the book that it's argued that Christ's equality with God is linked to the fact that He's begotten of God, and thus inherited all His Father's attributes. Our Lord Jesus Christ's divinity is ardently defended by the fact that He is begotten.

*'Before passing to some of the practical lessons that are to be learned from these truths, we must dwell for a few moments upon an opinion that is honestly held by many who would not for any consideration willingly dishonor Christ, but who, through that opinion, **do actually deny His Divinity. It is the idea that Christ is a created being**, who, through the good pleasure of God, was elevated to His present lofty position... But this view antagonizes the scripture which declares that Christ Himself created all things. To say that God began His work of creation by creating Christ is to leave Christ entirely out of the work of creation... **Now if He created everything that was ever created, and existed before all created things, it is evident that He Himself is not among created things.** He is above all creation and not a part of it. The Scriptures declare that Christ is "the only begotten son of God." **He is begotten, not created...** There was a time when Christ proceeded forth and came from God, from the bosom of the Father (John 8:42; 1:18)... **the point is that Christ is a begotten Son, and not a created subject.** He has by inheritance a more excellent Name than the angels; He is "a Son over His own house." Heb. 1:4; 3:6. **And since He is the only-begotten Son of God, He is of the very substance and nature of God, and possesses by birth all the attributes of God**; for the Father was pleased that His Son should be the express image of His Person,*

*the brightness of His glory, and filled with all the fullness of the Godhead.*<sup>43</sup> - (E. J. Waggoner, 'Christ and His Righteousness', p.17-19/19-22)

It is interesting that Waggoner stresses that for Christ to be created would be a denial of His divinity, yet Waggoner defends His divinity by maintaining that Christ has a beginning as a begotten Son. This is interesting because many theologians and teachers equate Christ being begotten with a denial of His divinity, as they make the two (created & begotten) synonymous to each other. But the pioneers understood that inspiration reveals these two are not the same and they understood that Christ being begotten of God is the basis for His divinity. E.J Waggoner also states in his book that Christ is rightfully called God and has the name of God (Jehovah). According to Waggoner, as a Son begotten, Christ is fully God, and thereby the name of God is given to Him by inheritance.

*In many places in the Bible Christ is called God. The Psalmist says: "The mighty God, even the Lord [Jehovah], hath spoken, and called the earth from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof... He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that He may judge His people... And the heavens shall declare His righteousness; for God is judge Himself." Ps. 50:1-6. That this passage has reference to Christ may be known (1) by the fact already learned, **that all judgment is committed to the Son**; and (2) by the fact that it is at the second coming of Christ that He sends His angels to gather together His elect from the four winds. Matt. 24:31. "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence."... **This is one of His rightful titles**... This name was not given to Christ in consequence of some great achievement, but it is His by right of inheritance. Speaking of the power and greatness of Christ, the writer to the Hebrews says that He is made so much better than the angels, because **"He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they."** Heb. 1:4. **A son always rightfully takes the name of the father; and Christ, as "the only begotten Son of God," has rightfully the same name.** A son, also, is, to a greater or less degree, a reproduction of the father; he has, to some extent, the features and personal characteristics of his father; not perfectly, because there is no perfect reproduction among mankind. But there is no imperfection in God, or in any of His works; and so Christ is the "express image" of the Father's person. Heb. 1:3. **As the Son of the self-existent God, He has by nature all the attributes of Deity.** It is true that there are many sons of God; **but Christ is the "only begotten Son of God," and therefore the Son of God in a sense in which no other being ever was or ever can be.** The angels are sons of God, as was Adam (Job 38:7; Luke 3:38), by creation; Christians are the sons of God by adoption (Rom. 8:14, 15); **but Christ is the Son of God by birth.** The writer to the Hebrews further shows that the position of the Son of God is not one to which Christ has been elevated, **but that it is one which He has by right.**'<sup>44</sup> - (E. J. Waggoner, 'Christ and His Righteousness', p.10-12/9-12)*

So we see that according to Waggoner, our Lord Jesus Christ is most assuredly fully God. The pioneers had no issue with Christ being begotten yet fully God, it's we who make an issue out of it down to our own misunderstandings, preconceived ideas, and faulty human reasonings. As shown by Waggoner, the Bible clearly reveals to us that Jesus is fully God, but we must understand how Scripture presents this fact. Is Christ fully God because He is another co-eternal being with the Father? The answer is no because the Bible doesn't reveal such.

Christ is fully God because He is begotten of God, and thus, He's God by nature. 'As *the Son of the self-existent God, He has by nature all the attributes of Deity*'. This was the message from the Father that Christ gave to His disciples, and He earnestly wanted them to understand and believe this truth, the truth that Jesus Christ truly came out from God the Father. '***For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.***' - (Jhn 17:8)

We don't honour God or Christ when we divert from what Jesus revealed to us about Himself and His relation to His Father. According to E.J Waggoner's book, we honour the Father & Son when we rightly acknowledge Their positions and relations to each other. He states,

*'A word of caution may be necessary here. Let no one imagine that we would exalt Christ at the expense of the Father, or would ignore the Father. That cannot be, for their interests are one. We honor the Father in honoring the Son. **We are mindful of Paul's words, that "to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him"** (1 Cor. 8:6); just as we have already quoted, that it was by Him that God made the worlds. **All things proceed ultimately from God, the Father; even Christ Himself proceeded and came forth from the Father;** but it has pleased the Father that in Him should all fullness dwell, and that **He should be the direct, immediate Agent in every act of creation. Our object in this investigation is to set forth Christ's rightful position of equality with the Father,** in order that His power to redeem may be the better appreciated.<sup>45</sup> - (E. J. Waggoner, 'Christ and His Righteousness', p.17/19)*

So we honour the Father when we acknowledge Him as the One Supreme source of all things and understand that '*all things proceed ultimately from God, the Father; even Christ Himself.*' And we honour Christ when we acknowledge Him as being God's Son who proceeded forth from Him, inherited all His divinity, and is the 'Agent' through Whom all things were created. God the Father accomplishes everything through His only begotten Son, Jesus Christ. When we reject Christ's own personal testimony that He is begotten of God, (Jhn 3:16-18) and say He is co-eternal with the Father, we are essentially rejecting Him as truly being God's Son and are thus dishonouring both Him and His Father who sent Him. '**Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also.**' - (1 Jhn 2:23)

Furthermore, Waggoner also affirms in his book that The Father & Son share the same Divine Spirit.

*'We cannot understand how Christ could be God and still become man for our sake. We cannot understand how He could create the world from nothing, nor how He can raise the dead, nor yet how it is that He works by His Spirit in our own hearts; yet we believe and know these things. **It should be sufficient for us to accept as true those things which God has revealed,** without stumbling over things that the mind of an angel cannot fathom. So we delight in the infinite power and glory which the Scriptures declare belong to Christ, without worrying our finite minds in a vain attempt to explain the*

Infinite. Finally, **we know the Divine unity of the Father and the Son** from the fact that **both have the same Spirit**. Paul, after saying that they that are in the flesh cannot please God, continues: "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." Rom. 8:9. **Here we find that the Holy Spirit is both the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ.**<sup>46</sup> (E. J. Waggoner, 'Christ and His Righteousness', p.20/23)

So here we see Waggoner claim that there is one single 'Divine unity of the Father and the Son', and we can know this from the fact that they both possess 'the same Spirit', the one Divine Spirit. Remember, when we receive Christ we receive the Father as well, for the Father is in Christ and Christ is in the believer through that same Divine Spirit, hence, Waggoner states that '*we find that the Holy Spirit is both the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ*'. Now we do not know how God's Spirit is able to be active everywhere at once. Nor do we know how Christ is fully Divine, yet was able to die, or how Christ is fully God but also fully Man. These things we don't know or understand, but we believe and accept them as truths because it's what the Bible tells us. As Waggoner says, '*it should be sufficient for us to accept as true those things which God has revealed*'. We must remember that '**The secret things belong unto the LORD our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever...**' - (Deut 29:29)

This doesn't then give us a licence to interpose our own ideas that we think may fill in the gaps to things we don't fully understand or God hasn't fully revealed to us in His Word. This is one of the ways that the trinity doctrine was slowly formulated in the first place. Hellenistic men heavily influenced by Greek philosophy weren't satisfied with just accepting what Scripture reveals, but rather they wanted to make sense of things they couldn't understand, and they covered God's Word in philosophical mysteries. They saw that Divinity was accredited to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and that there is One God according to the Bible. So they built a philosophical idea to explain that which they couldn't fully grasp, and formed an assumption that the One God of the Bible must be made up of three separate individuals who are one in some mysterious philosophical way (one in essence, three in person), even though this isn't actually what God said about Himself in Scripture. Such is a god of man's construction and imagination.

We've seen clearly then from E.J Waggoner's book, 'Christ and His Righteousness', that there was no teaching of God being triune, but rather, the One God of the Scriptures is the Father and Christ was literally begotten of Him, which makes Him fully God by nature. We've not seen evidence of Ellen White rebuking the teachings found in 'Christ and His Righteousness', but instead we've already seen that she commended the work and even went as far as saying '*that which has been presented harmonizes perfectly with the light which God has been pleased to give me during all the years of my experience.*' According to Ellen White, the messages presented in 'Christ and His Righteousness' were sent from '*The Lord in His great mercy*' which '*was to bring more prominently before the world **the uplifted Saviour***'. These are very bold statements and clearly demonstrate that Ellen White was in full agreement with everything that E.J Waggoner and Alonzo T. Jones had presented in their

1888 presentations, as well as everything being presented harmonising with what God revealed to her. Now it is true that the context of Ellen White's commendations were in regards to the message of Christ's righteousness by faith, but surely God's prophet wouldn't have made such statements about the presentations if she believed they contained error and heresy about the identity of our Lord Jesus Christ. This would not make sense.

We can also analyse statements from Waggoner elsewhere that show the exact same sentiments as the ones in 'Christ and His Righteousness.' For example, in 'the present truth 1891', Waggoner makes it clear that he believed Christ was the begotten Son of God prior to His resurrection and incarnation here on earth. Waggoner stated,

*"And declared to be the Son of God, ... by the resurrection from the dead." **This must not be understood as meaning that Jesus was not the Son of God before His resurrection, nor that He was not declared to be the Son of God before that time. We well know that He was the Son of God before the world was,** and He was then glorified with the glory of the Father. It was as the dearly-loved, **only-begotten Son of God that Christ came to this earth.** When He was baptized, at the beginning of his earthly ministry, the voice of God came from heaven saying, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Matthew 3:17. Upon the mount of transfiguration that voice again was heard, saying, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him." Matthew 17:5. And all through his earthly life, **Jesus did not hesitate to declare Himself the Son of God.** So we know that the resurrection did not affect His relationship with God.' - {PTUK July 16, 1891, page 232.3}*

Again, we also see that E.J. Waggoner stated elsewhere that Jesus Christ is superior to the angels because He is begotten, not created, and is very Creator Himself, thus, showing a clear understanding of the distinction between being begotten and being created.

***"The fact that Jesus is spoken of as the only-begotten Son of God should be sufficient to establish a belief in His divinity. As Son of God, He must partake of the nature of God.**" As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given the Son to have life in Himself." John 5:26. Life and immortality are imparted to the faithful people of God, but **Christ alone shares with the Father of the power to impart life. He has "life in Himself;" that is, He is able to perpetuate His own existence...** That Christ is Divine is shown by the fact that He receives worship. Angels have always refused to receive worship and adoration. But we read of the Father, that "when He bringeth in the first begotten into the world, He saith, And let all the angels of God worship Him." Hebrews 1:6. **If He is to receive worship from angels, it follows as a matter of course that He should receive worship from men...** - {PTUK December 18, 1890, page 409.1, 2}*

*'Let us take a little review of what we have already passed over. In the first chapter we learn that God still speaks to us by His Son, who is Heir of all things, by whom all things were created, and who, because He is the shining of the Father's glory and the very image of His substance, and bears all things upon His own life, has made reconciliation for sins, and is seated at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, having "a name that is above every name." **He is better than the angels, because He is the uncreated, begotten***



**Son, the Creator.** To Him, and not to the angels, has it been said, “Sit on My right hand, until I make Thine enemies — Thy footstool.” - {PTUK August 26, 1897, page 531.1}

Waggoner also reconfirmed that Christ inherited the name of His Father as a Son.

*‘The only name that any person can inherit is his father’s name. A person may have several names; but there is only one that he can inherit, and that is his father’s; all other names that he may have must be given to him. Now Christ had **“by inheritance” a name.** It could not possibly be any other than His Father’s name. **Having this name by inheritance, He has it by nature.** He has it by the very fact of His existence. As certainly as He exists, this name—**the name of the Father—belongs to Him. And the Father’s name being His by nature,** this name as certainly expresses His nature as it expresses the name of the Father. “The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin”—**this is the Father’s name and nature;** and this is the name and nature of the Son, **because He has by inheritance—by nature—His Father’s name**’ - {PTUK October 24 , 1895, page 677.5, 6}*

Also, we see from E.J. Waggoner’s writings that he was in agreement with Sister White in regards to the identity of Wisdom in proverbs 8. Like Ellen White, Waggoner affirms that Wisdom in chapter 8 is Christ speaking about Himself. He states:

*‘Jesus Christ Himself is the Beginning. Col. i. 18. He is “the beginning of the creation of God.” Rev. iii. 14. He is the power of God, and “the wisdom of God.” 1 Cor. i. 24. **Therefore it is He who speaks in the eighth chapter of proverbs, saying,** “I walk in the way of righteousness, in the midst of the paths of judgment; that I may cause those that love Me to inherit substance, and that I may fill their treasuries. The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.” Prov. viii. 20-23. On this last text it may be remarked that the words “set up” are from one Hebrew word meaning anointed, so that the meaning is the same as in the second psalm, “Yet have I set My name upon My holy hill of Zion.” The word is the same in the Hebrew, and it will be noticed in the margin we have “anointed” as the rendering of the Hebrew. Thus we learn that Christ was the anointed king before the earth existed. Moreover, the word “in” has really no place in the twentieth verse of Proverbs viii., as there is nothing in the Hebrew to indicate it. So we read, “The Lord possessed Me, the Beginning of His way, before His works of old.” Still further, it should be stated that the word “possessed” is the very same that occurs in Gen. iv. 1, where we read that on the birth of Cain, Eve said, “I have gotten a man from the Lord.” Therefore putting all these things together, **we learn that Jesus was brought forth “from the days of eternity”** Micah v. 2, margin), **before anything was created,** and that He Himself is the beginning of all the ways of God. He is “the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation.” Col. i. 15. He is the Beginning of everything.’ - {PTUK December 22, 1898, page 803.4-6}*

And just as we’ve already seen Ellen White state that ‘The Saviour is our Comforter’, we see Waggoner repeat this same statement, that Jesus Christ is the Comforter.

**‘Jesus is the Comforter.** “If any man sin, we have a Comforter with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.” 1 John 2:1 r.v., margin.’<sup>47</sup> (E.J. Waggoner, ‘The Everlasting Covenant’, p. 99/100)

Here Waggoner uses the word ‘Comforter’ instead of ‘advocate’ in 1 John 2:1 as they’re translated from the same Greek word, ‘*paraklētos*’.

George Ide Butler was another influential minister of the early Seventh-day Adventist church; he was also the General conference president at one time. We can see from his statements that he too believed that Jesus Christ was the literal begotten Son of God, and is fully Divine, not created, which again shows a clear understanding of the difference between the two. G.I Butler also pinpoints that the truth of Jesus Sonship is the foundational truth on which the Church is founded.

‘...They looked for merely a son of David, a great temporal prince, who should conquer their enemies and exalt the importance of their nation. But David in these very words foretold that the Messiah was his own Lord, **a divine being**. When Christ asked the disciples who the people said he was, their answers showed the plane of their expectation... But when he asked them who he was, impulsive Peter expressed the grand truth, "**Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.**" This answer Christ declared was a heavenly revelation to him, not a mere human conception, **the grand truth upon which his church is founded, which the powers of hell should never be able to overthrow.** Matt. 16 : 13-18. **When the church has living faith in this glorious truth, Satan cannot destroy it. But to believe in him as a mere human being, or some created agent, is quite another thing...** This Jesus is the first-born of every creature. " God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3 :16. The terms "only begotten" or "first begotten Son" are used at least eight times in the New Testament. These expressions positively imply his absolute pre-existence to every created being. **He was not created, and therefore not a creature. He was "begotten" in some manner not revealed, and is therefore of the same substance or essence as the Father. His existence precedes that of all others excepting the Father.** " For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him." ...’<sup>48</sup> - (G.I Butler, ‘Advent Review and Sabbath Herald’. August 22, 1893, p.7/535, 8/536)

Butler also explained that as a Son begotten of God, Jesus Christ thereby inherited all the Divine attributes of God, and is the complete image of God His Father.

‘Christ therefore is "the beginning of the creation of God" (Rev. 3:14) in the sense that it was his fiat, his exertion of divine power, carrying into effect the united counsels of the Father and Son, which brought the various parts of the universe into existence. He caused it to be. Personally he is precisely like his Father in appearance, **in nature, in character, in substance, and essence**...In him all the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily. **Not an attribute or power has the divinity of the Father withheld from the Son. When he begat him of his own substance**, the infinite majesty, glory, and excellence, the

supreme wisdom, omnipotence, omniscience, and self-supporting existence from which all the powers of the universe take their origin, was as a necessary **consequence conveyed to him**. Though two beings, distinct in individuality and person, they are one in all else, perfectly united in methods, character, love and goodness, power, prescience, and might. Yet Christ himself says, "My Father is greater than I." Sustaining the relation they do as the Father and the only begotten Son, precedence in a certain sense must necessarily be conceded to the Father. The existence of the Son is derived from the Father. This implies superiority in duration and rank. But as it pleased him that "all fulness," "the fulness of the Godhead bodily," should dwell in the Son, it would be difficult to tell in what other sense that superiority could be predicated.<sup>49</sup> - (G.I Butler, 'Advent Review and Sabbath Herald'. August 22, 1893, p. 8/536)

The Logos dates from the "beginning," "the beginning of the creation of God (Rev. 3:14), and he was the one who began that vast work. He commenced it, performed it, completed it every whit. Without him was not anything made that was ever created. The Father who begat him from his own substance, made him a fountain of life like himself. He is the Lifegiver in every sense, creating from nothing myriads of worlds, bringing all living beings into existence, and restoring, when it pleases him, the dead to life; and **this Logos is our divine Redeemer.**<sup>50</sup> - (G.I Butler, 'Advent Review and Sabbath Herald'. August 29, 1893, p.9/553)

According to G.I Butler, all truth is of great value and is eternal. An example of these eternal truths according to Butler is the truth that God is Creator and Jesus Christ is His only begotten Son.

All truth is valuable. There is an immeasurable difference of value 'between truth and error. There are many truths that are eternal. God is the creator of all things: Christ is his only begotten Son. His word is ever true. These and other doctrines like them always have been true and always will be true.<sup>51</sup> - (G.I Butler 'The Oriental Watchman', Vol 7, NO.12, December, 1904, p.7/183)

Another major pioneer of the SDA Church was Stephen N. Haskell. He *exerted leadership in almost every aspect of the early Seventh-day Adventist Church, including publishing ministry, world missions, urban evangelism, and conference administration... (and) he helped found several colleges and authored widely-circulated books on doctrine and Bible prophecy.*<sup>52</sup> - (Gerald Wheeler, 'Haskell, Stephen Nelson (1834–1922)', ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS)

Ellen White also spoke highly of Haskell. She said:

**'Brother Haskell is the Lord's servant, a man of opportunity. We appreciate his experience, his judgment, his thoughtful care and caution. He is indeed a mighty man in the Scriptures. He opens the Word of God in such a simple manner, making every subject reveal its true importance.'** - {12LtMs, Lt 140, 1897, par. 8}

Haskell was in agreement with his Adventist brethren of his time, that Christ is God's only begotten Son. *'This was an acknowledgment on their part of the prospering hand of God in providing for their temporal wants, and a token of an appreciation of the fact that Heaven had given them its choicest and best gift, even **God's first-born, God's only begotten Son**, to die for them.'*<sup>53</sup> - (S. N. Haskell, *'The Advent Review and Herald of The Sabbath'*, March 18, 1873, page 3/107)

And like the other pioneers, Haskell understood that Christ being God's Son meant that He shares equality with His Father, as He inherited all the names and attributes of His Father, which makes Him God too, thus, He is not a creation but is very Creator Himself.

*'Let us consider some of the leading thoughts: in the preceding chapters. The first chapter presents Christ — His character and position. He is the brightness of the Father's glory and the "express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power." He is better and much more exalted than the angels, "as He: hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." **He is the Son of God, and therefore has inherited every name which is applied to God**, the Creator of 'the heavens and the earth. **He also is the Creator, and is called God.** "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever," Again, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid; the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands." **Here Christ is presented on an equality with the Father, not created as were the angels, but the Creator of the angels — the great "I AM," He who inhabiteth eternity.**'<sup>54</sup> - (S. N. Haskell, *Review and Herald, 'THE SANCTUARY QUESTION.'* August 20, 1901, page 2/536)*

Also, we've seen in chapter 5 that Ellen White made it clear that there are just two Divine beings, and it was only those same two Divine beings that existed before creation. We've also seen from Ellen White that the plan of creation and salvation was wrought between two Divine beings: The Father & Son. We see that Haskell taught the exact same thing in his book, *'The Story of the Seer of Patmos'*. He stated:

*'The rainbow in the clouds is but a symbol of the rainbow which has encircled the throne from eternity. Back in the ages, which finite mind cannot fathom, **the Father and Son were alone in the universe.** Christ was the first begotten of the Father, and to Him Jehovah made known the divine plan of Creation. The plan of the creation of worlds was unfolded, together with the order of beings which should people them. Angels, as representatives of one order, would be ministers of the God of the universe. The creation of our own little world, was included in the deep-laid plans. The fall of Lucifer was foreseen; likewise the possibility of the introduction of sin, which would mar the perfection of the divine handiwork. It was then, in those early councils, that Christ's heart of love was touched; and the only begotten Son pledged His life to redeem man, should he yield and fall. **Father and Son**, surrounded by impenetrable glory, **clasped hands.** It was in appreciation of this offer, that upon Christ was bestowed creative power, and the everlasting covenant was made; and henceforth **Father and Son, with one mind, worked together to complete the work of creation.**' - {SSP 93.2}*

We've also seen from Ellen White that Lucifer wanted to be involved in the Divine councils with God and His Son, and this sparked the war in heaven. Again, Haskell describes the exact same thing. *'Before the creation of our world, "there was war in heaven." **Christ and the***

**Father covenanted together**; and Lucifer, the covering cherub, **grew jealous because he was not admitted into the eternal councils of the Two who sat upon the throne**. He, the light-bearer, standing so close to God that he reflected the glory of the throne, allowed jealousy to rankle in his heart. For the first time, the harmony of heaven was broken.' - {SSP 217.2}

It is clear that Stephen Haskell believed in just Two Divine Beings *'who sat upon the throne.'* According to Haskell, it was just *'Christ and the Father'* who *'covenanted together'*, and Lucifer grew resentment because of this. Haskell didn't believe that there was a third being who sat on the throne with the Father & Son, but he believed that there was a third being in heaven who wanted to sit on the throne also, namely Lucifer. This completely harmonises with everything we've read from the Spirit of prophecy. The Seventh-day Adventist brethren of this time did not believe in a 'God the Holy Spirit.'

Moreover, well known SDA pioneer, John Nevins Andrews, also taught that it was just Two Divine Beings involved in creation. According to Andrews, these Two were God the Father, the original source of all things, and His Son Jesus Christ, who He (the Father) created all things through. J.N Andrews stated,

*'The day (Lord's day) must be one which is claimed both by the Son and the Father... These texts clearly establish the fact that the Son was associated With the Father in the work of creation. And they also teach that whereas the Father was the original source of creative power, he exercised that power through his Son. It is certain, therefore, that the Son wrought directly in the work of creation, and that the Father wrought through him... We do not exclude the Father from participation in the acts by which the Sabbath was made in Eden; but we do maintain that the Son must have been directly concerned in the performance of those acts. For it would be absurd to teach that the Son was the one by whom the Father wrought the work of creation, and then to assert that the rest from that work was by the Father himself without the participation of his Son; and that the Sabbath as a memorial commemorated the part taken in creation by the Father, but not that part which was taken therein by the Son. But there is no rivalry between the Father and the Son; for they are one in interest and one in heart and work. John 10:30. " All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore, said I, that he shall take of mine and shall show it unto you." John 16:15. And it is certain that as the Son of God, by virtue of his share in the creative work, he has an original and inherent right to claim the Sabbath as his own holy day.'*<sup>55</sup> - (J.N Andrews, 'EXAMINATION OF T. M. PREBLE'S FIRST DAY SABBATH', The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath, February 13, 1872, Pages. 2-3/66-67)

According to Andrews, the Sabbath was instituted by Two Divine Beings, the Father & Son. Clearly there was a mutual understanding amongst the Adventist brethren concerning who was to be worshipped: The Father and the Son. There was no one else worshipped.

Also, J.N Andrews taught and believed that Christ had a beginning at some point in eternity, as He was begotten of God His Father:

*'Every member of the human family, except Adam, has had parents, and every one has had beginning of days; and indeed, with two exceptions, everyone has had end of life. Even the angels of God have all had beginning of days, so that they would be as much excluded by this language as the members of the human family.*

***And as to the Son of God, he would be excluded also, for he had God for his Father, and did, at some point in the eternity of the past, have beginning of days.*** So that if we use Paul's language in an absolute sense, it would be impossible to find but one being in the universe, and that is God the Father, who is without father, or mother, or descent, or beginning of days, or end of life.<sup>56</sup> - (J.N Andrews, 'Advent Review and Sabbath Herald'. September 7, 1869, Page. 4/84)

Earlier in chapter 3, we've seen Ellen White state in the Desire of ages page 21 that '*all things Christ received from God*', and it's the '*Father's life (that) flows out to all*' through His Son. Hence, she stated that it is God the Father who is '*the great Source of all*', not a trinity. Again, this was clearly understood by the pioneers. For example, J.N Andrews was in agreement with Sister White, that God the Father is the Ultimate source of life, and that life flows out through His Son to us.

***'That God is the fountain and source of immortality*** is plain from the statement of Paul. He speaks thus of **God the Father**: "*Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see; to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen.*" 1 Tim. 6:16. This text is evidently designed to teach that the **self-existent God is the only being who, of himself, possesses this wonderful nature.** Others may possess it as derived from him, **but he alone is the fountain of immortality. Our Lord Jesus Christ is the source of this life to us.** "*For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.*" John 5:26. "*As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.*" John 6:57. **The Father gives us this life in his Son.** "*And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*" 1 John 5:11,12. **These scriptures do clearly indicate that Christ is the source of endless life,** and that those only have this who have Christ.'<sup>57</sup> - (J.N Andrews, 'The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath', January 27, 1874, Page. 4/52)

So God the Father is the source of all life, and He pours out this life to us through His Son Jesus Christ. Therefore, the Lord Jesus Christ is the source of eternal life for the Christian, as God only gives this life to us through one Source, His Son Jesus (See 1 Jhn 5:11-12). Without Christ, we have no life (See Jhn 6:47-53), hence, Andrews said that '*Christ is the source of endless life*' for the believer in Christ.

Another well known influential pioneer of the Seventh-day Adventist Church was Uriah Smith. Ellen White was an admirer of Smith's works, and she strongly advocated his writings. For example, she said:

*'Elder Smith was connected with us at the beginning of the publishing work. He labored in connection with my husband. We hope always to see his name in the Review and Herald at the head of the list of editors; for thus it should be. Those who began the work, who fought bravely when the battle went so hard, must not lose their hold now. They are to be honored by those who entered the work after the hardest privation had been borne. I feel very tender toward Elder Smith. My life interest in the publishing work is bound up with his. He came to us as a young man, possessing talents that qualified him to stand in his lot and place as an editor. **How I rejoice as I read his articles in the Review—so excellent, so full of spiritual truth.** I thank God for them. I feel a strong sympathy for Elder Smith, and **I believe that his name should always appear in the Review as the name of the leading editor.** Thus God would have it. When, some years ago, his name was placed second, I felt hurt. When it was again placed first, I wept, and said, "Thank God." **May it always be there, as God designs that it shall be, while Elder Smith's right hand can hold a pen. And when the power of his hand fails, let his sons write at his dictation.**' - {20MR 220.1, 2} (February 5, 1902)*

Ellen White tells us here that she rejoiced when reading the articles of Uriah Smith, as they were *'so full of spiritual truth.'* Moreover, Ellen White also greatly endorsed Uriah Smith's well-known work: 'Daniel and The Revelation'.

She stressed the importance of this book, and placed its importance on the same level as the Great controversy and some of her other very

important books. She also made it clear that God had instructed her of the urgent need to have this book circulated. She said regarding this work:

*'**Instruction has been given me** that the important books **containing the light that God has given regarding Satan's apostasy in heaven** should be given a wide circulation just now; for through them the truth will reach many minds. 'Patriarchs and Prophets,' **'Daniel and the Revelation,'** and 'Great Controversy' are needed now as never before. **They should be widely circulated because the truths they emphasize will open many blind eyes.**' - {RH February 16, 1905, Art. A. par. 10}*

*'God commanded that certain warnings and the presentation of events to take place should be placed without delay before the people... The enemy would exercise his ingenuity through the men who should uphold and sustain me wherever I was called to go, that I might lead out in the work that God in his wisdom would have done. Then, if my brethren did not awake to the situation, I was to make no delay in taking the books into my own hands, and the Lord would prepare the way before me. He would not have the work delayed... **The light given was that "Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation," "Great Controversy," and "Patriarchs and Prophets," would make their way. They contained the very message the people must have, the special light God had given his people. The angels of God would prepare the way for these books in the hearts of the people.**' - {PHO79.5.2, 6.3-7.1}*

These aren't just merely Ellen White's preferences or opinions. Rather, she proclaims that she received instruction from God to circulate 'Daniel & the Revelation' because it contains 'special light (that) God had given His people.' Clearly, Uriah Smith's 'Daniel & the Revelation' should be of vital importance to us.

*'In Desire of Ages, Patriarchs and Prophets, 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.'* - {18LtMs, Lt 229, 1903, par.12}

Ellen White even said that she knew of no other book that could take the place of Smith's Daniel & the Revelation. *'**Daniel and Revelation**, Great Controversy, Patriarchs and Prophets, and Desire of Ages should now go to the world. The grand instruction contained in Daniel and Revelation has been eagerly perused by many in Australia. **This book has been the means of bringing many precious souls to a knowledge of the truth.** Everything that can be done should be done to **circulate Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation**. **I know of no other book that can take the place of this one. It is God's helping hand.**'* - {16LtMs, Ms76, 1901, par. 13}

Sister White also said that those who are new to the Advent message should become acquainted with the book, for then they'll be familiar with the experiences and truths that the pioneers were led to.

*'Especially should the book Daniel and the Revelation be brought before people as the very book for this time... Let our canvassers urge this book upon the attention of all. **The Lord has shown me** that this book will do a good work in enlightening those who become interested in the truth for this time. Those who embrace the truth now, who have not shared in the experiences of those who entered the work in the early history of the message, **should study the instruction given in Daniel and the Revelation, becoming familiar with the truth it presents**... Now is the gospel of Jesus Christ to be proclaimed. Satan will seek to divert the minds of those who should be established, strengthened, and settled in the truths of the first, second, and third angels' messages. The students in our schools **should carefully study Daniel and the Revelation, so that they shall not be left in darkness**, and the day of Christ overtake them as a thief in the night. **I speak of this book because it is a means of educating those who need to understand the truth of the Word.** This book should be highly appreciated. It covers much of the ground we have been over in our experience. **If the youth will study this book and learn for themselves what is truth, they will be saved from many perils.**'* - {1MR 60.5-61.1}

In this book (Daniel and the Revelation), it presents teachings regarding the origin and identity of our Lord Jesus Christ. As per instructed by the Lord's servant, we will analyse some of the teachings that were presented in this book.



Firstly, Uriah Smith makes it clear in the book that Christ was not created, but begotten, which therefore marks a distinction between the two things, just as we've seen countless of times from the other pioneers, including Ellen White. Also, Uriah Smith explains that Christ being equal with the Father, and receiving worship like the Father, does not mean He is co-eternal with the Father, for the Scriptures do not teach this view.

*To the Lamb, equally with the Father who sits upon the throne, praise is ascribed in this song of adoration. Commentators, with great unanimity, have seized upon this as proof **that Christ must be coeval (same age) with the Father**; for otherwise, say they, here would be worship paid to the creature which belongs only to the Creator. **But this does not seem to be a necessary conclusion. The Scriptures nowhere speak of Christ as a created being, but on the contrary plainly state that he was begotten of the Father.** (See remarks on Rev.3:14, where it is shown that Christ is not a created being.) **But while as the Son he does not possess a co-eternity of past existence with the Father**, the beginning of his existence, as the begotten of the Father, antedates the entire work of creation, in relation to **which he stands as joint creator with God.** John1:3; Heb.1:2. **Could not the Father ordain that to such a being worship should be rendered equally with himself, without its being idolatry on the part of the worshiper? He has raised him to positions which make it proper that he should be worshipped, and has even commanded that worship should be rendered him, which would not have been necessary had he been equal with the Father in eternity of existence.** Christ himself declares that "as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." John 5:26. The Father has "highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name." Phil.2:9. And the Father himself says, "Let all the angels of God worship him." Heb.1:6. **These testimonies show that Christ is now an object of worship equally with the Father; but they do not prove that with him he holds an eternity of past existence.**' - {Uriah Smith, DAR 430.1, 1897}*

Uriah Smith points out that Christ being Creator and receiving worship is not evidence for Him being co-eternal with the Father. Most Christians think that it can't be one without the other. Yet, we see Smith proclaim that the Father's existence precedes the Son, but all along he maintains the fact that the Lord Jesus Christ is not a creation of God, but He's begotten, and we worship Him because 'He stands as joint creator with God', and The Father 'has raised Him to positions which make it proper that He should be worshipped.' According to Smith, whilst it is incorrect to hold to the belief that Christ is the same age as the Father, it is also just as much an error to believe that Christ was created.

*'...Moreover, he is "the beginning of the creation of God." **Some attempt by this language to uphold the error that Christ was a created being**, dating his existence anterior to that of any other created being or thing, next to the self-existent and eternal God. But the language does not necessarily imply that he was created; for the words, "the beginning of the creation," may simply signify that the work of creation, strictly speaking, was begun by him. "Without him was not anything made." Others, however, and more properly we think, take the word to mean the "agent" or "efficient cause," which is one of the definitions of the word, understanding that Christ, is the agent through whom God has created all things, **but that the Son came into existence in a different manner, as he is called "the only begotten" of the Father.** It would seem utterly inappropriate to*

*apply this expression to any being created in the ordinary sense of that term.*' - {Uriah Smith, DAR 400.2, 1897}

Once again, we see a book that Ellen White praised and endorsed teaching that Christ was literally begotten of God. Not only did Sister White praise and promote Uriah Smith's 'Daniel & The Revelation', but we've seen that she declared the Lord had instructed her that '*Daniel and the Revelation*' is one of the books that should be circulated because it contained the '*light that God has given*'. It stands to reason that Ellen White agreed with the sentiments in Smith's 'Daniel & The Revelation', including what it taught about the Sonship of Christ. The ideas regarding God & Christ in the book are the exact same sentiments we saw in E.J Waggoner's work, 'Christ and His righteousness.' Would it be logical to conclude that Ellen White would heavily promote two works that both teach the same 'error' about our Lord Jesus Christ? Never mind the fact that she said God Himself instructed her to push for the circulation of these materials because His truths were in them. Would we also then conclude that God would be behind the circulation of books that contain heretical ideas about Him and His Son? Clearly such is not the case, these truths are truths of God, and the Lord's prophet stressed that the truths in 'Daniel & The Revelation' are eternal truths, and the truths in it should continue to be taught to the people through to the close of probation.

*'Those who are preparing to enter the ministry, who desire to become successful students of the prophecies, will find Daniel and the Revelation an invaluable help. **They need to understand this book.** It speaks of past, present, and future, laying out the path so plainly that none need err therein. Those who will diligently study this book will have no relish for the cheap sentiments presented by those who have a burning desire to get out something new and strange to present to the flock of God. The rebuke of God is upon all such teachers. They need that one teach them what is meant by godliness and truth. The great, essential questions which God would have presented to the people are found in Daniel and the Revelation. There is found solid, eternal truth for this time. Everyone needs the light and information it contains.' - {1MR 61.2}*

*'The interest in Daniel and the Revelation is to continue **as long as probationary time shall last. God used the author of this book as a channel through which to communicate light to direct minds to the truth.** Shall we not appreciate this light, which points us to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, our King?' - {1MR 63.1}*

Again, we clearly see Sister White's strong support for this book, for she stated that God used Uriah Smith '*as a channel through which to communicate light to direct minds to the truth*' in Daniel and the Revelation. It's no wonder that Ellen White earnestly wanted this book to be studied and shared.

*'Young men, take up the work of canvassing **for Daniel and the Revelation.** Do all you possibly can to sell this book. Enter upon the work with as much earnestness as if it were a new book. And remember that as you canvass for it, **you are to become familiar with the truths it contains. As you ponder these truths, you will receive ideas that will enable you not only to receive light, but to let light shine forth to others in clear, bright rays.**' - {1MR 63.3}*

We've seen that in 1902, Ellen White said that she rejoices to 'read his (Uriah Smith's) articles in the Review' because they're 'so full of spiritual truth'. And we see that Smith shared the same beliefs in his articles prior to 1902 as he did in 'Daniel and The Revelation' concerning God and His Son, Jesus Christ. For example, in the Review & Herald, we read a dialogue where questions are thrown at Uriah Smith, and he answers them.

Question: "...2. Does 1 Tim. 1:14-16 teach that God only by nature has immortality, and that Christ did not have it till it was bestowed upon him by the Father? J. F. A

Answer: "Ans.— ... (2) The expression that God " only hath immortality," **in the sense of being originally the supreme fountain and source of all life, must be true in the very nature of the case if he antedates all other beings.** Christ had a beginning. John 1 : 1. But that was not like the beginning of other intelligences in the universe, which are all creations of Christ himself. Col. 1 : 16.

**He was not a created being, but " proceeded forth and came from God." John 8:42. He is the only begotten Son of the Father. John 1: 14, 18. By nature, then, he is co-equal with God. From the beginning of his existence he must have been as essentially, immortal as God ; and yet it all came from God.** So Christ says that, " As the Father hath life in himself ; so bath he given to the Son to have life in himself." John 5 : 26. No others have immortality, **except as God and Christ bestow it upon them.**<sup>58</sup> - (Uriah Smith, Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, 'In the Question Chair', December 22, 1896, Page. 9/813)

Here we see Smith teach what we've already established in this document, that God the Father is the original 'supreme fountain and source of all life'. Yet still, Jesus Christ is 'not a created being, but (He) proceeded forth and came from God' (See Jhn 8:42), and therefore, 'by nature, then, He is co-equal with God.' Uriah Smith also makes the point that the immortal life the Father possesses wasn't something that Christ originally didn't have, but He had this 'from the beginning of his existence.' There was never a time when Christ never had this immortal life. This is because Jesus wasn't created, but He proceeded forth and came out from God (See Jhn 16:27). This means that Jesus was taken out of the very same material as the self-existent and immortal God, thus, Jesus is also of this very same material by nature, hence, Smith says, Jesus 'must have been as essentially, immortal as God; and yet it all came from God.' We know this is in harmony with Spirit of Prophecy, as we've already read from Sister White, that 'The Eternal Father... gave his only begotten Son, **tore from his bosom** Him who **was made** in the express image of his person' - {RH July 9, 1895, par, 13} And "**God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son,**... Though sin had produced a gulf between man and his God, divine benevolence provided a plan to bridge that gulf and **what material did he use? A part of himself, the brightness of the Father's glory came to a world all seared and marred with the curse...**' - {1888 711.3}

Immortality was part and parcel of Christ's natural inheritance as the Son of God, which no other being possesses naturally, for no other being came out of God, hence, the Lord Jesus Christ is the **only** begotten Son of God.

‘...With such inspired declarations before us, ought we to say that Jesus Christ is the Self-existent, Independent, Omniscient and Only True God; or the Son of God, begotten, upheld, exalted and glorified by the Father?’ - {Uriah Smith, BSA 44.13}

Moreover, we also find in Smith’s question chair articles in the review, that he didn’t believe the Holy Spirit was a third separate person in the same sense that the Father and Son are, thus, he didn’t believe in a third divine being called ‘God the Holy Spirit’ that sat on the throne alongside Christ and His Father.

Question: "Are we to understand that the Holy Ghost is a person, the same as the Father and the Son? Some claim that it is, others that it is not."

Answer: ‘ANS. —”The terms "Holy Ghost," are a harsh and repulsive translation. It should be "Holy Spirit " (*hagion pneuma*) in every instance. This Spirit is the Spirit of God, and the Spirit of Christ; the Spirit being the same whether it is spoken of as pertaining to God or Christ. But respecting this Spirit, **the Bible uses expressions which cannot be harmonized with the idea that it is a person like the Father and the Son. Rather it is shown to be a divine influence from them both, the medium which represents their presence** and by which they have knowledge and power through all the universe, when not personally present. Christ is a person, now officiating as priest in the sanctuary in heaven; and yet he says that wherever two or three are gathered in his name, he is there in the midst. Matt. 18:20. How?—**Not personally, but by his Spirit.** In one of Christ's discourses (John, chapters 14, 15, and 16) **this Spirit is personified** as "the Comforter," and as such has the personal and relative pronouns, " he," " him," and " whom," applied to it. **But usually it is spoken of in a way to show that it cannot be a person, like the Father and the Son.** For instance, **it is often said to be "poured out" and "shed abroad." But we never read about God or Christ being poured out or shed abroad.** If it was a person, it would be nothing strange for it to appear in bodily shape; and **yet when it has so appeared, that fact has been noted as peculiar.** Thus Luke 3:22 says : "And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him." But the shape is not always the same; for on the day of Pentecost it assumed the form of "cloven tongues like as of fire." Acts 2 3, 4. Again we read of the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth." Rev. 1:4 ; 3:1 ; 4:5 ; 5:6. This is unquestionably simply a designation of the Holy Spirit, put in this form to signify its perfection and completeness. **But it could hardly be so described if it was a person. We never read of the seven Gods or the seven Christs.**”<sup>59</sup> - (Uriah Smith, Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, ‘In the Question Chair’, October 28, 1890, Page. 8/664)

Uriah Smith stresses the point that the overall language Scripture uses about the Holy Spirit just doesn’t allow us to conclude that the Holy Spirit is a distinct person/being like the Father & Son. The Bible may not reveal much to us about the nature of the Holy Spirit or exactly what it is, but what it does reveal doesn’t point to it being a third divine member in heaven that is to be worshipped alongside God & His Son. To reach such a conclusion from what Scripture does reveal to us is a wild leap.

Moreover, like Ellen White, Smith recognised that there were still three great powers of heaven, for he understood the Holy Spirit to be a third independent agency that holds its own office in the work of redemption.

Smith stated:

*'...the Spirit of God, the Holy Ghost. He says there is one spirit; and that is the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit. He sets this forth as the source from which these blessings and these gifts spring. It may not then be out of place for us to consider for a moment what this Spirit is, **what its office is**, what **its** relation to the world and to the church, and what the Lord through this proposes to do for his people. **The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God; it is also the Spirit of Christ. It is that divine, mysterious emanation through which they carry forward their great and infinite work.** It is called the Eternal Spirit; **it** is a spirit that is omniscient and omnipresent; **it** is the spirit that moved, or brooded, upon the face of the waters in the early days when chaos reigned, and out of chaos was brought the beauty and the glory of this world. **It** is the agency through which life is imparted; **it** is the medium through which all God's blessings and graces come to his people. **It** is the Comforter; **it** is the Spirit of Truth; **it** is the Spirit of Hope; **it** is the Spirit of Glory; **it is the vital connection between us and our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ**; for the apostle tells us that if we "have not the Spirit of Christ," we are "none of his." **It is a spirit which is tender; which can be insulted, can be grieved,** can be quenched. **It** is the agency through which we are to be introduced, if ever we are introduced, to immortality; for Paul says that if the spirit of Him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you, he shall quicken also your mortal bodies by that Spirit which dwelleth in you; that is, the Spirit of Christ. Romans 8:11... You will notice in these few verses the apostle brings to view **the three great agencies which are concerned in this work: God, the Father; Christ, his Son; and the Holy Spirit.**' - {GCDB March 18, 1891, page 146.5-6, 147.4}*

We've seen Uriah Smith say that '*the Bible uses expressions which cannot be harmonized with the idea that it (The Holy Spirit) is a person like the Father and the Son.*' Like the rest of the pioneers, Smith didn't believe that the Holy Spirit was a third divine being in heaven, yet we've seen in the above statement, that he highlights the Holy Spirit has its own office, its own '*relation to the world and to the church*', and he even viewed the Holy Spirit as a third great agency that's one of '*the three great agencies which are concerned in this work.*' He also believed this third great agency had a personality, for it '*it is a spirit which is tender; which can be insulted, (and) can be grieved.*' Clearly there was an understanding amongst Ellen White and the rest of the pioneers concerning the Holy Spirit. None of them believed the Holy Spirit was an impersonal force. They all believed it works as an independent agency, has personality, and represents the Father & Son, for it's the Spirit of both of them. The pioneers understood the Spirit of God to be a third dignitary in the sense that it holds its own distinct office or role. So, like Uriah Smith, Ellen white also referred to the Spirit as a third independent agency in terms of its function/office. She said:

**'The operating agency was not revealed to view; men could not tell whence it came, or whither it went... No human reasoning of the most learned man can define the operations of the Holy Spirit upon human minds and characters; yet they can see the effects upon the life and actions. **The Holy Spirit is a free, working, independent agency. The God of heaven uses his Spirit as it pleases him,** and human minds and human judgment and human methods can no more set boundaries to its working, or**

*prescribe as to the channel through which it shall operate, than they can say to the wind.'* - {RH May 5, 1896, par.2}

Therefore, there should be no confusion as to why Ellen white spoke of the Spirit in this way, for the pioneers were all clearly in harmony on this point and understood each other. They used the same descriptions and words, and they didn't understand these terms to imply that God's Spirit was a third divine being.

Uriah Smith understood that the Bible's references to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit had nothing to do with a three in one god. According to Smith, '*...We are baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Matthew 28:19. By this we express our belief in the existence of **the one true God, the mediation of his Son, and the influence of the Holy Spirit.**' - {Uriah Smith, BSA 21.7}*

Another major influential pioneer of the Seventh-day Adventist Church was Ellen White's husband, James Springer White. We can see from his statements that he shared the same beliefs as the pioneers we've already looked at. For example, he didn't believe that the Holy Spirit was a third personage in the same way that the Father and Son are.

***The Father is a person, the Son is a person**; but the Holy Ghost is the same as the Holy Spirit. **It is a divine influence emanating from the Father and the Son...**<sup>60</sup> - (James White, The Signs of the Times, April 25, 1878, Page. 4/124)*

He also believed that Jesus Christ is equal with God the Father, but not co-eternal.

*'In creation, and in the institution of law, **the Son was equal with the Father**. In the beginning, before the fall, God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Gen. 1:26. Compare with this statement, words that are found in one of the gospels: "In the beginning was the Word [Christ], and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." John 1:1. It was God the Father that said to God the Son, "Let us make man." 3. In his exaltation, before he humbled himself to the work of redeeming lost sinners, Christ thought it not robbery to be equal with God, because, in the work of creation and the institution of law to govern created intelligences, **he was equal with the Father. The Father was greater than the Son in that he was first. The Son was equal with the Father in that he had received all things from the Father**. The reader may now look upon the Father and the Son, to use a common figure, as a great creating and law-instituting firm.<sup>61</sup> - (James White, 'Advent Review and Sabbath Herald', January 4, 1881, Page. 2)*

It's evident that James White believed the Lord Jesus Christ is the literal Son of God, not a metaphorical son.

*'The Most Holy, containing the Ark of the ten commandments, was then opened for our Great High Priest to enter to make atonement for the cleansing of the Sanctuary. If we take the liberty to say there is not a literal Ark, containing the ten commandments in heaven, we*

may go only a step further and deny the literal City, **and the literal Son of God.** Certainly, **Adventists should not choose the spiritual view,** rather than the one we have presented. **We see no middle ground to be taken.**<sup>62</sup> (James White, 'The Parable', Matthew XXV,1-12. Page. 22/16)

We've already seen Ellen White state that 'one of the marked characteristics of spiritualist teachers' is that 'they refuse to acknowledge Christ as the Son of God.' They refuse to take God's Word for what it plainly says, which is what Papists do. As Adventists, we 'should not choose the spiritual view.' As James White said, 'we see no middle ground', either we believe that Jesus Christ is truly the literal Son of the living God, or we believe He's a metaphorical son.

Overall, by analysing these writings and teachings of many of the pioneers, it's clear that they didn't believe in a triune god, but they believed that God is one Person, the Father, and Jesus Christ is His only begotten Son. This is because that's what the language of Scripture reveals. The Bible reveals to us that God is one Being in the most literal sense of the word, and He has a Son, the Lord Jesus Christ who is equally Divine. God brought the pioneers back to the simplicity of His Word and eradicated all the complicated spiritualisation of His Word that had infected the mind of Christians throughout the centuries. This is what gave way to the idea that only men of certain ranks can be able to interpret the Bible, for it's covered in mystery, and this is still the belief of Romanists today. God wants us to be able to just read and believe His Word for what it plainly says whenever we can. If we say One God doesn't actually mean one, but three, or Son of God doesn't actually mean God has a literal Son, then we're shrouding the Word in mystery, for one without any presupposition would not arrive to such conclusions. God wants us to have simple faith, and believe that Christ is truly His Son. 'But these are written, **that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God...** - (Jhn 20:31) This is why we as Seventh-day Adventists profess to be the remnant. Our church initially restored the beliefs of the primitive Christian Church, but out of fear of being labelled a cult, we've compromised to lessen our distance with the fallen churches.

## Chapter 7: The Pioneers on the Trinity

In this next chapter, we will analyse what the stance and opinions of the Seventh-day Adventist pioneers actually were concerning the Trinity. Now it must first be highlighted that the SDA pioneers being non-trinitarian isn't secret but it is common knowledge, and very few honest Adventists who know their churches history would deny this. For example, SDA trinitarian apologists: Woodrow Wilson Whidden, Jerry Moon, and John W. Reeve wrote in their book that was in defence of the trinity *'That most of the leading SDA pioneers were non-Trinitarian in their theology has become accepted Adventist history.*<sup>63</sup> - (Woodrow W. Whidden, Jerry Moon, John W. Reeve, *'Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships'*, Review and Herald Publishing Association, (2002), p. 190) So the purpose of this chapter will be to find out if the pioneers were silent on this topic, or did they speak out on this topic? Would they have been neutral concerning number 2 of the present SDA fundamental beliefs?

Firstly, when analysing the writings of the pioneers, we can clearly see that they wouldn't have been neutral or silent concerning this change of belief to the trinity in the SDA Church, for they made many statements in regards to the trinity doctrine. For instance, J.H Waggoner stated:

*'They (theologians) take the denial of a trinity to be equivalent to a denial of the divinity of Christ. Were that the case, we should cling to the doctrine of a trinity as tenaciously as any can; but it is not the case. They who have read our remarks on the death of the Son of God know that we firmly believe in the divinity of Christ; but we cannot accept the idea of a trinity... As Christ is the Son of God, and the only representative of the Father, it could not be considered strange that he should bear the name and title of his father; "for it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell." Col. 1:19... As before remarked, the great mistake of Trinitarians, in arguing this subject, is this: they make no distinction between a denial of a trinity and a denial of the divinity of Christ. They see only the two extremes, between which the truth lies; and take every expression referring to the pre-existence of Christ as evidence of a trinity. The Scriptures abundantly teach the pre-existence of Christ and his divinity; but they are entirely silent in regard to a trinity.'*<sup>64</sup> (J.H. Waggoner, *'The Atonement An Examination of A Remedial System In The Light of Nature and Revelation'*, Chapter VI, Doctrine of a Trinity Subversive of the Atonement, 1884, Pages. 115, 121/165, 173)

J.H Waggoner points out the fact that trinitarians can't seem to distinguish between denying the divinity of Christ and denying the trinity. They think these are one and the same thing, therefore, many times they defend the trinity by defending the divinity of Christ, but this is fighting a strawman. Nontrinitarianism isn't one monolithic belief. One can still believe that Jesus Christ is fully God, but not hold the trinitarian view. Waggoner stated that *'if a denial of a trinity (was) equivalent to a denial of the divinity of Christ, we should cling to the*



*doctrine of a trinity as tenaciously as any can.*' This was because the pioneers believed that the divinity of Christ was of utmost importance. This is why the pioneers also found no commonality with the unitarians who rejected the divinity of Christ, and believed they too were walking in great error. For example, James White made it plain that **'we have not as much sympathy with Unitarians that deny the divinity of Christ, as with Trinitarians who hold that the Son is the eternal Father, and talk so mistily about the three-one God. Give the Master all that divinity with which the Holy Scriptures clothe him.'**<sup>65</sup> - (James White, 'The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath', June 6, 1871, Page. 5/197)

In fact, as much as James White was opposed to the trinity doctrine, he still believed that the unitarians beliefs about Christ were even worse than the trinitarians because they reject the divinity of Christ. He stated:

*'PAUL affirms of the Son of God that he was in the form of God, and that he was equal with God... Phili. 2:6. The reason why it is not robbery for the Son to be equal with the Father is the fact that he is equal. If the Son is not equal with the Father, then it is robbery for him to rank himself with the Father. **The inexplicable trinity that makes the godhead three in one and one in three, is bad enough ; but that ultra Unitarianism that makes Christ inferior to the Father is worse.** Did God say to an inferior, "Let us make man in our image?" **The great mistake of the Unitarian is in taking Christ when enfeebled with our nature as the standard of what he was with the Father before the creation of the world,** and what he will be when all divine, seated beside the Father on his eternal throne.'<sup>66</sup> - (James White, 'The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath', November 29, 1877, page. 4/172)*

*'ON the broad platform of the divine law, and redemption from its transgression through the death and mediation of the divine Son, both the Seventh-day Baptists and the Seventh-day Adventists stand in general agreement... The principal difference between the two bodies is the immortality question. **The S. D. Adventists hold the divinity of Christ so nearly with the trinitarian, that we apprehend no trial here.**'<sup>67</sup> - (James White, 'The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath', October 12, 1876, page. 4/116)*

We see this sentiment expressed again in the question and answer section of the Review and Herald when someone had asked if Seventh-day Adventists were trinitarians or unitarians, and the response was 'neither'.

Question: *'2... Are S.D. Adventists Unitarian or Trinitarian?...*

(Answer) ***Neither. We do not believe in the three-one God of the Trinitarians nor in the low views of Jesus Christ held by Unitarians. We believe that Christ was a divine being, not merely in his mission, but in his person also.'***<sup>68</sup> - ('The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath', June 27, 1878, page. 4)

Unfortunately, the early Seventh-day Adventists often had to deal with accusations from trinitarians who claimed that they denied Christ's divinity, or taught He was inferior to the Father. Another example of this was E.J Waggoner having to write a response to a Methodist who raised a dispute against the SDA beliefs, one of these being a claim that SDA's deny the divinity of Christ.

*'The Methodists have recently issued another book on the Sabbath question, written by the Rev. Dr. M. C. Briggs, now of Santa Clara, Cal. The book is in many respects different from any that have preceded it, notably in that it attempts simply to prove "a commanding probability" that the venerable day of the sun—"the wild solar holiday of all pagan times"—was the original Sabbath of Jehovah. We have promised the author a review of his book in the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, and with this we begin the fulfillment of that promise.'* - {E.J Waggoner, SITI March 25, 1889, page 167.45}

Concerning Seventh-day Adventists, the Methodist (Briggs) stated that: *"One only regrets that their influence is not brought to bear in support of the true Sabbath. Their genius of interpretation-especially that of the Saturday-Sabbath Adventists-illustrates itself in specific results which must counter-work each other, such as formal feet washing (now well-nigh abandoned, I believe), **the denial of Christ's divinity**, the utter and contemptuous rejection of a supersensuous nature, a soul or spirit in man, and the annihilation of the wicked."* - {SITI March 25, 1889, page 167.46}

In regards to the claim of denying Christ's divinity, Waggoner responded saying:

*'But when the Doctor (Briggs) states that Seventh-day Adventists deny the divinity of Christ, **we know that he writes recklessly. We are fully persuaded in our own mind that he knows better**; but be that as it may, **the statement has been made so often by men who professed to know whereof they were speaking, that many have come to believe it**; and for their sakes, as well as for the benefit of those who may now have given the subject any thought, **we propose to set forth the truth. We have no theory to bolster up, and so, instead of stating propositions, we shall simply quote the word of God, and accept what it says.** The first text that we quote is that one so familiar to everyone who knows anything of the Bible, John 1:1:... That this refers to Christ is evident from verse 4: "In him was life; and the life was the light of men;" and from verse 14: "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth." Indeed, we never heard of anyone who doubted that the evangelist has reference to Christ in this passage. **From it we learn that Christ is God. That text alone, if we had no other, is sufficient to establish the divinity of Christ, for the word "divinity" means, "the nature or essence of God."** **We believe in the divinity of Christ, because the Bible says that Christ is God.**'* - {E.J Waggoner, SITI March 25, 1889, page 167.48-49}

We see here that E.J Waggoner countered the Methodists' accusation by firmly defending the fact that Adventists believe Jesus Christ is God, '*because the Bible says that Christ is God.*' Notice that Waggoner said this accusation to discredit SDA's had '*been made so often by men who professed to know whereof they were speaking.*' To discredit the Seventh-day Adventist Church, those from Babylon had to develop falsehoods such as this. This was an on-going argument against the Adventist Church because they would not bow down to the 'orthodox' god of Rome. Also, take note that Waggoner said '*that he (Briggs) writes recklessly. We are fully persuaded in our own mind that he knows better.*' Waggoner and the other Adventist brethren had no doubt in their minds that many of those who were throwing around these accusations were very much aware of what the SDA's actually believed, and that they knew full well that Adventists didn't actually deny Christ's divinity. But this was an easy tactic to use to scare others from further investigating what the church actually believed, thus, when these false claims were continually made, '*many... (came) to believe it.*' We see this same tactic used today by ministers in our very own church. For example, well known Seventh-day Adventist minister, Professor Walter Veith was answering questions on a Q&A panel, and was confronted with a question concerning the historic Seventh-day Adventist belief about Jesus Christ being begotten, and whether He was actually begotten or not. Immediately we see that Professor Veith responded with a statement simply just arguing that Christ is God, and not created.

Professor Veith went on to give a speech proclaiming that Christ is not a created being, even though that's not what the topic of the question was in the first place. Let's analyse the question he received, and the answer he gave.

Question: '*...**Nontrinitarian movement teaches that only begotten Son means that Christ was birthed or generated by the Father...** in the Greek indicates one and only. I guess, what are your thoughts?*

Answer: '*It does mean unique, it does mean one and only, one of a kind. In Him was life, unborrowed, underived. I lay down my life, and I take it up again, no one takes it up from me. **Only God can say that.** And He was from eternity. **There was never a time when He was not. If Jesus is not God, we are all dead in our sins. Let no one touch the divinity of Christ!** Now if we look at the antitrinitarian movement. I don't believe in a Catholic pantheistic Trinity. I serve a personal God, and there are three powers in heaven and I'm instructed in the Bible to baptise people in those three powers of heaven... **If anyone wants to get rid of the Holy Spirit, sooner or later they have to get rid of Jesus Christ as the self-existent eternal God, and they will have to make Him a created being in order to be consistent... if Jesus has become a created being, then please go and become a Jehovah's witness and don't bother this Church anymore.***<sup>69</sup> - ('QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS: Pastor. Walter Veith (Better Audio)', [Mins - 1:24:22 - 1:26:23])

We see here from Professor Walter Veith a prime example of what the pioneers had to put up with, and the false accusations that were thrown at them concerning their beliefs about Jesus Sonship. Firstly, we see that Prof. Veith quotes Ellen White from her book, 'The Desire of Ages', and this quote is supposed to destroy the argument that Christ is begotten. But we've already seen in chapter 3 of this document that this argument holds no weight when we actually allow sister White to interpret herself. Moreover, Prof. Veith then goes on to quote

the words of Christ which point to Christ's divine attributes, and he then proclaims that 'Only God can say' such things. The problem is this wasn't what the question was. The question wasn't about whether Christ was divine or not, it was asking whether He was begotten of the Father or not, yet Prof. Veith says no, and says 'let no one touch the divinity of Christ', This straightaway implies that those who believe Christ is begotten don't believe He is Divine. Once again, we see this scare tactic being used, so that those who are unaware of what the pioneers actually believed will be scared away from investigating the different view as soon as they hear that someone is a non-trinitarian Adventist. They'll immediately perceive them as 'dissident offshoot' SDA's who deny the divinity of Christ. Prof. Veith throws more accusations by stating, 'If anyone wants to get rid of the Holy Spirit, sooner or later they have to get rid of Jesus Christ as the self-existent eternal God', which implies that those who believe in Christ's literal Sonship reject the Holy Spirit. Again, where has such an assertion come from? We've seen that the pioneers rejected the idea of a third being receiving worship in heaven alongside the Father & Son, but all along they expressed their belief in the Holy Spirit and believed that this was the vital source of sanctification and life for the Christian. We see Prof. Veith battling a straw man to the utmost. Prof. Veith then equates those who believe Christ is begotten to the Jehovah's witnesses by saying, 'if Jesus has become a created being, then please go and become a Jehovah's witness and don't bother this Church anymore.' Again, Walter Veith faces a problem here. The Jehovah's Witnesses believe that Jesus Christ is a creature, for they believe He's a created angel. The Jehovah's Witnesses teach that Christ is the archangel Michael, but they believe Michael is a literal angel, not just simply another title for the Divine Son of God. He then says such people shouldn't bother the church anymore, yet those who believe Christ is begotten believe the exact same thing the founders of this same church believed. Like we've seen with Pastor Doug Batchelor already, Prof. Veith equates begotten with created, even though we've seen the pioneers and Ellen White make the distinction. If one chooses not to believe that Christ is truly begotten of the Father, that's one thing, but to misconstrue peoples beliefs is dishonest, or at the very least, a result of ignorance.

We must always strive to represent our opponent's position in its strongest form, not in a weak straw man form. As Christians, even if we don't agree with someone's position, we must never attribute an opinion to them that they themselves do not hold. The truth shouldn't need deceptive tactics to stand, but the truth will always be held up by God's Word. This is why Waggoner said in response to the Methodist: 'We (SDA's) have no theory to bolster up, and so, instead of stating propositions, we shall simply quote the word of God, and accept what it says.' The Seventh-day Adventist's didn't need to bolster up man made theories by throwing around false assumptions of others beliefs. They simply defended their positions from Scripture.

Therefore, when Waggoner continued with his response to the Methodists, he argued exactly why Adventists believe Christ is divine. He stated:

***'The fact that Jesus is spoken of as the only begotten Son of God should be sufficient to establish a belief in his divinity. As Son of God, he must partake of the nature of God. "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." John 5:26. Life and immortality are imparted to the faithful followers of God, but Christ alone shares with the Father the power to impart life. He has "life in himself," that is, he is able to perpetuate his own existence. This is shown by his own words when, showing the voluntary nature of his sacrifice for man, he said: "I lay down my life,***

*that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.”* **That Christ is divine is shown by the fact that he receives worship.** Angels have always refused to receive worship and adoration. But we read of the Father, that “when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.” Hebrews 1:6. If he is to receive worship from angels, it follows as a matter of course that he should receive worship from men; and we find that even while here on earth, **in the likeness of man, he received worship as God.**’ - {E.J Waggoner, SITI April 8, 1889, page 201.35-36}

We see plainly from E.J Waggoner that the SDA’s of his time firmly believed that Christ was divine. It’s just their understanding of why He was divine that was different to those who opposed them. They didn’t believe He’s divine because He’s part of a three in one god, but they believed He is divine because He is the only begotten Son of God, and thus, ‘*as Son of God, he must partake of the nature of God.*’ Also, notice Waggoner quotes the same scriptures that Prof. Veith quoted in order to discredit the nontrinitarians and prove Christ’s divinity. Yet Waggoner, who believed Christ is begotten, used these same passages to prove Christ is divine. This was because the Seventh-day Adventists had no qualms with Jesus Christ being God. They recognised that the Lord Jesus Christ was God, and even ‘*in the likeness of man, he received worship as God.*’

We see that Ellen White herself also had to deal with charges from other Christians who accused SDA’s of denying the divinity of Christ. Sister White shares of her account:

*‘In this country (Australia), the denominational ministers tell the most unblushing falsehoods to their congregations in reference to our work and our people. Whatever false report has been started, is circulated by those who oppose the truth, and is repeated from church to church and from community to community. **The circulators of these falsehoods take no pains to find out whether or not they are true, for many of those who repeat the reports, though not the framers of them, still love the false reports, and take delight in giving them a wide circulation. They do not, like honest, just men, come to those who are accused, and seek to find out what is the truth concerning what they have heard in regard to their faith; but without inquiry they spread false statements in order to prejudice the people against those who hold the truth.** For instance, an effort was made to obtain the use of the hall at a village four miles from Hastings, where some of our workers proposed to present the gospel to the people; but they did not succeed in obtaining the hall, because a school-teacher there opposed the truth, **and declared to the people that Seventh-day Adventists did not believe in the divinity of Christ.** This man may not have known what our faith is on this point, but he was not left in ignorance. **He was informed that there is not a people on earth who hold more firmly to the truth of Christ’s pre-existence than do Seventh-day Adventists.** But the answer was given that they did not want that the doctrines of Seventh-day Adventists should be promulgated in that community. So the door was closed... **As in Christ’s day, the ministers will not***

**investigate the Scriptures, and candidly compare the doctrines presented with their Bibles, but rather seize upon some lying report, some scandal from far off or from near at hand, and present a false statement to their congregations as **an evidence that they should close their ears to the “strange doctrines” of the Seventh-day Adventists.** Through these lying reports, **the people whose minds have been stirred up by the truth are quieted down, and as they have not the moral courage to investigate the Scriptures for themselves, or to ferret out the falsehood, they turn from the men who have the message of God.**’ - {RH December 5, 1893, par. 5 - 6}**

We see that such accusations towards the Seventh-day Adventist’s were commonplace wherever the brethren would go. There was mass circulation of false reports. And a common one we’ve seen was ‘*that Seventh-day Adventists did not believe in the divinity of Christ.*’ It is intriguing that Sister White noted that the accuser was ‘*informed that **there is not a people on earth** who hold more firmly to the truth of Christ’s pre-existence (including divinity) than do Seventh-day Adventists.*’ Why were the SDA’s then so confident that there was not a people on earth who were more firmly rooted in Christ’s divinity when they were clearly non-trinitarian? It is because unlike the other churches, the Adventists believed in the sole fact that vindicates Christ’s divinity, which is His relation to the Father. Other Christians may defend the divinity of Christ but they fail to know the relation of Christ to the Father, and therefore their foundation for proving Christ’s divinity is weak, contradictory, and confusing. Nevertheless, Sister White pointed out the unfortunate fact that most people will blindly believe false reports and take them as ‘*evidence that they should close their ears to the “strange doctrines.”*’ And unfortunately, many Seventh-day Adventists have adopted this same approach, and they will choose to blindly believe false reports that are touted by ministers rather than investigate the Scriptures for themselves and ‘*compare the doctrines presented with their Bibles.*’

We see that the early Seventh-day Adventists were so strictly bound by Scripture that they refused to bow under the pressure of false accusations concerning their beliefs, and would rather be labelled as a heretical cult for not compromising to mainstream and so-called ‘orthodox’ Christian beliefs. The opinions of men did not matter for the pioneers. If something wasn’t taught in Scripture, they didn’t hold to it. Hence, E,J Waggoner said in response to another trinitarian concerning SDA beliefs:

***‘You ask what we teach about the Trinity. Inasmuch as we find no such expression in the Scriptures, we do not teach anything about it.*** But as to the Being of God,-the Godhead,-Divinity as revealed in the Father, the Word (the Son), and the Holy Spirit, ***we believe and teach just what the Bible says, and nothing else.*** No man can by searching find out God. No creature can understand the Almighty to perfection. The finite mind cannot comprehend infinity. ***Therefore, in discussions about the Trinity, about the nature of God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, are manifestations of gross presumption.***<sup>70</sup> - (E.J Waggoner, The Present Truth, Vol. 18 (1902) January 2, 1902, Page. 77/83)

We also see a response from the Review & Herald in regards to a question about whether Christ is created or not, and the response states:

**'You are mistaken in supposing that S. D. Adventists teach that Christ was ever created. They believe, on the contrary, that he was "begotten" of the Father, and that he can properly be called God and worshiped as such.** They believe, also, that the worlds, and everything which is, was created by Christ in conjunction with the Father. **They believe, however, that somewhere in the eternal ages of the past there was a point at which Christ came into existence.** They think that it is necessary that **God should have antedated** (preceded) **Christ in his being, in order that Christ could have been begotten of him, and sustain to him the relation of son.** They hold to the distinct personality of the Father and Son, rejecting as absurd that feature of Trinitarianism which insists that God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit are three persons, and yet but one person (being). S. D. Adventists hold that God and Christ are one in the sense that Christ prayed that his disciples might be one ; e., one in spirit, purpose, and labor.<sup>71</sup> - (W.H LittleJohn, 'Advent Review and Sabbath Herald', April 17, 1883, Page. 10/250)

Moreover, we can find further evidence that Ellen White herself was in agreement with her non-trinitarian brethren, for she also had been challenged upon the doctrine of the trinity when she was with her husband. We see that James White and his wife, Ellen White, were confronted by a Christian missionary over them not holding to the trinitarian stance, and they were further accused by him of being unitarians and denying Christ's divinity. James White explains the story in the Review & Herald.

*'... we left in company **with Mrs. W.** and Bro. and sister Abbey... upon the train, we met a man of marked physical and mental powers, just returning from his missionary field in China... This missionary seemed very liberal in his feelings toward all Christians. **But after catechizing us upon the trinity, and finding that we were not sound upon the subject of his triune God, he became earnest in denouncing unitarianism, which takes from Christ his divinity, and leaves him but a man.** Here, as far as our views were concerned, **he was combating a man of straw.** **We do not deny the divinity of Christ.** **We** delight in giving full credit to all those strong expressions of Scripture which exalt the Son of God. We believe him to be the divine person addressed by Jehovah in the words, "Let us make man." He was with the Father before the world was. He came from God, and he says, "I go to him that sent me."<sup>72</sup> - (James White, 'The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath', June 6, 1871, Page. 4-5/196-197)*

We once again see an example of a trinitarian fighting a straw man by assuming that Seventh-day Adventists deny the divinity of Christ because they don't worship a triune god. We see in this encounter that Mrs. White was present with her husband, and he included her in the beliefs he held to. We don't see Ellen White distancing herself from her husband's views during this encounter, and we've already examined exactly what James White believed in the previous chapter concerning God and His Son. This is because these views were the official stance of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of that time, and Ellen White was a co-founder of this Church. It's clear that those who belonged to other churches were very much aware that the SDA Church held to a non-trinitarian stance, hence the ongoing criticisms from them.

So we see that the brethren of the early Seventh-day Adventist Church would not adopt the doctrine of the trinity because it would force them to go beyond what God revealed about Himself and His Son in Scripture. When it came to the identity of who God the Father is, who His Son Jesus is, and who the Holy Spirit is, the pioneers simply stayed within the realm of the language Scripture uses instead of jumping to conclusions that the Bible doesn't actually say. Seventh-day Adventist preacher and once President of the New York conference, Roswell F. Cottrell, expressed these exact sentiments when explaining why he rejects the doctrine of the trinity. He said:

*'This has been a popular doctrine and regarded as orthodox ever since the bishop of Rome was elevated to the popedom on the strength of it. It is accounted dangerous heresy to reject it.; but each person is permitted to explain the doctrine in his own way. All seem to think they must hold it, but each has perfect liberty to take his own way to reconcile its contradictory propositions ; and hence a multitude of views are held concerning it by its friends, all of them orthodox, I suppose, as long as they nominally assent to the doctrine. For myself, I have never felt called upon to explain it, nor to adopt and defend it, neither have I ever preached against it. But I probably put as high an estimation on the Lord Jesus Christ as those who call themselves Trinitarians. This is the first time I have ever taken the pen to say anything concerning the doctrine. My reasons for not adopting and defending it, are 1. Its name is unscriptural—the Trinity, or the Triune God, is unknown to the Bible; and I have entertained the idea that doctrines which require words coined in the human mind to express them, are coined doctrines. 2. I have never felt called upon to adopt and explain that which is contrary to all the sense and reason that God has given me. All my attempts at an explanation of such a subject would make it no clearer to my friends. But if I am asked what I think of Jesus Christ, my reply is, I believe all that the Scriptures say of him. If the testimony represents him as being in glory with the Father before the world was, I believe it. If it is said that he was in the beginning with God, that he was God, that all things were made by him and for him, and that without him was not anything made that was made, I believe it. If the Scriptures say he is the Son of God, I believe it. If it is declared that the Father sent his Son into the world, I believe he had a Son to send. If the testimony says he is the beginning of the creation of God, I believe it. If he is said to be the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person, I believe it. And when Jesus says, "I and my Father are one," I believe it; and when he says, "My Father is greater than I," I believe that too; it is the word of the Son of God, and besides this it is perfectly reasonable and seemingly self-evident.'*<sup>73</sup> (R.F Cottrell, 'Advent Review and Sabbath Herald', June 1, 1869, Pages. 4-5/180-181)

R.F Cottrell's above writings on the trinity had received some criticism from a Baptist publication:

*'The Baptist Tidings has noticed some remarks of mine on this subject, not long since published in the REVIEW. He says, "A writer in the Advent Review, in speaking of the trinity, gives his reasons why be never adopted or tried to explain the doctrine. Some of his views are very sensible and logical. He by no means denies the full character, and works, and worship ascribed to Christ in the Bible. These are endorsed and unequivocally acceded to. The question with him seems to be solely in the use of the word trinity, as applied to God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. His objection is that it*



is unscriptural. That the term trinity, 'or triune God,' does not occur in the Bible. This point, so far as the use of words is concerned, all will admit is well taken. **The use of the word cannot be defended on strict scriptural phraseology. Neither can some other doctrines, or scriptural truths, as theologically expressed, but which still are generally received...**<sup>74</sup> - ('Advent Review and Sabbath Herald', July 6, 1869, Page. 2/10)

Here, the Baptist writer is honest by acknowledging that Cottrell doesn't deny Christ's divinity and the worship that is due Him. The argument this writer makes is that the absence of a word or term in Scripture does not automatically mean something the word means or describes is not a Scriptural teaching. This point is true, for there are words we use that are not found in Scripture to explain Bible truths, such as the word 'omniscient' to describe God as all knowing, which Scripture does teach. However, R.F Cottrell responded by saying that the absence of the word 'trinity' in Scripture wasn't the sole reason he rejected it, but it was the very absence of the concept and idea of a triune god that caused him to reject it and believe it's unbiblical. He stated:

'The use of an unscriptural term is not my sole objection. A term not found in the-Scriptures may truly express a scriptural idea. But when no term can be found in the Scriptures that will convey the idea, it looks suspicious, at least, that the idea, as well as the term, is unscriptural... to hold the doctrine of the trinity is not so much an evidence of evil intention as of intoxication from that wine of which all the nations have drunk. The fact that this was one of the leading doctrines, if not the very chief upon which the bishop of Rome was exalted 'to the popedom, does not say much in its favor. This should cause men to investigate it for themselves... Men have gone to opposite extremes in the discussion of the doctrine of the trinity. Some have made Christ a mere man, commencing his existence at his birth in Bethlehem; others have not been satisfied with holding him to be what the Scriptures so clearly reveal him, the pre-existing Son of God... I would simply advise all that love our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to believe all that the Bible says of him, and no more.'<sup>75</sup> - (R.F Cottrell, 'Advent Review and Sabbath Herald', July 6, 1869, PP. 2-3/10-11)

As already stated, the pioneers could not adopt the trinity because they couldn't see it from Scripture. They saw that God didn't reveal Himself to be a trinity, but He revealed Himself as being truly one singular Being, and He had a Son. It's also clear that the pioneers believed Jesus Christ is fully divine. And those today who continue to insist that the non-trinitarian SDA's deny Christ's divinity are spouting false imputations, especially if they have knowledge on what the early SDA Church taught. Also, those who do this out of ignorance are maligning a group of believers over something they don't understand and have no knowledge on. 'You are correct in saying we do not deny the divinity of Christ. If those who assert such a thing are acquainted with our faith they know better; if they do not know they are guilty of speaking evil of the things they know not.'<sup>76</sup> - ('Advent Review and Sabbath Herald', July 14, 1868, Page. 16/64)

Furthermore, the pioneers believed that the doctrine of the trinity was just another leftover remnant of popery that's rooted in paganism. For example, SDA pioneer John Norton Loughborough gave a list of reasons for his rejection of the trinity after being asked what his objections were to the belief.

**'QUESTION 1. What serious objection is there to the doctrine of the Trinity?**

**ANSWER.** *There are many objections which we might urge, but on account of our limited space we shall reduce them to the three following: 1. It is contrary to common sense. 2. **It is contrary to scripture.** 3. **Its origin is Pagan and fabulous.***

*These positions we will remark upon briefly in their order. And 1. It is not very consonant with common sense to talk of three being one, and one being three. Or as some express it, **calling God "the Triune God," or "the three-one-God."** If Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are each God, it would be three Gods; for three times one is not one, but three... 3. **Its origin is pagan and fabulous. Instead of pointing us to scripture for proof of the trinity, we are pointed to the trident of the Persians, with the assertion that "by this they designed to teach the idea of a trinity, and if they had the doctrine of the trinity, they must have received it by tradition from the people of God. But this is all assumed, for it is certain that the Jewish church held to no such doctrine... This doctrine of the trinity was brought into the church about the same time with image worship, and keeping the day of the sun, and is but Persian doctrine remodeled.** It occupied about three hundred years from its introduction to bring the doctrine to what it is now. **It was commenced about 325 A. D., and was not completed till 681.** See Milman's Gibbon's Rome, vol. iv, p.422. It was adopted in Spain in 589, in England in 596, in Africa in 534. - Gib. vol. iv, pp.114,345; Milner, vol. i, p.519. - {J. N. Loughborough. ARSH, 5 November, 1861, Page. 184.3 - 184.4, 184.9 - 184.10}*

J. N. Loughborough pinpoints that the trinity is of pagan origin, which is actually one of the arguments that trinitarians sometimes use to prove the doctrine as Loughborough stated. The assertion is that Satan counterfeits everything of God, and therefore, the pagans having their own forms of the trinity must mean that the True God is a trinity. As Loughborough stated, this is just simply a gross assumption. Deducing truth by looking at error should not be how we form our beliefs. Also, Loughborough identifies the fact that the trinity was a doctrine that had only begun to be brought into the Church during the 4th century, which was around the same time that 'image worship, and keeping the day of the sun' was starting to be brought in, and even then it had not been completely formulated. The Pioneers understood that the foundation of the trinity was no different to that of Sun-day worship, and thus, throughout the centuries, many had been put to death and persecuted for rejecting the trinity. E.J Waggoner said in response to the question 'Do you believe in the Trinity ? ';

*"If I knew what you meant by the term, I might tell you ; **but from the days of Athanasius until now** all discussion about the Trinity has been an attempt to define the indefinable and the incomprehensible. **Thousands have been put to death for not professing belief in a formula which even its professors could not comprehend, nor state in terms that anybody else could comprehend.** The Scriptures reveal "One God and Father of all," our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the brightness of the Father's glory, and "the eternal Spirit " through whom Christ offered Himself and was raised from*

*the dead ; but we do not profess any knowledge of them beyond what the Scriptures give us. In teaching and preaching the Gospel we always confine ourselves strictly to Scripture terms and language ; those who manufacture terms must be looked to for definitions of them.*”<sup>77</sup> - (E.J Waggoner, ‘Present Truth’, July 30, 1903, Page. 3/483)

E.J Waggoner mentions the great persecutions that had come about from the Church against those who refused to uphold the belief in the triune god. From the time of Athanasius in the 4th century, many Christians who had rejected this doctrine were banished and exterminated. The First Nicene Creed that was brought about at the Council of Nicaea in 325 AD (although not trinitarian) laid a foundation for the trinity by subtly introducing Origen’s philosophy of the co-eternality of the Son with the Father (eternal-generation) by stating; ‘And those who say **“there once was when he (Jesus) was not”**, and “before he was begotten he was not”... **these the catholic and apostolic church anathematises.**’<sup>78</sup> – (PAPAL ENCYCLICALS ONLINE, ‘First Council of Nicaea – 325 AD’, THE PROFESSION OF FAITH OF THE 318 FATHERS, No. 2)

After this, the next phase of constructing the triune god was done at the First Council of constantinople 381 AD by ushering in the Holy Spirit as deity in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, which stated;

*‘And in the Spirit, the holy, the lordly and life-giving one, proceeding forth from the Father, **co-worshipped and co-glorified with Father and Son**, the one who spoke through the prophets; in one, holy, catholic and apostolic church.*’<sup>79</sup> - (PAPAL ENCYCLICALS ONLINE, First Council of Constantinople – 381: Council Fathers - 381 A.D., The exposition of the 150 fathers)

And it wasn’t until over a century later that the Trinity doctrine as understood today was finally presented in a creed; The Anasthasian Creed, which states:

*‘WHOSOEVER will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith. Which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. And the Catholick Faith is this: **That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity**; Neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the Substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son: and another of the Holy Ghost. **But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal.** Such as the Father is, such is the Son: and such is the Holy Ghost... The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible: and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible. The Father eternal, the Son eternal: and the Holy Ghost eternal. And yet they are not three eternal: but one eternal... **So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty: and the Holy Ghost Almighty. And yet they are not three Almighty: but one Almighty. So the Father is God, the Son is God: and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet they are not three Gods: but one God... And in this Trinity none is afore (before), or after other: none is greater, or less than another; But the whole three Persons are co-eternal together: and co-equal. So that in all things, as is aforesaid: the Unity in Trinity, and the***

**Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped.** *He therefore that will be saved: must thus think of the Trinity... This is the Catholick Faith: **which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.** Glory be to the Father, and to the Son: and to the Holy Ghost;...*<sup>80</sup> - (THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 'The Creed of S. Athanasius')

Once this 'orthodox' Papal god was finally established and settled, then the campaigns could continue to take place to root out the non-trinitarian kingdoms who would not ascribe to this god of the Universal Church. A.T Jones speaks of this history when stating:

*'War followed, and the Burgundian dominions were made subject to the rule of Clovis, A. D. 500. The Visigoths possessed all the southwestern portion of Gaul. They too were Arians; and the mutual conspiracy of the Catholics in the Gothic dominions, and the crusade of the Franks from the side of Clovis, soon brought on another holy war. At the assembly of princes and warriors at Paris, A. D. 508, Clovis complained, "It grieves me to see that the Arians still possess the fairest portion of Gaul. Let us march against them with the aid of God ; and, **having vanquished the heretics,** we will possess and divide their fertile province."... The oracle was satisfactory, and in the event was completely successful. "The Visigothic kingdom was wasted and subdued by the remorseless sword of the Franks." — Gibbon... — all of which Gregory, bishop of Tours, commended as the will of God, saying of Clovis that " God thus daily prostrated his enemies under his hands, and enlarged his kingdom, because he walked before him with an upright heart, and did that which was well pleasing in his sight." M Uman. —*

**Thus was the bloody course of Clovis glorified by the Catholic writers, as the triumph of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity over Arianism. When such actions as these were so lauded by the clergy as the pious acts of orthodox Catholics, it is certain that the clergy themselves were no better than were the bloody objects of their praise.**<sup>81</sup> - (Alonzo T. Jones, 'THE TWO REPUBLICS OR ROME AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA', 1891, p. 527-528)

And within the same century, laws and legislations had been enacted by the Roman Emperor Justinian, which included laws of compulsion to worship the Trinity god. The legislation stated:

**'Title 1. Concerning the most exalted Trinity and the Catholic faith, and providing that no one shall dare to publicly oppose them.**

We desire that all peoples subject to Our benign Empire shall live under the same religion that the Divine Peter, the Apostle, gave to the Romans... **we should believe that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit constitute a single Deity, endowed with equal majesty, and united in the Holy Trinity**... (1) We order all those who follow this law to assume the name of Catholic Christians, and considering others as demented and insane, **We order that they shall bear the infamy of heresy;** and when the Divine vengeance which they merit has been appeased, they shall afterwards be punished in accordance with Our resentment, which we have acquired from the judgment of Heaven... Let no place be afforded to heretics for the conduct of their ceremonies, and let no occasion be offered for them to display the insanity of their obstinate minds... **Let all bodies of heretics be prevented from holding unlawful assemblies,** and let the name of the

only and the greatest God be celebrated everywhere, and **let the observance of the Nicene Creed, recently transmitted by Our ancestors, and firmly established by the testimony and practice of Divine Religion, always remain secure.**

(1) Moreover, he who is an adherent of the Nicene Faith, and a true believer in the Catholic religion, should be understood to be one who believes that Almighty God and Christ, the Son of God, are one person, God of God, Light of Light; and let no one, by rejection, dishonor the Holy Spirit, whom we expect, and have received from the Supreme Parent of all things, in whom the sentiment of a pure and undefiled faith flourishes, **as well as the belief in the undivided substance of a Holy Trinity... Let those who do not accept these doctrines cease to apply the name of true religion to their fraudulent belief; and let them be branded with their open crimes, and, having been removed from the threshold of all churches, be utterly excluded from them, as We forbid all heretics to hold unlawful assemblies within cities...** We direct that all Catholic churches, throughout the entire world, shall be placed under **the control of the orthodox bishops who have embraced the Nicene Creed.**<sup>82</sup> - (THE ENACTMENTS OF JUSTINIAN. THE CODE. Book I, Title 1. S.P.Scott, *The Civil Law*, XII, Cincinnati, 1932)

We see that the 'orthodoxy' of the Trinity doctrine is something that has been ingrained in the minds of Christians over centuries. We see in this ancient legislation that anyone who denies that *'the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit constitute a single Deity, endowed with equal majesty, and united in the Holy Trinity... shall bear the infamy of heresy.'* It is as early as this that we see that those who would reject *'the belief in the undivided substance of a Holy Trinity'* would have to be *'removed from the threshold of all churches, (and) be utterly excluded from them.'* And this was followed by the year 538 AD, where the 1260 days of Papal rule and dominance began with the Bishop of Rome, even the Pope, being established as *'Head of all bishops, and the true and effective corrector of heretics.'*

This is the history and spirit behind the Trinity god. Is it no wonder that Christians today respond with such shock and vehemence at any doctrine that would dare question the Trinity? Is it no wonder that Seventh-day Adventists during the time of the pioneers would be victims of false reports, and ministers of other churches would give false statements to *'their congregations as an evidence that they should close their ears to the "strange doctrines" of the Seventh-day Adventists'*? We saw that James White gave a report of a missionary that was *'liberal in his feelings toward all Christians,'* and yet went on to catechize them *'upon the trinity'* after *'finding that we were not sound upon the subject of his triune God.'* And such feelings continue to persist today in the Christian world. So effectively has this trinity god permeated the thinking and minds of men for over a millennia, that any group of believers who fail to accept this triune god will instantly be branded as a cult. And this thinking has its roots in a history of force and persecution in order to cement it.

J.N Andrews made this same observation when analysing the history of this doctrine in the Church. Andrews highlighted that the trinity was just one of many doctrines of Babylon that many were forced to ascribe to from its onset. Andrews stated:

*‘The cause of the fall of Babylon is thus stated: “she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.”... The wine of this, is that with which the church has intoxicated the nations of the earth. There is but one thing that this can refer to; viz., **false doctrine**. This harlot, in consequence of her unlawful union with the powers of earth, **has corrupted the pure truths of the Bible, and with the wine of her false doctrine**, has intoxicated the nations... The doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul. This was derived from the Pagan mythology, and was introduced into the church by means of distinguished converts from Paganism... **The doctrine of the Trinity** which was established in the church by the council of Nice, A. D. 325. **This doctrine destroys the personality of God, and his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. The infamous, measures by which it was forced upon the church which appear upon the pages of ecclesiastical history might well cause every believer in that doctrine to blush**... The change of the fourth commandment. The pagan festival of Sunday has been substituted by the church for the Rest day of the Lord.’ - {J.N Andrews, ARSH, March 6, 1855 185.32 - 185.34, 185.36}*

According to Andrews, the trinity comes from the wine of Babylon alongside ‘*the doctrine of... natural immortality*’ and ‘*the pagan festival of Sunday*’. And like many other false doctrines of Rome, people were led to accept the trinity god by coercion, and the rejection of this papal god was met with ‘*infamous, measures by which it was forced upon the church*’. For the founders of the SDA Church, the trinity was just simply another component of Babylon that had the same foundation as Sunday worship. For instance, James White stated that the trinity, like Sunday worship, was a doctrine that the Protestants had taken from the Church of Rome, along with other errors that they still hold onto. He stated:

*‘As fundamental errors, we might class with this counterfeit sabbath other errors which Protestants have brought away from the Catholic church, such as sprinkling for baptism, **the trinity**, the consciousness of the dead and eternal life in misery. The mass who have held these fundamental errors, have doubtless done it ignorantly; **but can it be supposed that the church of Christ will carry along with her these errors till the judgment scenes burst upon the world? We think not**... This class, who live just prior to the second advent, will not be keeping the traditions of men... And as the true light shines out upon these subjects, **and is rejected by the mass**, then condemnation will come upon them. ‘ - {James White, ARSH, September 12, 1854, page. 36.7}*

For James White, the trinity was a remnant of Popery that the Protestant world had refused to let go of, just like all her other Babylonian dogmas. James White also went on to say that if the reformers had continued reforming, they would have abandoned the trinity as well as the

other false doctrines, and then they would have been completely free from the intoxicants of Rome.

*‘The “mystery of iniquity” began to work in the church in Paul’s day. It finally crowded out the simplicity of the gospel, and corrupted the doctrine of Christ, and the church went into the wilderness. Martin Luther, and other reformers, arose in the strength of God, and with the Word and Spirit, made mighty strides in the Reformation. **The greatest fault we can find in the Reformation is, the Reformers stopped reforming.** Had they gone on, and onward, till they had left the last vestige of Papacy behind, such as natural immortality, sprinkling, **the trinity**, and **Sunday-keeping**, the church would now be free from her unscriptural errors.’ - {James White, ARSH, February 7, 1856, page. 148.22}*

For the pioneers, the doctrine of the trinity was as far from the truth as the teaching that the commandments in the new testament were not in reference to the 10 commandments. James White stated:

*‘The faith of Jesus is to be kept, as well as the commandments of God... **We are told by those who teach the abolition of the Father’s law, that the commandments of God mentioned in the New Testament, are not the ten**, but the requirements of the gospel, such as repentance, faith, baptism and the Lord’s supper. But as these, and every other requirement peculiar to the gospel, are all embraced in the faith of Jesus, it is evident that the commandments of God are not the sayings of Christ and his apostles. To assert that the sayings of the Son and his apostles are the commandments of the Father, **is as wide from the truth as the old trinitarian absurdity that Jesus Christ is the very and Eternal God.** And as the faith of Jesus embraces every requirement peculiar to the gospel, it necessarily follows that the commandments of God, mentioned by the third angel, embrace only the ten precepts of the Father’s immutable law which are not peculiar to any one dispensation, but common to all.’ - {James White, ARSH, August 5, 1852, page. 52.41 - 52.42}*

We see that James White was very vocal on his beliefs concerning the trinity, and he most assuredly would not have approved of the second fundamental belief of the present day SDA Church. For James White, this change of doctrine in the SDA Church would not be the progressive step of ‘present truth’, but it would be a demonstration of a backslidden church marching Romewards. Moreover, we see yet again an absence of rebuke from Ellen White. Ellen White never rebuked her husband for his beliefs, on the contrary, she commended them. She said that **‘God has permitted the precious light of truth to shine upon His word and illuminate the mind of my husband.** He may reflect the rays of light from the presence of Jesus upon others by his preaching and writing.’ - {3T 502.3, 1875} Ellen White tells us that God permitted His ‘precious light of truth’ to ‘illuminate the mind of... (her) husband’, and that her husband would reflect the rays of light from Christ’s presence through ‘his preaching and writing.’ Once again, we see bold statements from Ellen White concerning someone she was in close fellowship with. She proclaims that the light of truths from God could be seen from her husband’s writings. There seems to be a

trend from Ellen White of commending her fellow brethren and their works in regards to biblical truths. Ellen White did not shy away from speaking out on error and rebuking those who were peddling with falsehoods, for this is what she was called to do: ***‘Serious errors in doctrine and practice were cherished, and some were ready to condemn all who would not accept their views. God revealed these errors to me in vision and sent me to His erring children to declare them;’*** - {5T 655.4} Yet, she never came out and spoke out against the beliefs that her brethren held concerning the identity of God and His Son. Rather, she said concerning her brethren and husband that *‘many of the pioneers, who shared with us these trials and victories, remained true till the close of life, and have fallen asleep in Jesus. Among these is the faithful warrior (James White) who for thirty-six years stood by my side in the battle for truth. God used him as a teacher and leader to stand in the front ranks during the severe struggles of those early days of the message; but he has fallen at his post, and, with others who have died in the faith, he awaits the coming of the Lifegiver, who will call him from his gloomy prison-house to a glorious immortality.’* - {RH November, 20, 1883, par. 6}

It stands to reason that Ellen White was obviously in harmony with the beliefs of her husband, especially concerning who God is, or else she would have never made such statements that can put people at risk of adopting heresies about The Father and The Son. We can identify the major points that Ellen White and her husband were in agreement on. For example, Ellen White and her husband both warned about the dangers of teachers and doctrines who destroy the personality of God and Christ. Ellen White said, *“Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father; [but] he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also... He who denies the personality of God and of his Son Jesus Christ, is denying God and Christ. “If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father.”*

***If you continue to believe and obey the truths you first embraced regarding the personality of the Father and the Son, you will be joined together with him in love’*** - {RH March, 8, 1906, par.17, 19}

James White stated exactly what doing away with the personality of God and His Son entails. He stated:

*‘...the expression of the Apostle, “they shall be turned from the truth unto fables,” is worthy of especial attention. We will here briefly notice some of the popular fables of the age... Here we might mention the Trinity, which does away the personality of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ.’* - {James White , ARSH December 11, 1855, page. 85.10, 85.15}

James White viewed the trinity as a doctrine that did away with the personality of God and His Son. We’ve seen Ellen White specify that ‘one of the ***marked characteristics of spiritualist teachers*** (is) ***they refuse to acknowledge Christ as the Son of God... Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father.***” 1 John 2:22, 23.



***Spiritualism, by denying Christ, denies both the Father and the Son, and the Bible pronounces it the manifestation of antichrist. - {PP 686.1}***

And once again, we see James White identify the doctrine that does this very thing. He said, ***‘the way spiritualizers... have disposed of or denied the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ is first using the old unscriptural trinitarian creed, viz, that Jesus Christ is the eternal God, though they have not one passage to support it, while we have plain scripture testimony in abundance that he is the Son of the eternal God.’***<sup>83</sup> - (James White, ‘The Day - Star’, January 24, 1846, page. 1/25)

James White didn’t see any conflict between his beliefs about God & Christ and the writings of his wife. In fact, James White explicitly said that the trinitarians cannot accept the writings of Ellen White because they do not agree with their trinitarian beliefs. He said;

***‘We invite all to compare the testimonies of the Holy Spirit through Mrs. W., with the word of God. And in this we do not invite you to compare them with your creed. That is quite another thing. The trinitarian may compare them with his creed, and because they do not agree with it, condemn them. The observer of Sunday, or the man who holds eternal torment an important truth, and the minister that sprinkles infants, may each condemn the testimonies of Mrs. W. because they do not agree with their peculiar views...’***<sup>84</sup> - (James White, ‘The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath’, June 13, 1871, page. 4/204)

James White clearly saw that the writings of his wife could not be harmonised with the concept of a triune god, and therefore the trinitarian would condemn them. Notice that James White also listed other doctrines that could not be supported by Ellen White’s writings, such as Sunday observance, eternal torment, and sprinkling for baptism, and thus those who ascribe to such beliefs would condemn the writings of his wife. The trinity is listed here as just another one of these papal falsehoods that would have to cause those that ascribe to it to condemn the writings of Ellen White. James White clearly understood the position of his wife, and he saw no trinity in her position. It’s clear from this that Ellen White could not have been trinitarian if her writings were in conflict with the trinity. At the very least, one would have to acknowledge that she wasn’t trinitarian until at least 1881, for this is when her husband died. So one could make the case that she changed her stance on the personality of God and Christ, and departed from the stance she had whilst James White was alive.

But even as late as 1905, Ellen White warned about the dangers of those who would come in to break down the foundational truths that had been established, and this included adopting theories that would destroy the personality of God and Christ. For example, she stated:

***‘Let not any man enter upon the work of tearing down the foundations of the truth that have made us what we are. God has led His people forward step by step though there were pitfalls of error on every side. Under the wonderful guidance of a plain, “Thus saith the Lord,” a truth has been established that has stood the test of trial. When men arise and attempt to draw away disciples after them, meet them with the truths that have been tried as by fire... Those who seek to remove the old landmarks are not holding fast; they are not remembering how they have received and heard. Those who***

**try to bring in theories that would remove the pillars of our faith concerning the sanctuary or concerning *the personality of God or of Christ*, are working as blind men. They are seeking to bring in uncertainties and to set the people of God adrift without an anchor.**' - {MR 760.9.3, 9.5, 1905}

Many argue that Ellen White changed her beliefs concerning God and Christ, yet Ellen White warned against 'those who seek to remove the old landmarks' and 'those who try to bring in theories that would remove the pillars of 'the Advent faith 'concerning'... the personality of God or of Christ'. Again in 1905, Ellen White said, 'That which I have written is what the Lord has bidden me write. **I have not been instructed to change that which I have sent out.** I stand firm in the Adventist faith; **for I have been warned in regard to the seducing sophistries that will seek for entrance among us as a people.** The Scripture says, 'Some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils.' I present before our people the danger of being led astray as were the angels in the heavenly courts. **The straight line of truth presented to me when I was but a girl is just as clearly presented to me now.**' - {RH January, 26, 1905, par.19}

Ellen White said in 1905 that she had 'not been instructed to change that which' she had 'sent out'. According to sister White, 'The straight line of truth' that had been 'presented to' her when she 'was but a girl' was 'just as clearly presented' to her in 1905. Does this sound as though Ellen White would have really shifted in her position concerning the very identity of God and His Son?

The present SDA Church teaches that the trinity was adopted by the church through 'progressive truth.' Many men of influence in the current church today also push the narrative that Ellen White is the one who started this change. For example, this line of argument can be seen by once Advent Review editor, William G. Johnsson. In 1994 he stated:

'Some Adventists today think that our beliefs have remained unchanged over the years, or they seek to turn back the clock to some point when we had everything just right. But all attempts to recover such "historic Adventism" fail in view of the facts of our heritage. **Adventist beliefs have changed over the years under the impact of "present truth."** Most startling is the teaching regarding Jesus Christ, our Saviour 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). Likewise, **the Trinitarian understanding of God, now part of our fundamental beliefs, was not generally held by the early Adventists.**<sup>85</sup> - (William G. Johnsson, 'Adventist Review', January 6, 1994, page. 10)

So according to Johnsson, the original Adventist beliefs concerning God & Christ had 'changed over the years under the impact of present truth'. He rightfully acknowledges that

'the Trinitarian understanding of God, now part of our fundamental beliefs, was not generally held by the early Adventists', and this includes Ellen White, for we've seen that her husband made it clear that her writings did not agree with the trinitarian view. However, Johnsson explains this away by claiming that the pioneers 'false doctrine' was gradually disposed of due to Ellen White who brought about this change, and he uses the popular quote that trinitarians love to use to prove their case. But was Ellen White really changing her views on God, and did she really begin to bring such changes into the Advent faith? We see in 1905 that Ellen White proclaims that this was definitely not the case. She said:

*'If we are the Lord's appointed messengers, **we shall not spring up with new ideas and theories to contradict the message that God has given through His servants since 1844.** At that time many sought the Lord with heart and soul and voice. The men whom God raised up were diligent searchers of the Scriptures. **And those who today claim to have light, and who contradict the teaching of God's ordained messengers, who were working under the Holy Spirit's guidance, those who get up new theories, which remove the pillars of our faith, are not doing the will of God, but are bringing in fallacies of their own invention, which, if received, will cut the church away from the anchorage of truth and set them drifting, drifting,** to where they will receive any sophistries that may arise.'* - {20LtMs, Ms 75, 1905, par. 5}

A year later, Ellen White reaffirmed that the truths discovered in the early years of the Advent movement were still the same.

*'And now, **after half a century of clear light from the Word as to what is truth, there are arising many false theories to unsettle minds.** But the evidence given in our early experience has the same force that it had then. **The truth is the same as it ever has been, and not a pin or a pillar can be moved from the structure of truth.** That which was sought for out of the Word in 1844, 1845, and 1846 **remains the truth today in every particular.**'* - {21 LtMs, Lt 38, 1906, par.3}

It is interesting that Ellen White kept making these sorts of statements in the 1900's. This was the decade that ministers and theologians of the church today claim Ellen White began to shift in her beliefs and change things. Yet, we've seen that in 1905 she warned against 'those who try to bring in theories that would remove the pillars of our faith concerning the sanctuary or concerning **the personality of God or of Christ.**' The attack on the personality of God and of Christ had already begun to try making its way into the Church prior to 1905. This especially grew prominent during the John Harvey Kellogg controversy. Many are aware that Kellogg began to adopt and teach pantheism, which was revealed in his book: 'The Living Temple.' However, it wasn't only pantheism that Kellogg adopted. He also embraced the doctrine of the Trinity. After Ellen White had rebuked Kellogg over his teachings in 'The Living Temple,' there had been exchanges of dialogue between Arthur G. Daniells and Ellen White's son, William (Willie) C. White. A.G Daniells disclosed to Willie White that Kellogg had made a confession that he came to believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, and this would be made clear in his revision of the Living Temple.

A.G. Daniells wrote:

'Dear Brother White:--

Ever since the council closed I have felt that I should write you confidentially regarding Dr. Kellogg's plans for revising and republishing "The Living Temple." But I have allowed the pressure of work to prevent me from doing so. Last evening we received a letter from the Doctor (Kellogg) which makes me feel that I must not delay any longer to write you about this matter. In one of the Doctor's statements made to the brethren while in council, he referred to "The Living Temple," and gave us to understand that it would be entirely withdrawn from the market... But the day the council closed, I had a long conversation with him about the book... He said that some days before coming to the council, he had been thinking the matter over, and began to see that he had made a slight mistake in expressing his views. He said that all the way along he had been troubled to know how to state the character of God and his relation to his created works... **He felt sure that he believed just what the Testimonies teach, and what Dr. Waggoner and Elder Jones have taught for years;** "but he had come to believe that none of them had expressed the matter in correct form. **He then stated that his former views regarding the trinity had stood in his way of making a clear and absolutely correct statement: but that within a short time he had come to believe in the trinity, and could now see pretty clearly where all the difficulty was, and believed that he could clear the matter up satisfactorily. He told me that he now believed in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost;** and his view was that it was God the Holy Ghost, and not God the Father, that filled all space, and every living thing... I placed before him the objections I found in the teaching, and tried to show him that the teaching was so utterly contrary to the gospel that I did not see how it could be revised by changing a few expressions... After talking with me, he had a long interview with Prof. Prescott, in which he tried to get Brother Prescott to help him correct the statements that were misleading... Brother Prescott consented to give the book a careful examination, and write the Doctor his decision. After spending a whole day going through the book from the first part to the last, **Brother Prescott became thoroughly convinced that it would be impossible to revise that part of the book dealing with theology,** and he wrote the Doctor to that effect... **We are simply amazed at the course the Doctor is taking regarding this book.** In the first place, we have believed most sincerely for a year that the teaching of the book is subversive of the gospel of Jesus Christ. You will remember that a year ago, professor Prescott pointed out three fundamental errors which strike at the very foundation of the gospel: **One is a clear-cut denial of the personality of God as set forth in the Scriptures;**... **Now the Spirit of Prophecy comes forward and denounces these errors in unmistakable language.** The teaching of the book is called mysticism, subtle sophistries, Satanis delusions,... Up to the time the Spirit of prophecy spoke, the Doctor and those who believed with him, took an unyielding position, and **treated those who differed with them, as enemies who were creating dissensions and strife. They gave us fair warning that this battle would be fought out to the bitter end,** and that **the old traditional theories would be rolled under.**<sup>86</sup> - (A.G. Daniells, The General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, October 29, 1903, p. 1 - 4)

So Kellogg explained to Daniells that he had plans to make a revision on the book. He felt that he could not express his views clearly before but now he could because he had come to believe in the Trinity. Notice that one of the contentions Prescott had with Kellogg's view was

that it was a 'clear-cut denial of the personality of God as set forth in the Scriptures.' Also, the letter states that those on Kellogg's side had 'treated those who differed with them, as enemies who were creating dissensions and strife.' Also, Daniells states that Kellogg and his supporters gave a warning 'that **the old traditional theories would be rolled under.**' Now we see that Kellogg 'felt sure that he believed just what the Testimonies teach,' concerning his new found beliefs. Kellogg had come to believe in 'God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost,' the Trinity. Months before this letter, Ellen White had written to Kellogg stating.

'You are not sound in the faith. I have stated this in my diary months ago. You have certainly placed the people of God, **whom the Lord has led step by step in the ways of truth and placed upon a solid foundation**, in a false showing before unbelievers. Some have departed from the faith and will continue to misrepresent the work God has given me. The sanctuary question is a clear and definite doctrine as we have held it as a people. **You are not definitely clear on the personality of God, which is everything to us as a people. You have virtually destroyed the Lord God Himself.**' - {18LtMs, Lt 300, 1903, par. 6 - 7}

Nevertheless, Kellogg maintained that his sentiments were supported by the prophet of God. Kellogg expressed great confusion over the backlash he received, for he was adamant that the Spirit of Prophecy supported his beliefs. He stated in a letter to B.I. Butler;

'As far as I can fathom, the difficulty which is found in *The Living Temple*, **the whole thing may be simmered down to the question: Is the Holy Ghost a person? You say no.** I had supposed the Bible said this for the reason that the personal pronoun 'he' is used in speaking of the Holy Ghost. **Sister White uses the pronoun 'he' and has said in so many words that the Holy Ghost is the third person of the Godhead.** How the Holy Ghost can be the third person and not be a person at all is difficult for me to see.'<sup>87</sup>  
- (Letter from J. H. Kellogg to G. I. Butler, October 28, 1903)

John. H. Kellogg states that the whole controversy is ultimately 'simmered down to the question: Is the Holy Ghost a person?' He expresses confusion over why G.I Butler does not believe so, and he then argues that Ellen White agreed with his own view, for she 'has said in so many words that **the Holy Ghost is the third person of the Godhead**'. Does not this sound familiar?

Is it not interesting that Kellogg was using the exact same arguments as ministers and others alike in the SDA Church today use to argue that Sister White had changed her beliefs around this time period by adopting the trinity and teaching about god the holy spirit? They will quote her saying 'the third person of the Godhead' and camp on such statements, just like Kellogg did. Clearly the pioneers were also aware of this sort of language expressed by Ellen White but they didn't reach the same conclusions as Kellogg and most SDA's today. B.I Butler responded to these arguments of Kelloggs by stating:

'So far as Sister White and you being in perfect agreement, I shall have to leave that entirely between you and Sister White. **Sister White says there is not perfect agreement**; you claim there is. **I know some of her remarks seem to give you**

***strong ground for claiming that she does. I am candid enough to say that,*** but I must give her the credit until she disowns it of saying there is a difference too, and ***I do not believe you can fully tell just what she means.*** Those scriptures that she quotes so much of late, “we must eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of God”, and all that Scripture there, I had often thought had I been living and heard those remarks right from Christ, I should, in my way of thinking, have been in great danger of looking at them as something so passing strange that I could not have endorsed them, and I doubt not the Saviour used them to give those who were wanting some reason to disown Him a chance. He says distinctly, in that connection, that those words were to be understood in a spiritual sense. Sister White, I suppose, means that also. It is the only way I can understand the words. ***It is really to be a partaker of Christ’s spiritually as literally as we could eat His flesh and drink His blood. His spiritual nature should be imparted to us,*** really and actually. It is necessary to any genuine conversion. ***This I fully believe. God dwells in us by His Holy Spirit, as a Comforter,*** as a Reprover, especially the former. When we come to Him we partake of Him in that sense, ***because the Spirit comes forth from Him; it comes forth from the Father and the Son. It is not a person walking around on foot, or flying as a literal being...***<sup>88</sup> - (G.I. Butler letter to J.H. Kellogg, April 5, 1904)

So Butler responded to Kellogg by first acknowledging that some of Sister White’s statements could be taken as giving Kellogg’s view ‘*strong ground for claiming*’ she taught his view. But Butler himself did not take Ellen White’s statements to mean that she was saying the Holy Spirit is a literal being, rather he took her as meaning Christ’s ‘*spiritual nature*’ that’s ‘*imparted to us.*’ We’ve seen such sentiments expressed by Ellen White in chapter 5 of this document. Nevertheless, Butler said that ‘*so far as Sister White and you being in perfect agreement, I shall have to leave that entirely between you and Sister White.*’ Butler acknowledged that it was ultimately only Ellen White who could say that Kellogg was right or wrong concerning whether her views were in harmony with his and whether her statements really did mean what Kellogg was claiming; that they were meaning; the Holy Spirit is a person. But Ellen White had already responded to these arguments put forth by Kellogg.

Sister White wrote;

‘I have some things to say to our teachers in reference to the new book, “The Living Temple.” ***Be careful how you sustain the sentiments of this book regarding the personality of God.*** As the Lord represents matters to me, these sentiments do not bear the indorsement of God. ***They are a snare that the enemy has prepared for these last days.*** I thought that this would surely be discerned, and that it would not be necessary for me to say anything about it. ***But since the claim has been made that the teachings of this book can be sustained by statements from my writings, I am compelled to speak in denial of this claim. There may be in this book expressions and sentiments that are in harmony with my writings. And there may be in my writings many statements which, when taken from their connection, and interpreted according to the mind of the writer of “The Living Temple,” would seem to be in harmony with the teachings of this book. This may give apparent support to the assertion that the sentiments in “The Living Temple” are in harmony with my writings. But God forbid that this opinion should prevail.***’ - {RH, October 22, 1903, par. 1}

Ellen White reiterates the exact same point as Butler. Like Butler, Sister White acknowledges that her writings may have ‘*many statements which, **when taken from their connection, and interpreted according to the mind of the writer** of “The Living Temple,” would seem to be in harmony with the teachings of this book.*’ So, as this document itself stated in chapter 5, Sister White’s statements could appear to support the notion of a third divine being in heaven when read with certain presuppositions and lenses detached from what her writings overall teach and say on the subject. Kellogg argued that ‘*Sister White uses the pronoun ‘he’ and **has said in so many words** that the Holy Ghost is the third person of the Godhead.*’ and therefore, she must have taken his view that the Holy Spirit is a literal person. But Butler told Kellogg he was mistaken in reading her statements in such a way, and Sister White herself emphatically denied that this was the case, she said ‘*I am compelled to speak in denial of this claim.*’ It is apparent that this was a growing notion amongst the supporters of Kellogg, and Sister White was aware of this. She responded to this argument by saying ‘*God forbid that this opinion should prevail.*’ Unfortunately, Seventh-day Adventists today have taken the side of Kellogg in this controversy, and use the very same Spirit of prophecy statements that Kellogg used to substantiate their claim that Ellen White began to believe in a literal third divine being called ‘God the Holy Spirit,’ just like Kellogg did. For example, well known minister in the Seventh-day Adventist Church, Pastor Dwayne Lemon, used this exact same argument on a Q&A panel. Notice what he said:

Question: “*A friend of mine has come to me with a view of the Trinity, trinitarian view, which we have in the Church now, (they) says it is contrary to what our pioneers believed... I’m still working on it but what’s the true position of the trinitarian position...?*”

Dwyane Lemon’s Answer: ‘*Well number one, the first thing that we would have to remember is this the word Trinity does not mean what a lot of people say it means, that’s the first point. In other words, when a lot of people hear the word ‘Trinity’, we often think of Roman Catholicism and there’s a hierarchy and all of this other stuff with God’s over here, the Son is over here, and the Spirit of God is this that and the other, but the word Trinity simply means a group of three. That’s what the word Trinity means simply by definition, a group of three. Okay, so that’s point number one that I want them to understand, is **did our pioneers and did Ellen White herself acknowledge three eternal persons?** Did they acknowledge Father Son and Holy Spirit? That would be the first point and **the answer is yes.** Then secondly, I would say how are you going to use the spirit of prophecy to try to disprove it **when evangelism page 616 clearly says the Holy Spirit is a person with a personality?** So I’m like, you can’t get away from that **because the anti-Trinitarian movement, they’re not simply against the name, they’re against the concept and they believe that the Holy Spirit is not a personal being** but more so a force or an energy that exudes from Christ or the Father, but if they’re using Ellen White, **I just ask them then what you’re going to do with evangelism 616. Evangelism 616 clearly says the Holy Spirit is a person with a personality. That is a clear direct statement so for me that shuts it as far as Ellen White is concerned...**<sup>89</sup> - (Dwayne Lemon Trinity Question) [Mins - 0:12 - 2:21]*

We see here that Pastor Lemon is using the exact same logic and arguments that Kellogg was using concerning Spirit of Prophecy and the deity of the Holy Spirit as a third divine being. Kellogg said ‘*the whole thing may be simmered down to the question: **Is the Holy Ghost***

**a person?’** And he went on to defend his assertion by saying that ‘*Sister White uses the pronoun 'he' and has said in so many words that the Holy Ghost is the third person of the Godhead. How the Holy Ghost can be the third person and not be a person at all is difficult for me to see.*’ We’ve seen that Ellen White did refer to the Holy Spirit as a person and wrote many things that could be taken the way that Kellogg understood it, but the pioneers, like Butler, including Ellen White herself, emphatically made it clear that this is not what she meant, ‘*God forbid that this opinion should prevail.*’ Pastor Lemon insists that this is what she meant, and he latches on to the same sort of statement and says that it ‘*is a clear direct statement so for me that shuts it as far as Ellen White is concerned,*’ as though that is all we have of Ellen White’s writings concerning the Holy Spirit. Kellogg and his companions warned ‘*that this battle would be fought out to the bitter end, and that the **old traditional theories would be rolled under.***’ And today, the Church holds to the position that during this time period, Ellen White changed her stance concerning the personality of God and of Christ, and she embraced the trinity, having then begun to teach about the third divine being in heaven; God the Holy Spirit.

However, Ellen White seemed to speak contrary to the assertions that are made by the present SDA Church. In fact, it was in these later years of Ellen White’s that she began to warn more and more about the great changes that were going to take place in the church. In light of the Kellogg controversy, Ellen White warned that the enemy would bring in the idea that the church was to reform their beliefs, and this would lead to the church giving up the doctrines they once held to. In 1904, Ellen White gave this warning by stating:

*‘... The truth will be criticized, scorned, and derided; but the closer it is examined and tested, the brighter it will shine. As a people, we are to stand firm on the platform of eternal truth that has withstood test and trial. We are to hold to the sure pillars of our faith. The principles of truth that God has revealed to us are our only true foundation. They have made us what we are. The lapse of time has not lessened their value. **It is the constant effort of the enemy to remove these truths from their setting, and to put in their place spurious theories.***

*He will bring in everything that he possibly can to carry out his deceptive designs... I have been instructed by the heavenly messenger that some of the reasoning in the book, “Living Temple,” is unsound and that this reasoning would lead astray the minds of those who are not thoroughly established on the foundation principles of present truth. It introduces that which is naught but speculation **in regard to the personality of God and where His presence is...** When I first left the State of Maine, it was to go through Vermont and Massachusetts, to bear a testimony against these sentiments. **“Living Temple” contains the alpha of these theories. I knew that the omega would follow in a little while; and I trembled for our people. I knew that I must warn our brethren and sisters not to enter into controversy over the presence and personality of God.** The statements made in “Living Temple” in regard to this point are incorrect. The scripture used to substantiate the doctrine there set forth, is scripture misapplied... Few can discern the result of entertaining the sophistries advocated by some at this time. **But the Lord has lifted the curtain, and has shown me the result that would follow. The spiritualistic theories regarding the personality of God, followed to their logical conclusion, sweep away the whole Christian economy... The enemy of***



**souls has sought to bring in the supposition that a great reformation was to take place among Seventh-day Adventists, and that this reformation would consist in giving up the doctrines** which stand as the pillars of our faith, and engaging in a process of reorganization. Were this reformation to take place, what would result? **The principles of truth that God in His wisdom has given to the remnant church, would be discarded. Our religion would be changed. The fundamental principles that have sustained the work for the last fifty years would be accounted as error. A new organization would be established. Books of a new order would be written. A system of intellectual philosophy would be introduced. The founders of this system would go into the cities, and do a wonderful work... Nothing would be allowed to stand in the way of the new movement.** The leaders would teach that virtue is better than vice, **but God being removed**, they would place their dependence on human power, which, without God, is worthless. **Their foundation would be built on the sand, and storm and tempest would sweep away the structure...** I hesitated and delayed about the sending out of that **which the Spirit of the Lord impelled me to write**. I did not want to be compelled to present the misleading influence of these sophistries. But in the providence of God, the errors that have been coming in must be met. - {SpTBo2 1904, 51.1 - 51.3, 53.2, 54.1, 54.3, 55.2}

This prophecy from Ellen White is astonishing. Ellen White tells us that Satan would seek to bring in the notion among Seventh-day Adventists that a reformation is to take place in the church, and this would result in giving up the doctrines that were established through the pioneers. Ellen White wrote this in 1904, and she said that *'the fundamental principles that have sustained the work for the last fifty years would be **accounted as error**'*. So the truths that the Adventist brethren had from at least 1854 to Ellen White's latter years would be accounted as error by this 'new' SDA Church, which is why she said *'our religion would be changed.'* She warned the Church more than once in the same letter against entering *'into controversy over the presence and personality of God.'* So clearly if this new movement was to take place, there would be a direct attack on the personality of God, which Sister White said *'is everything to us as a people.'* It is not a side issue. We've seen in the first chapter that Ellen White stressed that *'light has been given that God is the eternal, self-existent One. From my girlhood I have been given plain instruction that God is a person.'* The Pioneers were settled on this, and the Church did not need to enter into any controversy over this. Further down in the above letter, Ellen White stated;

*'We are God's commandment-keeping people. For the past fifty years every phase of heresy has been brought to bear upon us, to becloud our minds regarding the teaching of the word,—especially concerning the ministration of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary, and the message of heaven for these last days, as given by the angels of the fourteenth chapter of Revelation. **Messages of every order and kind have been urged upon Seventh-day Adventists, to take the place of the truth which, point by point, has been sought out by prayerful study, and testified to by the miracle-working power of the Lord.** But the way-marks which have made us what we are, are to be preserved, and they will be preserved, as God has signified through His word and the testimony of His Spirit. **He calls upon us to hold firmly, with the grip of***

***faith, to the fundamental principles that are based upon unquestionable authority.***’ - {SpTBo2 1904, 59.1}

Here, Ellen White beseeches the brethren ‘*to hold firmly, with the grip of faith, to the **fundamental principles** that are based upon unquestionable authority.*’ In 1904, the Seventh-day Adventist Church was using the 1889 fundamental principles. Concerning God, number one and two stated;

I – ***That there is one God, a personal, spiritual being***, the creator of all things, omnipotent, omniscient, and eternal; infinite in wisdom, holiness, justice, goodness, truth, and mercy; unchangeable, and everywhere present by his representative, the Holy Spirit. Ps. 139:7.

II – ***That there is one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Eternal Father***, the one by whom he created all things, and by whom they do consist...

XIX – ***That the Spirit of God*** was promised to manifest ***itself*** in the church through certain gifts, enumerated especially in 1 Cor. 12 and Eph. 4; that these gifts are not designed to supersede, or take the place of, the Bible, which is sufficient to make us wise unto salvation, any more than the Bible can take the place of the Holy Spirit; that, in specifying the various channels of ***its*** operation, that Spirit has simply made provision for ***its*** own existence and presence with the people of God to the end of time, to lead to an understanding of that word which ***it*** had inspired, to convince of sin, and to work a transformation in the heart and life; and that those who deny to the Spirit ***its*** place and operation, do plainly deny that part of the Bible which assigns to ***it*** this work and position.’

<sup>90</sup> - (A Revised Declaration of the Fundamental Principles Taught & Practiced by The Seventh-Day Adventists, STEAM PRESS OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION, BATTLE CREEK, MICH. 1889, No. 1-2, 19, p. 4, 10-11)

So we clearly see that the personality of God and Christ were part of the 1872 & 1889 fundamental principles. The brethren of that time believed ‘*that there is one God*’ and this one God is not a trinity but He’s ‘*a personal, spiritual being.*’ And the one Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of this one God; ‘*the Son of the Eternal Father.*’

And the Holy Spirit is the ‘*the Spirit of God*’ which ‘*was promised to manifest **itself** in the church through certain gifts,*’ and ‘*various channels of **its** operation, including making provision for **its** own existence and presence with the people of God to the end of time, to lead to an understanding of that word which **it** had inspired.*’

However, it is clear that the Church eventually discarded these principles and sided with Kellogg in this controversy, as shown in the 28 fundamental beliefs of today;

***The Trinity - There is one God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, a unity of three coeternal Persons...***

***God the eternal Son*** became incarnate in Jesus Christ...

**God the eternal Spirit was active with the Father and the Son in Creation, incarnation, and redemption. He is as much a person as are the Father and the Son. He inspired the writers of Scripture. He filled Christ's life with power...**<sup>91</sup> ('Seventh-day Adventist 28 Fundamental Beliefs, 2020 Edition, No. 2, 4-5 p. 3-4)

So we see the difference between the 1872/89 fundamental principles that were 'based upon unquestionable authority,' and the present fundamental beliefs of the Church concerning the personality of God and Christ. The One God has been changed from being 'a personal, spiritual being' to 'a unity of three coeternal Persons.' And Christ has been changed from being 'the Son of the Eternal Father' to 'God the eternal Son.' And we see the recognition of the assertions Kellogg was trying to introduce, as the Holy Spirit has been changed from being 'the Spirit of God' and an 'it', to 'God the eternal Spirit' and a 'He', a literal person like 'the Father and the Son,' a person that 'was active with the Father and the Son in Creation.' It is no wonder that Kellogg and his companions warned 'that the old traditional theories would be rolled under.'

Can we see the changes that have taken place in the SDA Church that have caused it to become a different religion, as Sister White warned would happen? Can we see what 'principles of truth that God in His wisdom has given to the remnant church would be discarded?' We need not to conjecture concerning this, for leading men in the SDA Church of today have told us about these changes themselves. They have told us why the founders of this Church (the Pioneers) would not be able to be members of the present SDA Church. For example, 13 years after the SDA Church officially adopted the doctrine of the Trinity, George R. Knight, who's an SDA author and historian of the Church stated that, '**most of the founders of Seventh-day Adventism would not be able to join the church today if they had to subscribe to the denomination's Fundamental Beliefs. More specifically, most would not be able to agree to belief number 2, which deals with the doctrine of the Trinity. For Joseph Bates the Trinity was an unscriptural doctrine, for James White it was that "old Trinitarian absurdity," and for M. E. Cornell it was a fruit of the great apostasy, along with such false doctrines as Sundaykeeping and the immortality of the soul.**'<sup>92</sup> - (George R. Knight, Ministry, 'Adventists and change,' October 1993, page. 10)

Knight proclaims that the founders of the SDA Church would not be able to join the church today because they couldn't agree with the doctrine of the trinity. Knight highlights that for the pioneers, the trinity '**was a fruit of the great apostasy**'. They wouldn't be able to join because the SDA Church of today worships a different god to the one they worshipped. In 1980, the Church officially abandoned the True God and His only-begotten Son in exchange for the mysterious god of Rome, the Trinity. Ellen White's statement rings true, that '*our religion would be changed.*' Notice that Ellen White also said that '*a new organization would be established (and) books of a new order would be written.*' The next generation of Adventists would be blinded and deceived by the new generation ministers that are so highly regarded by SDA members, yet these ministers teach that which is contrary to what the Church originally taught, as we've seen by the statements from some popular preachers in this document. Moreover, Ellen White said that 'the founders of this system would go into the cities, and do a wonderful work', and '*nothing would be allowed to stand*

*in the way of the new movement.* The corporate Seventh-day Adventist Church boasts over 20 million members, and has truly become a world wide force spread throughout the world, with many hospitals, universities, schools, and radio channels that broadcast the doctrines of this new organisation. The foundational truths of the Advent movement have been trampled upon and nothing has been allowed to stop the growth of this new system. Truly ‘*a wonderful work*’ has been done, but with ‘**God being removed**’, dependence has been ‘*on human power, which, without God, is worthless.*’ The true God is not in this new organisation, and the truth is accounted as error by the leading men of this new Church. Also, take special note of Ellen White’s statement that ‘*their (SDA Church) foundation would be built on the sand, and storm and tempest would sweep away the structure.*’ The General Conference Churches would no longer be built upon the rock, but on sand, which would eventually be swept away by the storm and tempest.

What is this storm and tempest that comes against the Church? What is the solid structure that the true remnant in the last days will be built upon? What belief causes the SDA Church to depart from the solid structure and be swept away by the enemy? Ellen White answers these questions herself by using Scripture. She said:

*‘Jesus now put a second question, relating to the disciples themselves: “But whom say ye that I am?” Peter answered, “Thou art the Christ, **the Son of the living God.**”... Peter had expressed the faith of the twelve... Jesus answered Peter, saying, “Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven.” **The truth which Peter had confessed is the foundation of the believer's faith.** It is that which Christ Himself has declared to be eternal life... For six thousand years, faith has builded upon Christ. For six thousand years **the floods and tempests of satanic wrath have beaten upon the Rock of our salvation; but it stands unmoved.** Peter had expressed the truth which is the foundation of the church's faith, and Jesus now honored him as the **representative of the whole body of believers**’ - {DA 411.4, 412.1 - 412.3, 413.4 - 413.5}*

The confession of Peter’s, that Jesus Christ is the Son of the living God is the foundation of the Christian faith. And for 6000 years, Satan’s ‘tempest... *wrath have beaten upon the Rock of our salvation*’.

We’ve seen in chapter 3 of this document that this tempest from Satan had begun with the war in heaven. Ellen White says ‘*Peter had expressed the truth which is the **foundation** of the church's faith*’. And Ellen White has told us that the ‘**foundation**’ of the Seventh-day Adventist Church ‘*would be built on the sand, and storm and tempest would **sweep away the structure***’. So the foundation of the early Seventh-day Adventist Church would be changed for a weak structure. And Ellen White has told us that the foundation of the Church’s faith is Peter's proclamation that our Lord Jesus Christ is truly the Son of God. The SDA Church had restored this foundation. This is what the remnant is. But the SDA Church has abandoned this belief and has rejected Jesus Christ as truly being God’s Son. When the SDA Church chose to take the position that Jesus Sonship isn’t literal, they then sided with the cause of Satan and his false churches. Dr. Merlin D. Burt, who is an SDA theologian, professor, and founding director of the integrated Center for Adventist Research at Andrews University highlights this change of foundation that took place in the church. He makes this

observation in his 'brief study (which) provides a survey of the Adventist historical progression from anti-Trinitarianism to a **Biblical Trinitarian view**'<sup>93</sup> (Merlin D. Burt, 'History of Seventh-day Adventist Views on the Trinity', 2006 page. 2/126, Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 17/1 (Spring 2006): 125–139.)

He breaks down some of these changes as he states:

*'For many, Uriah Smith's Daniel and the Revelation held a nearly inspired status. **His book had been read and studied by nearly every Adventist for over sixty years.** In Smith's discussion of the seventh church in Revelation 3, he made the following comment: "The Son came into existence in a different manner, as he is called **'the only begotten' of the Father.** It would seem utterly inappropriate to apply this expression to any being created in the ordinary sense of that term." **This statement was removed in the 1944 edition. Naturally, some were unhappy that Daniel and the Revelation had been tampered with.** Consideration of the final resolution of the Trinity doctrine cannot be completed without mentioning the role of the book Questions on Doctrine. It anchored the doctrine of the Trinity or Godhead. Questions on Doctrine affected Adventist theology in several ways.* A further study of this is beyond the scope of this paper. But it must be noted that while the book produced conflict in other areas, **there was virtually no dissent on the book's clear teaching of the Trinity.** The book affirmed: "As to Christ's place in the Godhead, **we believe Him to be the second person of the heavenly Trinity—comprised of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.**"... The lack of negative response to the book's clear defense of the Trinity demonstrates that the church at large had accepted **what had previously been known as the "new view."** ... the development of the Trinity doctrine demonstrates that **sometimes doctrinal changes require the passing of a previous generation. For Seventh-day Adventists, it took over 50 years for the doctrine of the Trinity to become normative.**'<sup>94</sup> (Merlin D. Burt, 'History of Seventh-day Adventist Views on the Trinity', pages. 14-15/138-139, Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 17/1 (Spring 2006): 125–139.)

Can we not see from Dr. Burt's observations that the warnings Ellen White gave already came to pass in the Church? Notice that Burt points out that Uriah Smith's book 'Daniel and the Revelation had been **tampered with**' to omit the teachings concerning Christ's literal Sonship. He then mentions another book called 'Questions on Doctrine (which) affected Adventist theology in several ways.' One of these doctrines the book exalted was the trinity. This book was written in 1957 to explain Adventist beliefs to the Evangelical world. The book made an effort to show the Evangelicals that Adventism wasn't so different from the rest of protestantism, and did not need to be looked upon as a cult. This book was written in an effort to lessen the distance between the SDA's and Evangelicals (Harlots). This book was written by a man called LeRoy Froom, who was instrumental in bringing changes to the Adventist faith, including the slow introduction of the Trinity. LeRoy Froom himself admitted that he had to go to Christian sources outside of Adventism to find information and teachings on the Holy Spirit. In LeRoy Frooms book called 'Movement of Destiny,' he stated:

*'May I here make a frank personal confession? When, back between 1926 and 1928, I was asked by our leaders to give a series of studies on the Holy Spirit... I found that, aside from priceless leads found in the Spirit of Prophecy, **there was practically nothing in our literature setting forth a sound Biblical exposition in this tremendous field of study.** There were no previous pathfinding books on the question in our literature. **I was compelled to search out a score of valuable books written by men outside of our faith...** Having these, I went on from there. But they were decided early helps. And scores, if not hundreds, could confirm the same sobering conviction that some of these **other men frequently had a deeper insight into the spiritual things of God than many of our own men then had on the Holy Spirit** and the triumphant life.'<sup>95</sup> -*

(LeRoy Froom, 'Movement of Destiny, page. 322/324)

LeRoy Froom plainly admits that he went to seek out information on the Holy Spirit from 'books written by men outside of our faith'. He goes on to say that 'these other men frequently had a deeper insight into the spiritual things of God than many of our own men.' Clearly Froom couldn't find what he wanted from SDA literature concerning the Holy Spirit because the pioneers were not trinitarian. In order to find information that would support the trinity, he had to delve into the literature of Babylon. This is what began to creep into the church. The new movement that Ellen White spoke of was already beginning to take place. Also, remember that Dr. Burt stated that the Church's eventual acceptance of the trinity had been the acceptance of something that '**had previously been known as the "new view."**' This trinity god was something new to the Adventist faith. It was '**the "new view."**' This was something that would have obviously been resisted by the pioneers and men of their generation. This is why Burt went on to say that '*the Trinity doctrine demonstrates that sometimes doctrinal changes require the passing of a previous generation.*' In order for the doctrine of the trinity to be brought into the SDA Church, men of the pioneer's era had to die. Ellen White said that the '*dead are to speak*' through their writings. She said the pioneers '*works shall follow them, (and) we are to repeat the words of the pioneers in our work*'. Yet, these men behind the new system proclaimed that they turned away from the works of the pioneers in exchange for the works of men in Babylon, and they were waiting for the last of the pioneers to die in order to bring in their changes.

LeRoy Froom further confirms this by stating that in 1930, the former General conference President had advised him to wait for the death of the remaining pioneers before bringing in the changes to the Church. He said,

*'Back in the spring of 1930 Arthur G. Daniells, for more than twenty years president of our General Conference, told me he believed that, at a later time, I should undertake a thorough survey of the entire plan of redemption —its principles, provisions, and divine Personalities—as they unfolded to our view as a Movement from 1844 onward... Also that it would round out in historical sequence what he had begun in 1926 in the comparatively brief recital of his epochal Christ Our Righteousness... His urge met with a definite response in my heart, for I was keenly interested in such a project. But I was awed by its magnitude and far-reaching character... He said... **I was a connecting link between past leaders and the present.** But, he said, **it is to be later—not yet, not yet...** Elder **Daniells recognized the serious problems involved, and sensed almost prophetically certain difficulties that would confront. He knew that time would be required for certain theological wounds to heal, and for attitudes to***

**modify on the part of some.** Possibly it would be **necessary to wait until certain individuals had dropped out of action, before the needed portrayal could wisely be brought forth.**<sup>96</sup> (LeRoy Froom, 'Movement of Destiny', page. 19/17)

The breeding ground for changing the Church had been taking place early on, but there couldn't be a full fledged change immediately because there would have still been opposition at this point, so it was '*necessary to wait until certain individuals had dropped out of action*'. We see from these statements that there had been great agitation amongst the high men of the church for change. These men wanted to reform the foundations of the Church that were laid down by the pioneers. Again, this is exactly what Ellen White said would take place. She said that Satan would '*bring in the supposition that a great reformation was to take place among Seventh-day Adventists, and that this reformation would consist in giving up the doctrines which stand as the pillars of our faith.*' We've seen from the statements above that the Church had men on the posts waiting for the very men that played a part in laying down the '*the pillars of our faith*' to drop dead so that the '*process of reorganization*' could begin, as '*doctrinal changes require the passing of a previous generation*'. We've seen Dr. Burt point out that Uriah Smith's book had been tampered with, and that '*the final resolution of the Trinity doctrine cannot be completed without mentioning the role of the book Questions on Doctrine... (which) anchored the doctrine of the Trinity*'. The author of this book that '*anchored the doctrine of the Trinity*' admitted that he '*was compelled to search out a score of valuable books written by men outside of our faith*' to use for the works he was going to produce for people of the SDA Church. Can we not see that this is exactly what Ellen White spoke about in such precise detail? She said '*A new organization would be established (and) **books of a new order would be written.***' We then have men from our theological institutions stating that books like '*Questions on Doctrine*' had been introduced to the Church which '*affected Adventist theology*' and brought in doctrines that began to be accepted by Seventh-day Adventists, and these doctrines '*had previously been known as the "**new view.**"*' This couldn't be any clearer. Truly Ellen White was a prophet of God, and she forewarned her brethren about what was to take place in the Church. LeRoy Froom stated that

*'the next logical and inevitable step in the implementing of our unified "Fundamental Beliefs" involved revision of certain standard works so as to eliminate statements that taught, and thus perpetuated, erroneous views on the Godhead. Such sentiments were now sharply at variance with the accepted "Fundamental Beliefs" set forth in the Church Manual, and with the uniform "Baptismal Covenant" and "Vow" based thereon, which, in certificate form, was now used for all candidates seeking admission to membership in the church.'*<sup>97</sup> - (LeRoy Froom, 'Movement of Destiny', page. 424/422)

Truly '*a new organization*' had been established and the truth has been '**accounted as error**'. What were the motivations behind the efforts of these leading men to bring the trinity god into the Church? Were they motivated by genuine spiritual convictions that came about after serious Bible study and revelations from God? The answer is no. As already pointed out, Froom's book '*Questions on Doctrine*' was written to bring us closer to the harlot churches. The book was written in an effort to soften Rome's daughter's views

concerning Seventh-day Adventists, so that we are not seen as such a 'strange cult.' For example, in this book, Froom stated:

*'Today the primary emphasis of all our leading denominational literature, as well as the continuous presentation over radio and television, emphasizes the historic fundamentals of the Christian faith. **But the charges and attacks have persisted. Some continue to gather up quotations from some of our earlier literature long since out of date, and print... And we feel that we should not be identified with, or stigmatized for, certain limited and faulty concepts held by some, particularly in our formative years... We are one with our fellow Christians of denominational groups** in the great fundamentals of the faith once delivered to the saints.'*<sup>98</sup> - (LeRoy Froom, 'Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine', 1957, pages. 28/31 - 29/32)

So these changes and revisions of the SDA's 'erroneous views on the Godhead' were made to achieve unity with the fallen churches, so that we may be 'one with our fellow Christians of denominational groups.' The Trinity god was brought into the remnant as a gateway for ecumenism. We've seen in the introduction of this document that one of the requirements for membership of the ecumenical World Council of Churches is to believe in the trinity.

*'The Constitution of the World Council of Churches defines its basis as follows: «"The World Council of Churches is a communion of Churches which believe in the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour according to the Scriptures and they therefore seek to carry out together their common calling to render glory to **the one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit**»" (WCC Constitution art.1). This organization (is) for the promotion of ecumenism... The basis therefore of the Constitution of the WCC, **a basis which must be accepted by all who demand membership**, is profession of faith in Jesus Christ **and in the Trinity**. As we have seen this is also the prospective for the celebration of the Jubilee. **It is a basis which embraces all Christians.**'<sup>99</sup> - (Eleuterio F. Fortino, Ecumenical Commissions, 'Jesus Christ One Lord of All Christians: An Affirmation of the World Council of Churches')*

The WCC has added to what Christians are to believe according to Scripture. We are to believe in the name of the Son of God, Jesus Christ, but they add to this by attaching the trinity. The trinity is the glue that binds the fallen churches together. And infiltrators in our church brought in the trinity to achieve greater union with the daughters of Rome. This is a great departure from the stance of the pioneers who held onto their Biblical convictions concerning God and His Son, despite such beliefs being at sharp 'variance' with the 'orthodox' churches. Unity was not the goal for the early Seventh-day Adventists, rather their message was to come out of the fallen churches and never compromise on Bible truth for the sake of peace and unity. Ellen White said, *'If unity could be secured only by the compromise of truth and righteousness, then let there be difference, and even war.'* - {GC 45.3}

The Trinity is at the root of ecumenism and allegiance to Popery.

*'On the part of the Catholic Church, **when indicating the basis for our quest for unity among Christians** the Second Vatican Council said: «"Taking part in this movement, which is called ecumenical, **are those who invoke the Triune God** and*



*profess Jesus, as Lord and Saviour... At the basis of ecumenism then is the profession of faith in Jesus Christ and in the Most Holy Trinity. This is the common basis...*<sup>100</sup>  
 (Eleuterio F. Fortino, Ecumenical Commissions, 'Jesus Christ One Lord of All Christians: An Affirmation of the Second Vatican Council')

Our Lord in His great mercy had 'impelled' sister White to write the warnings down so that we can identify 'the misleading influence of these sophistries' that would enter our Church. It's our choice to take heed to the warnings from the Lord or close our eyes and ears to them. Now it's true that as we grow and progress in Christ and His Word, we should expect new revelations from the Bible that we may have not known before. Truth most assuredly is progressive and we can expect to learn more truths as we get closer to the Second Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. However, truth is progressive, not regressive. Truth is still absolute, therefore, truth that we discover can't contradict truth that preceded it. Ellen White came out of trinitarianism after she left the Methodist Church and received visions from God, and she clearly didn't see a tripersonal god, hence, she never taught such a concept. For her to have been 'corrected' on this point in her later years and shown that God is actually a trinity would have been a complete contradiction of what she was first shown. This wouldn't be progressive at all, for new light can't contradict former light because all light comes from the True Light, Jesus Christ. Ellen White said in 1905:

*'I long daily to be able to do double duty. I have been pleading with the Lord for strength and wisdom to reproduce the writings of the witnesses who were confirmed in the faith in the early history of the message... **When the power of God testifies as to what is truth, that truth is to stand forever as the truth. No after-suppositions contrary to the light God has given are to be entertained.** Men will arise with interpretations of Scripture which are to them truth, but which are not truth. **The truth for this time God has given us as a foundation for our faith. He Himself has taught us what is truth. One will arise, and still another with new light, which contradicts the light that God has given under the demonstration of His Holy Spirit.** A few are still alive who passed through the experience gained in the establishment of this truth. **God has graciously spared their lives to repeat and repeat, till the close of their lives,** the experience through which they passed, even as did John the apostle till the very close of his life. And **the standard-bearers who have fallen in death are to speak through the reprinting of their writings. I am instructed that thus their voices are to be heard.** They are to bear their testimony as to what constitutes the truth for this time... **We are not to receive the words of those who come with a message that contradicts the special points of our faith. They gather together a mass of Scripture and pile it as proof around their asserted theories.** This has been done over and over again during the past fifty years. And while the Scriptures are God's Word, and are to be respected, the application of them, **if such application moves one pillar of the foundation that God has sustained these fifty years, is a great mistake...** **God never contradicts Himself.** Scripture proofs are misapplied if forced to testify to that which is not true. Another and still another will arise, and bring in supposedly great light, and make their assertions. But we stand by the old landmarks.' - {20LtMs, Lt 329, 1905, par. 17 - 19, 21}*

Notice Ellen White said 'the standard-bearers who have fallen in death are to speak through the reprinting of their writings.' And she was 'instructed that... their voices are to

*be heard'* through their writings. Yet, we've seen ministers of the new SDA Church state that *'doctrinal changes require the passing of a previous generation.'* This is at complete odds with what Ellen White said. Yet again, sister White warned that *'one will arise, and still another with new light, which contradicts the light that God has given... another and still another will arise, and bring in supposedly great light.'* This is exactly what has happened in the Church. We've seen this confirmed by William G. Johnson when he stated that *'Adventist beliefs have changed over the years under the impact of "**present truth.**"* Majority of Seventh-day Adventists have been deceived into believing that the Trinity was brought into the Adventist faith *'under the impact of "present truth"* and new progressive light. This is what prominent theologians and ministers of the Church today teach their congregations, and the people have fallen for it. Yet, Ellen White said when men arise *'and bring in supposedly great light'* that *'contradicts the light that God has given'*, we must *'stand by the **old landmarks.*** Many Adventists aren't even aware that there has ever been a change in the Church concerning the God that is worshipped. To believe the Trinity was adopted by the SDA Church due to 'present truth' creates serious implications for our profession as the remnant. The Trinity wasn't a new doctrine that the pioneers were unacquainted with. It was the doctrine that dominated Christianity under popedom for centuries, and still does to this day. The pioneers knew exactly what this doctrine was. If we are to believe that the pioneers were in error for rejecting this doctrine, then what we are saying is that though the harlot churches were in error concerning other doctrines, they were still correct when it came to the very identity of God. But the remnant Church that God raised up were in great error concerning their beliefs about God, and had to revert to the view of the fallen churches. Is this what progressive truth is? If the founders of this faith couldn't even get the identity of God correct whilst Babylon had it correct, how can one say that they were raised up and led by God? The General Conference Churches have led us to believe that the transition from believing Christ is the literal Son of God to a metaphorical Son is 'present truth'. This is an attack from Satan, for he knows that as long as one ascribes to the trinity, they can't believe in the true Sonship of Christ, which is the foundation of the Christians faith. The Sonship of Christ and the trinity are opposed to each other.

This is why J.N. Loughborough mentioned that he once held a discussion concerning the Sonship of Christ versus the Trinity.

He said, *'Last evening I spoke to a good audience in Bloomfield. My subject, by request, **was the sonship of Christ in opposition to the trinity.***<sup>102</sup> - (J.N. Loughborough, *'The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath'*, May 9, 1871 page. 6/166)

The Pioneers understood that one can't uphold the doctrine of the trinity and believe that Jesus Christ is truly the Son of God. These can't harmonise with each other. As I've already stated, the trinitarian cannot accept that Jesus Christ is the only, real, true, and literal Son of God the Father. There must be some mysterious explanation for them concerning this. This is why we keep seeing a diverse range of explanations and theories from ministers in our church, and Christianity at large, explaining what it actually means when the Bible says that Jesus is 'the Son of God.'

It's all well and good to keep the Biblical seventh-day Sabbath but it all means nothing if we don't worship the True God of the Sabbath. The Sabbath points us to the True God and His Son, whilst the trinity is just simply the Roman Sun-god. Ellen White said, *'I saw the nominal church and **nominal Adventists, like Judas, would betray us to the Catholics** to obtain their influence to come against the truth. **The saints then will be an obscure people**, little known to the Catholics; but the churches and **nominal Adventists who know of our faith and customs** (for they hated us on account of the Sabbath, for they could not refute it) **will betray the saints** and report them to the Catholics as those who disregard the institutions of the people; that is, that they keep the Sabbath and disregard Sunday' - {SpM 1.5}* The General Conference have led the Seventh-Day Adventist Church back to the false worship that our pioneers were called out of. Is it no wonder that we're told that many leaders of the church will betray the brethren and urge us to accept SUN-day? They've already urged us to accept the Roman god of SUN-day, the god that unites Protestants and Catholics alike. SDA pioneer, Merritt E. Cornell recognised that the trinity was just another link between Protestants and Rome, as is Sun-day worship and her other false doctrines that her daughters ascribe to.

*'**Protestants and Catholics are so nearly united in sentiment**, that it is not difficult to conceive how Protestants may make an image to the Beast. **The mass of Protestants believe with Catholics in the Trinity**, immortality of the soul, consciousness of the dead, rewards and punishments at death, the endless torture of the wicked, inheritance of the saints beyond the skies, sprinkling for baptism, and the **PAGAN SUNDAY** for the Sabbath; all of which is contrary to the spirit and letter of the new testament. **Surely there is between the mother and daughters, a striking family resemblance.**' - {FT 76.1}*

Even secular historians have observed that the trinity was one of the major doctrines that connected the aims of Protestants and Catholics, as both made efforts to exterminate 'heretics' who rejected it. For example, reformation historian Diarmaid MacCulloch stated:

*'In many essentials, the aims of Reformation Christians were the same as those of medieval Western Christianity which they sought to destroy: **to worship a triune God**... and also, ever **since the Emperor Constantine I had begun the alliance between government and the Church in the fourth century**, to mould the whole of society into a shape which could be considered agreeable with God. **Both sides talked of the Christian God in terms thrashed out over five centuries of argument in the early church, culminating in the theological juggling of the Council of Chalcedon in 451**... **This was the faith of mainstream Protestantism**: the 'magisterial Reformation'. Small groups of radical Protestants came up with variations on it, **and as a consequence they were hated and feared by Catholics and mainstream Protestants alike**. The word 'Anabaptist' which was commonly given to these radicals struck terror in the minds of all those entrusted with authority... Indeed, there are signs that one of the ploys which the Elizabethan regime **used to unite the country's conservative** (Catholic) **and Protestant local leaders in the delicate***

**opening months of the new reign was to set them looking for Anabaptists...** Anabaptists, as their nickname ('rebaptisers') implies, rejected the value of baptism from the existing churches and practised the baptism only of consenting adults. Some of them **further denied the reality of the Trinity**, either from rationalist motives or **because their fundamentalist reading of scripture could not find the doctrine in sacred text**, and so they turned to some version of unitarian belief.<sup>103</sup> - (Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603', Ch 9, pages. 127 - 128)

MacCulloch highlights the fact that even though the mainstream Protestants were at odds with the Roman Catholics, they still had similar objectives in many ways, such as upholding the 'worship (of) a triune God.' Notice that he says 'both sides talked of the Christian God in terms thrashed out over five centuries of argument', thus pointing to the fact that the trinity was a god which had been formulated by men over the centuries of Christianity. He goes on to explain that 'small groups of radical Protestants' who didn't ascribe to this mainstream view of God 'were hated and feared by Catholics and mainstream Protestants alike'. Although these groups were opposed to each other, they were led by the same spirit when it came to the god that they worshipped. Not only did the mainstream Protestants of the 16th century persecute those who objected to infant baptism, but they also persecuted those who rejected their triune god. Such had been the consequence of rejecting this mysterious god from the early days of its inception in the 5-6th century. Also, notice that MacCulloch points out that some of these 'radical Protestants' (Anabaptists) had 'denied the reality of the Trinity... because their **fundamentalist reading of scripture** could not find the doctrine in sacred text.' Many of these 'radical' reformers just couldn't find the concept of the triune god when they approached Scripture with a fundamentalist reading of it. Just like the pioneers, many of these anabaptists could not worship this god that was foreign to Scripture, and they were persecuted for it by both Protestants and Catholics alike. This is why James White said that 'the greatest fault we can find in the Reformation is, the Reformers stopped reforming' and if they continued, they would have 'left the last vestige of Papacy behind' and would have departed from 'the trinity, and Sunday-keeping', for both of these rest upon the same foundation: paganism and popery.

We can exalt the Sabbath all we like, but if we aren't rooted in the Rock; the True Son of God, then our foundation is built upon the sand, and sooner or later we'll be swept away and fall completely into line with the rest of the Sunday keeping churches that refused to keep reforming. God used the SDA pioneers to expose the errors of Rome and call people out of Babylon to the True God, yet we insist on rejecting the light we once had in order to latch onto the same god that Rome and her daughter's worship. As mentioned already, the Sabbath points to the True God who instituted it, and Sunday points to the Trinity which Satan instituted through Rome. Rome confirms this herself.

'Q. 1092. **What is Sunday**, or the Lord's Day in general?

A. It is a day dedicated by the Apostles **to the honour of the most holy Trinity**, and in memory that Christ our Lord arose from the dead upon Sunday, sent down the holy Ghost on a Sunday, &c. and therefore is called the Lord's Day. It is also called Sunday from the old Roman denomination of Dies Solis, the day of the sun, to which it was sacred.<sup>104</sup> - (The Douay Catechism of 1649, page. 130/125)

'86... **From Sunday to Sunday**, the pilgrim people follow in the footsteps of Mary, and her maternal intercession gives special power and fervour to the prayer which rises from the Church **to the Most Holy Trinity**.<sup>105</sup> - (Apostolic Letter Dies Domini of The Holy Father John Paul II to the Bishops, Clergy and Faithful of The Catholic Church on Keeping The LORD'S Day Holy, 86)

'Francis advocates resurrecting the concept of the common good (156–158), and urges us to stir up the desire to invest in it:.. The development of an ecological spirituality, which Francis proposes, is strengthened within the Christian tradition by treasuring the sacramental signs, particularly Eucharist; by revering the mystery of the Incarnation and its echo in the bodily nature of worship; **by cultivating Sabbath rest; and by discerning the mystery of Trinity in the interrelatedness of all things in creation** (233–240).<sup>106</sup> - (Rita Ferrone, 'Re-Reading 'Laudato si', LA CROIX international, Vatican City, December 27, 2018)

We can pretend all we like that Sunday, the Trinity, and Rome aren't all linked, however, for the Catholic Church, the Trinity is just another doctrine for them that proves they still have hold and authority over the Protestant Churches.

'Our opponents sometimes claim that no belief should be held dogmatically **which is not explicitly stated in the Scripture** but the Protestant churches have themselves accepted such dogma as the Trinity for which there exists no such authority in the Gospels.<sup>107</sup> - (LIFE Magazine, Vol. 29, Number 18, October 30, 1950, page. 51)

Just like the Sunday 'Sabbath', veneration of saints, immortality of the soul, and various 'holy' days, the trinity is a dogma that the Roman Catholic Church is happy to acknowledge isn't grounded in Scripture. The Catholics have no issue with admitting this, for they don't profess to hold to sola scriptura, they in fact explicitly reject it, for they have the 'authority' to interpret Scripture and place their traditions on equal footing with the Word of God, as they claim to hold Apostolic succession. When we ascribe to Creeds that were made by Rome, we are in effect acknowledging that they have Apostolic succession, and they know this. The Jesuits have had their mark upon the corporate Seventh-day Adventist Church since they enshrined this strange papal god; the very foundation and fabric of Roman Catholicism. The Mother of Harlots tells us that:

'233 Christians are baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: not in their names,<sup>55</sup> **for there is only one God, the almighty Father, his only Son and the Holy Spirit: the Most Holy Trinity**.<sup>234</sup> **The mystery of the Most Holy Trinity is the central mystery of Christian faith and life. It is the mystery of God in himself. It is therefore the source of all the other mysteries of faith, the light that enlightens them. It is the most fundamental and essential teaching in the "hierarchy of the truths of faith"**.<sup>56</sup> The whole history of salvation is identical with the history of the way and the means by which **the one true God, Father, Son and Holy**

***Spirit***, reveals himself to men "and reconciles and unites with himself those who turn away from sin"<sup>108</sup> - (Catechism of the Catholic Church: Paragraph 2. THE FATHER, 233-234)

Ellen White says there are only a few people in the Christian world who worship the True God as He is revealed in Scripture. Majority have exchanged the God of the Bible for a philosophical god formulated by men. '**...A philosophical idol is enthroned in the place of Jehovah; while the true God, as he is revealed in his word, in Christ, and in the works of creation, is worshiped by but few...** Though in a different form, idolatry exists in the Christian world today as verily as it existed among ancient Israel in the days of Elijah. The God of many professedly wise men, of philosophers, poets, politicians, journalists,—the God of polished fashionable circles, of many colleges and universities, **even of some theological institutions**,—**is little better than Baal, the sun-God of Phoenicia**' - {4SP 399.1}

The Trinity is just 'a philosophical idol' invented by men who created this god just like Ancient Israel did when they fashioned a golden calf due to not knowing what else to do. Hellenistic men patched up together passages of Scripture mingled with philosophy, then imagined and created a three-person-god for themselves. The Bible isn't supposed to be a source of building materials to use for constructing our own god. The God of the Bible is not a constructed thing, idols are constructed. The Bible tells us exactly who God is. We don't have to rely on philosophical church dogmas to know who our God is. And Rome tells us that her understanding of God was formulated after centuries of on-going church councils and discussions amongst 'Church Fathers' to come up with a complete understanding.

'<sup>250</sup> ***During the first centuries the Church sought to clarify her Trinitarian faith***, both to deepen her own understanding of the faith and to defend it against the errors that were deforming it. ***This clarification was the work of the early councils, aided by the theological work of the Church Fathers*** and sustained by the Christian people's sense of the faith. <sup>251</sup> ***In order to articulate the dogma of the Trinity, the Church had to develop her own terminology with the help of certain notions of philosophical origin***: "substance", "person" or "hypostasis", "relation" and so on. In doing this, she did not submit the faith to human wisdom, but gave a new and unprecedented meaning to these terms, which from then on **would be used to signify an ineffable mystery**, "infinitely beyond all that we can humanly understand"<sup>109</sup> - (Catechism of the Catholic Church: Paragraph 2. THE FATHER, 250 - 251)

In order to attain clarity on who the God of the Bible is, the Church had to rely on men of high learning. '*This clarification was the work of the early councils, aided by the theological work of the Church Fathers.*' What Christ and His apostles revealed through the Word wasn't enough to have a clear understanding of who God is according to Rome. So the people had to be dependent on the '*church Fathers*' to attain this understanding and clarity. Unfortunately, this way of thinking still continues to plague the Churches today, including the Seventh-day Adventist Church. One of the greatest and most effective tools that Satan has in his arsenal to keep Christians deceived is man's admiration for those who they believe are more learned than they are. This was the same method Satan used in the Jewish Church during the time of Christ. Ellen White highlights this when she says:

***'The people gave credence to what the priests and Pharisees taught, in place of seeking to understand the word of God for themselves.** They honored the priests and rulers instead of honoring God, and **rejected the truth that they might keep their own traditions.** Many had been impressed and almost persuaded; **but they did not act upon their convictions,** and were not reckoned on the side of Christ. Satan presented his temptations, until the light appeared as darkness. Thus many rejected the truth that would have proved the saving of the soul.' - {DA 489.4}*

This tendency to look up to those who have great influence in the Church and are perceived as well studied has been a thorn in the Christian Church throughout the ages, and this same tendency has infected Adventists as they look up to ministers of stature within Adventism. So deceptive are these agents of the enemy with their reputations of high learning. They're able to cause us to believe that one means three, Father means not Father, and Son doesn't mean Son. They've brought us to a point where we believe that begotten means unique, adoption, and anything else but begotten. When we read that it's Christ who dwells in us, we don't truly believe that, but we believe it's another god dwelling in us. We accept these theories that our own eyes are clearly not reading in the Scriptures because we value the opinions of 'wise' men over trusting God for what His word just plainly tells us. We think God surely didn't mean what He just said, and there must be a deeper hidden meaning not given in the texts, and only those wise teachers who have been educated in the seminaries can understand these things.

Such is the way of Satan, clouding the plain texts of God's Word with philosophical spiritualised interpretations. How deceitful is the enemy that he uses human agencies to accuse those who attempt to expose his deceptions as being heretics and enemies of the Church. This is the very same tactic he used in heaven.

*'The very work which he (Satan) himself was doing, **he charged upon the loyal angels.** It was his policy to perplex with subtle arguments concerning the purposes of God. **Everything that was simple he shrouded in mystery, and by artful perversion cast doubt upon the plainest statements of Jehovah.** And his high position, so closely connected with the divine government, **gave greater force to his representations.**' - {PP 41.3}*

The same tactic of the enemy has been used throughout the ages. God's prophets were accused of being troublers of the people. Throughout Church history the exact same method has been used. Those throughout Church history who have sought to restore true biblical doctrine had been accused by the 'orthodox' Church as being agents of Satan who were being used to bring in disharmony, cause division to the unity of the church, and were branded as heretics. This same tactic of the enemy has seeped into the Adventist Church. Many prominent ministers and men of influence in the Church are accusing those who are attempting to restore the church back to its foundations established by the pioneers of being agents of Satan, who are bringing in heresies to spark division, and distract us from the three angel's messages. And many will be deceived by such sentiments and choose to blindly accept spiritualised interpretations of Scripture rather than just accept God's Word for what it plainly states because it goes against the 'orthodoxy' of what the Church teaches.

*'Those who engage in the work of God's cause today will meet just such trials as Paul endured in his work. By the same boastful and deceptive work Satan will seek to draw*

converts from the faith. *Theories will be brought in that it will not be wise for us to handle. Satan is a cunning worker, and he will bring in subtle fallacies to darken and confuse the mind and root out the doctrines of salvation. **Those who do not accept the Word of God just as it reads will be snared in his trap.*** ‘ - {22LtMs, Ms 43, 1907, par.12}

Such is exactly what the Trinity doctrine is. God's Word plainly tells us that there is One God (See 1 Cor 8:4 & Gal 3:20), and that this One God has a Son (See Acts 3:13 & Acts 5:30-31). Yet, we have many teachers and theologians who will explain away these clear biblical texts by beautifully explaining the trinity in creedal language using philosophical formulas that aren't even found in Scripture, and people will accept it as gospel. This is exactly what the Roman Catholic Church does and has always done, and her daughters imitate her by doing the same thing.

How absurd that many SDA preachers and ministries zealously preach against the doctrines of Rome whilst they themselves embrace the central mystery doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. They teach that the god of the antichrist system is the God of the first angel's message. As mentioned already, Rome is very much aware of this, and thus, regard SDA's as her fellow brethren. The Roman Catholic Church isn't too concerned that we reject their papal sabbath, or even that we teach that they're Babylon. As far as Rome is concerned, all these points aren't enough for us to be perceived as a threat or non-Christian because we still worship the same god as them. Notice what she (Rome) says concerning Seventh-day Adventists:

*‘Many Evangelical leaders even have asserted—**incorrectly**—that Adventists are not Christians, even though they believe in Christ's divinity and use a **valid Trinitarian** form of baptism. Seventh-day Adventists agree with many Catholic doctrines, **including the Trinity**, Christ's divinity, the virgin birth, the atonement, a physical resurrection of the dead, and Christ's Second Coming... Unfortunately, they also hold many false and strange doctrines. Among these are the following: (a) the Catholic Church is the Whore of Babylon; (b) the pope is the Antichrist; (c) in the last days, Sunday worship will be “the mark of the beast”;... By virtue of their valid baptism, and their belief in Christ's divinity and **in the doctrine of the Trinity, Seventh-day Adventists are Christians. But Christians, once separated from the Church our Lord founded**, are susceptible to being “tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine” (Eph. 4:14).<sup>110</sup> - (Catholic Answers: Seventh-day Adventism)*

Rome rightfully acknowledges that Adventists hold hostile beliefs to their system. Yet, she goes on to say that those who have asserted ‘*that Adventists are not Christians*’ are incorrect because they ‘*agree with many Catholic doctrines, **including the Trinity.***’ Now it's true that Rome also lists sound doctrines that we agree with (albeit beneath the surface she is faulty on all of them), however, Rome regards all other Protestant Churches as walking in error but still Christian because they believe in the Trinity. This is why the article said that ‘*Seventh-day Adventists are Christians. But Christians, once separated from the Church our Lord founded, are susceptible to being “tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine.*’ Rome doesn't perceive the SDA Church as being much different to the other Protestant Churches. As far as she is concerned, all the Protestant Churches are wayward and hold unsound doctrines, but all along they're still Christian and worship their triune god.



For the whore, these Protestant Churches are just simply wayward daughters who need to return to their mother. This is why Sister White warned Seventh-day Adventists that **‘We are in danger of becoming a sister to fallen Babylon, of allowing our churches to become corrupted, and filled with every foul spirit, a cage for every unclean and hateful bird; and will we be clear unless we make decided movements to cure the existing evil?’** - {21MR 380.1}

We’ve seen Rome affirm that the foundation of the Catholic faith is the Trinity. All the Protestant churches have various beliefs that are opposed to each other, but the one thing that binds them all together is the Trinity. All other differences don’t matter too much, but the line is crossed when the triune god of Rome is rejected. This is why Pope Francis said that *‘ecumenism (is) a ‘spiritual process’ **rooted in the Trinity.***<sup>111</sup> - (Catholic News Agency, 2014)

This echoes Pope John Paul II who said, *‘precisely for this reason, **this unity, the supreme gift of the Most Holy Trinity, is at the same time the loftiest obligation of all who profess Christ.***<sup>112</sup> - (Homily Of John Paul II At The Ecumenical Prayer Service, 31 May, 1999)

And *‘let us contemplate the glory of the Trinity which makes the Church one, holy, catholic and apostolic... “if we continue to love one another and **to join in praising the Most Holy Trinity** ... we will be faithful to the deepest vocation of the Church”... **Ecumenism itself finds its solid foundation in this reference to the Trinity...***<sup>113</sup> - (John Paul II, General Audience, 14 June, 2000)

This is why prominent preachers of Babylon can proclaim that all the various denominations of Christendom **‘have far more in common than what divides... when you talk about Pentecostals, charismatics, evangelicals, fundamentalists, Catholics, Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, on and on, they would all say we believe in the Trinity.’**<sup>114</sup> - (Rick Warren, CNSNews, Protestants, Catholics Must Unite to Defend Life, Sex, Marriage, February 4, 2015) And this includes the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

In 2017, to mark the 500th anniversary of the Reformation, an organisation was formed, called Wittenburg 2017.

*‘It was the first meeting of the Wittenburg 2017 Initiative – a **growing fellowship of Catholics, Lutherans, Messianic Jews, and those of other Christian traditions** who are responding to the 500th anniversary of the Protestant Reformation with prayer, confession, repentance, forgiveness, and reconciliation.’*<sup>115</sup> - (George Miley, ‘What is the Wittenburg 2017 Initiative?’, CHRIST CHURCH ANGLICAN, August 4, 2017)

So we see that this is an ecumenical initiative to bring together all Christians of different traditions and beliefs together. The variety of doctrines aren't too important for these sorts of movements. However, this initiative still has core beliefs;

*'The leaders of Wittenberg 2017 come from different Christian traditions, nationalities and generations. **We do not fully agree on all matters of doctrine or practice;** however, **we are bound together by beliefs that we see as most central and vital to our Christian faith...** **OUR HOPE FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY IS ROOTED IN THE LOVE OF THE TRINITY...** The Scriptures reveal that God is One, and simultaneously Three. God is a personal plurality of oneness ... a fellowship ... a communion. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit do not experience unity and plurality as antithetical. (Deuteronomy 6:4; 2 Corinthians 13:14)... **The nature of the Trinity is a mystery beyond our comprehension, but we are invited to contemplate this mystery, and relate to each Person of the Godhead.** In order to meditate on the Triune God, we must think in terms of the characteristics of personhood. Persons possess the capacity to live in relational oneness with other persons. **God is three Persons in eternal, holy, loving, indivisible relationship.**'<sup>116</sup> - (WITTENBERG 2017, CORE BELIEFS)*

So, this ecumenical fellowship stresses that all those involved '*do not fully agree on all matters of doctrine or practice*', yet still, they are '*bound together by beliefs that*' they '*see as most **central** and vital.*' And this most central and vital doctrine that even the most liberal of fellowship's have to hold is the doctrine of the Trinity, they are bound together by the Triune god. This is because the Papacy has continued to make strides for a reestablishment of a universal church, like the days of the dark ages. In order for this to happen, all the Churches have to unite under Romanism, the mother. Consequently, all those bound up together under the authority of Rome have to worship the god of Rome, which will thereby demonstrate their recognition and belief in the Apostolic succession of the Roman Catholic Church. Hence, the Wittenberg 2017 council proclaims that the doctrine of the Trinity, even the mystery god, is '*most **central**... to our Christian faith* ', for the mother herself tells us that '*the mystery of the Trinity is the **central doctrine** of Catholic faith*', this '*mystery of the Most Holy Trinity is the **central mystery** of Christian faith and life.*' and '*is therefore the **source of all the other mysteries** of faith.*' It is clear that the Trinity is the foundation of Ecumenism and unification with the Pope of Rome. There is no way around this.

Now, there are many Adventists who are aware of the SDA Church cosying up with Rome, however, these Adventists tend to be confused about this and can't seem to understand what the root of this apostasy actually is. We've just seen what the root of this is, and delegates of the SDA Church have told us this themselves. For instance, Dr. Ganoune Diop who is '*Director of Public Affairs and Religious Liberty for the worldwide Seventh-day Adventist Church*'<sup>117</sup> - (Public Affairs and Religious Liberty: Seventh-day Adventist Church, Ganoune Diop)

stated that ***‘there is much that unites Christians... Unity is grounded in the being of God who is Trinity: a unity in Trinity... (and) Seventh-day Adventists support Christian unity as they join the Triune God who is determined to gather people He created in His image.’***<sup>118</sup> - (Ganoune Diop, Adventist Review: ‘Why Adventists Participate in UN and Ecumenical Meetings’, October 9, 2015)

Could this be made any clearer? As stated, there are many SDA’s who are aware of the apostasy that is happening and have raised great concerns over men like Dr. Diop, yet these Adventists can’t seem to realise why this is taking place in the first place! Dr. Diop has declared that SDA’s can participate in this union with the whore and her daughters because this unity is found in the ‘*Triune God.*’ We’ve already seen this notion supported by both Catholics and Protestants alike. According to these churches, including our own, unity is grounded on the basis of worshipping the trinity. Pope Francis said in his *Laudato Si* encyclical letter that

***‘everything is interconnected, and this invites us to develop a spirituality of that global solidarity which flows from the mystery of the Trinity.’***<sup>119</sup> (Encyclical Letter *Laudato Si*: Of The Holy Father Francis on care for our common home)

According to Pope Francis, the source of ‘*global solidarity*’ is found in the Trinity god. And these sentiments are shared by the Seventh-day Adventist Church, as they state in their fundamental beliefs that ***‘this unity has its source in the oneness of the triune God...’***<sup>120</sup> - (‘*Seventh-day Adventist 28 Fundamental Beliefs*’, (2015 Edition, No. 14, p, 7)

The deception isn’t even subtle. All of the fallen Churches have declared that their unity is founded in the invocation of the triune god, and the SDA Church have chosen to partake in this unity. Remember, Rome has told us that Sunday worship is in ‘*honour of the most holy Trinity*’. The Trinity god is built upon sand, and this will ultimately lead one to accept the day that points to this god, the god of Rome. Sadly ***‘Satan has gained marked advantage in ---- because the people of God have not guarded the outposts. The very men whose labors God has signified that He would accept if they were fully consecrated have been the ones to be deceived, to fail in their duties, and to prove a terrible burden and discouragement, instead of the help and blessing that they should have been. These men who have been trusted to keep the fort have well-nigh betrayed it into the hands of the enemy. They have opened the gates to a wily foe, who has sought to destroy them.’*** - {4T 211.2}

***‘Unsanctified ministers are arraying themselves against God. They are praising Christ and the god of this world in the same breath. While professedly they receive Christ, they embrace Barabbas, and by their actions say, “Not this Man, but Barabbas.” Let all who read these lines, take heed. Satan has made his boast of what he can do. He thinks to dissolve the unity which Christ prayed might exist in His church. He says, “I will go forth and be a lying spirit to deceive those that I can, to criticize, and condemn, and falsify.” Let the son of deceit and false witness be entertained by a church that has had great light, great evidence, and that church will discard the message the Lord has sent, and receive the most unreasonable assertions and false suppositions and false theories. Satan laughs at their folly, for he knows what truth is. Many will***

***stand in our pulpits with the torch of false prophecy in their hands, kindled from the hellish torch of Satan...***' - {TM 409.2-3}

'Babylon is also charged with the sin of unlawful connection with "the kings of the earth." It was by departure from the Lord, and alliance with the heathen, that the Jewish church became a harlot; and Rome, corrupting herself in like manner by seeking the support of worldly powers, receives a like condemnation. Babylon is said to be "the mother of harlots." By her daughters must be symbolized **churches that cling to her doctrines and traditions, and follow her example of sacrificing the truth** and the approval of God, **in order to form an unlawful alliance with the world.** The message of Revelation 14, announcing the fall of Babylon must apply **to religious bodies that were once pure and have become corrupt.**' - {GC 382.2-382.3}

But God will have His faithful remnant in these last days, for 'the hour cometh, and now is, when the **true worshippers** shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him **must worship him in spirit and in truth.**' - (Jhn 4:23-24) There will be a true unity amongst the true believers that isn't rooted in the Papal god. 'Till we all come **in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God...**' - (Eph 4:13) The true Church is not built upon the foundation of hellenistic philosophers and the so-called 'Church Fathers'. The whore and her daughters are built upon this foundation. But the True Church is 'built upon the foundation of the **apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself** being the chief cornerstone;' - (Eph 2:20)

Now it is important to note that within trinitarian Adventism, there isn't actually a unanimous agreement on what the trinity is, but there are variations concerning it, and you'll get a different answer depending on which Adventist you ask. Some will say that God is one being in three persons, and others will say that God is three beings that are one in unity. One example of one of these understandings can be shown by a statement from the former associate director of the BRI, Ekkehardt Mueller. He stated,

*"There is only one God (Deut. 6:4), however, Father, Son and Holy Spirit are all called God (Matt. 27:46; John 20:28; Acts 5:3-4). Consequently, we do not worship three Gods, but one God who reveals Himself in and consists of three "persons." The three persons share one nature. Each person of the Godhead is by nature and essence God, and the fullness of the deity dwells in each of them. On the other hand, each person of the Godhead is inseparably connected to the other two... **God has revealed his nature as Trinity, that is, three coeternal persons, who, though distinct, constitute the one divine Trinitarian being.**"*<sup>121</sup> - (Ekkehardt Mueller, 'Biblical Research Institute', No. 23, July, 2008, p. 8-9)

We see here that Ekkehardt Mueller ascribes to the traditional understanding of the trinity; ‘three coeternal persons, who... constitute the one divine Trinitarian being’.

We can see this same understanding from another BRI theologian; Paul Petersen, who wrote in a study concerning God that;

*‘The doctrine of the Trinity developed as the early church encountered the Greco-Roman world and began to reflect on how best to explain the biblical message to a pagan world. **The core elements of the doctrine of the Trinity are oneness and distinctiveness. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are one, yet three.** To express this conviction, words and expressions came into use that are not explicitly used in the Bible. **The oneness of God we confess by claiming that God is one in being; the distinctiveness we confess by teaching that there are three persons.***<sup>122</sup> - (Paul Petersen, Biblical Research Institute, ‘God in three persons —in the New Testament’, Andrews University, May 2015, p. 4/3)

And we see that there is also the other version of the trinity amongst Adventists that’s taught; three beings. For example, William Richard Leshar who once ‘served as pastor,... teacher of theology, editor of the Sabbath School lesson quarterly, director of the Biblical Research Institute, vice president of the General Conference, and... president of Andrews University.’<sup>123</sup> - (Adventist Review, ‘Long-time Adventist Administrator Richard Leshar passes away’, August 30, 2017) stated that ‘God is a mystery. And we do not know in what ways that unity might exist other than in purpose. There are some ways in which we can seem to say that God is not a unity. But even then we are not sure what we are talking about. **The idea of three Beings that are One is a mystery**, and it seems to me that we should not try to remove all of that mystery from the statement.’<sup>124</sup> (W. R. LESHER, Adventist Review, April 23, 1980, p.14/518)

We see here that Lasher presents God as being three beings, rather than three persons in one being. We see this same sentiment expressed in the book ‘trinity’, written by Woodrow Wilson Whidden, Jerry Moon, and John W. Reeve which says:

*‘The second thing to notice about the “coordinate relationship” of the Spirit with the Father and the Son (in 2 Cor 13:14) associates the Holy Spirit with “communion”... This word... strongly suggests interpersonal communications between relational beings... Not only does this passage support the personality of the Spirit, but it also suggests the **profound unity or oneness inherent in the doctrine of the Trinity. Here are three divine beings lined up together in such a way as to point to Their oneness of purpose** in imparting grace and love to God's people through Their deep fellowship with one another and the redeemed.’<sup>125</sup> - (Woodrow W. Whidden, Jerry Moon, John W. Reeve, ‘Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships’, Review and Herald Publishing Association, (2002), p. 74)*

So we see here that there's a clear disharmony within the Seventh-day Adventist Church concerning what the trinity actually is. As long as everyone in the church ascribes to some variation of it, no one is concerned, it doesn't matter how contradictory everyone's views may be, they just need to uphold a three in one god of some sort. This is why we've seen R.F Cottrell say earlier: *'each has perfect liberty to take his own way to reconcile its contradictory propositions ; and hence a multitude of views are held concerning it by its friends, all of them orthodox, I suppose, as long as they nominally assent to the doctrine.'*

However, a lot of Seventh-day Adventists will still attempt to distance themselves from Roman Catholicism by saying that they don't believe in the trinity, but they believe in the 'Godhead'. This tends to be more prominent in the 'conservative' and independent circles of Adventism. What they mean by this is that they don't hold the orthodox Trinitarian belief that the One God of the Bible is one single being existing as three distinct persons. Rather, they take the alternative view we've seen. These Adventists believe that there are three beings, and these three beings are one in agreement, and it is this that makes them one God. So the Father is one Self-existent independent God and source of deity in and of Himself, the Son is another self-existent independent God and source of deity in and of Himself, and the Holy Spirit is a third independent self-existent God and source of deity in and of Himself. And what makes these three co-eternal beings one God is that they all agree with each other. An example of this understanding and rationale of the meaning of 'One God' can be analysed in Pastor Doug Batchelor's study on the Godhead. In the section 'Unity or Quantity', he states:

***'Most of the confusion regarding the number of beings composing the Godhead springs from a simple misunderstanding of the word "one."*** Simply put, "one" in the Bible does not always mean numerical quantity. Depending on the Scripture, "one" can often mean unity... We need to keep in mind that when Moses said, "The Lord is one," ***Israel was surrounded with polytheistic nations that worshiped many gods that were constantly involved in petty bickering and rivalry*** (Deuteronomy 6:4), ***whereas the God who created is composed of three separate beings who are perfectly united in their mission*** of saving and sustaining their creatures. As the Spirit is executing the will of both the Father and Son, ***it is His will also.***<sup>126</sup> - (Doug Batchelor , 'The Trinity', Unity or Quantity?, Amazing Facts, 2003)

Notice that Pastor Doug Batchelor makes a comparison between the pagan gods and the Hebrew God. Pr. Batchelor highlights that the one difference between the multiple gods of the pagans and the multiple beings of the Hebrews is that the *'polytheistic nations... worshiped many gods that were constantly involved in petty bickering and rivalry', 'whereas the God who created is composed of three separate beings who are perfectly united in their mission.'* So according to Doug Batchelor, what distinguishes Biblical monotheism from polytheism is that the multiple gods of the Bible are in agreement with each other, unlike the polytheist gods, and it's this that makes these three divine beings one God. So if the three beings of the Godhead had disagreements with each other, then they could be classed as three gods. So essentially, according to this line of reasoning, the One God of the Bible is only one for as long as the three beings that constitute the one God don't clash with each other. This is the only requirement to determine if there is One God. This

rationale isn't unique to Doug Batchelor in Adventism, we see this argument presented in the book *'Trinity'* also. The authors of this book state when explaining the oneness of God:

***'Unlike the multiple gods of polytheism, the three persons of the biblical Godhead are profoundly united in purpose, mind, and character so that despite Their individuality, they are never divided, never in conflict, and thus constitute not three gods, but one God.'***<sup>127</sup> - (Woodrow W. Whidden, Jerry Moon, John W. Reeve, *'Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships'*, Review and Herald Publishing Association, (2002), p. 192)

So again, we see from Adventists an explanation of the difference between *'the multiple gods of polytheism'* and the One God of the Bible. According to this view, the God of the Bible consists of three separate beings who *'are never divided, never in conflict, and thus constitute not three gods, but one God'*. The only difference between the pagans and the Hebrews is that the Hebrew gods see eye to eye, therefore, they're not multiple gods, but one God. So for these Adventists who ascribe to this understanding, God is just simply a word to describe a unity rather than a tangible and personal being. And many Adventists will maintain that this is not the Trinity but it is the 'Godhead.' But there is another problem with this logic. First of all, we have seen throughout this document that there is a clear misuse and misunderstanding of the word 'Godhead' itself, especially in Adventism, although the confusion also persists outside of Adventism too. Now it is important to use terms correctly. The word Godhead is not an unbiblical word but it can be used erroneously depending on what people mean when they say it. 'Godhead' in and of itself is not unbiblical if one uses/understands the term correctly. In the King James Version, the word 'Godhead' is translated from three Greek words. One is *'theios'*,<sup>Strong's G2304</sup> which is defined in the lexicon as; *'godlike (neuter as noun, divinity):—divine.'* Thayer's Lexicon defines it as follows: *"divinity, deity, to denote the divine nature, power, providence, in the general, without reference to any individual deity."*

So another word for 'Godhead' is divinity, deity or divine nature. That's what it means and that is how the Bible uses it. For example, Peter says:

*'grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord, according as his **divine** (theios) **power** hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue: whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the **divine** (theios) **nature**, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust.'* - (2 Peter 1:2-4)

In these above verses, the word 'Divine' is the same word (theios) that is translated to 'Godhead' in Acts 17:29. And you see how the word just means divine nature or divinity (Divine power, Divine nature). That is why in other Bible translations, Godhead in Acts 17:29 is translated as literally that (Divine nature)

'Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the **Godhead** is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device.' - (Acts 17:29 KJV)

'Being then the offspring of God, we ought not to suppose that the **Divine Nature** is like gold or silver or stone, an image formed by the craft and thought of man.' - (Acts 17:29 LSB)

'Therefore, since we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the **Divine Nature** is like gold or silver or stone, something shaped by art and man's devising.' - (Acts 17:29 NKJV)

And another word that 'Godhead' is translated from in the Bible is '*theiotēs*,' <sup>Strong's G2305</sup> which again in the lexicon is just defined as 'divinity or Divine nature.'

'For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and **Godhead** (*theiotēs*); so that they are without excuse.' - (Romans 1:20 KJV)

'For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes, both His eternal power and **divine nature** (*theiotēs*), have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made, so that they are without excuse.' - (Romans 1:20 LSB)

'For the invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and **divinity** (*theiotēs*); that they may be without excuse.' - (Romans 1:20 ASV)

This is all it means.

The last word it's translated from is '*theotês*,' <sup>Strong's G2320</sup> which again, is defined 'deity, Divinity or Godhead' as it does in KJV.

As already highlighted in chapter 2, this is why Paul said that in Christ dwells the fullness of the Godhead.

'For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the **Godhead** (*theotês*) *bodily*.' - (Colossians 2:9 KJV)

So this verse is literally just saying that the fullness of divinity/deity dwells in Christ.

'For in Him all the fullness of **Deity** (*theotês*) *dwells bodily*' - (Colossians 2:9 LSB)

In the same letter, Paul says; 'For it pleased the Father that **in him** (Christ) should **all fulness dwell**;' - (Colossians 1:19 KJV)

So in other words, it pleased God the Father that in His Son should all the fullness of Deity/divinity (Godhead) dwell.



So as has been stated, there's nothing wrong with the term 'Godhead' but people use it wrong and completely misunderstand it. People basically use it as a synonym for the Trinity. All the Sunday churches use the term 'Godhead' as an interchange with the Trinity. And a lot of SDA's will say they don't believe in the Trinity but they believe in the 'Godhead' and they think that is less Catholic but they mean a similar thing to a certain extent. If SDA's are asked what the Godhead is or what they mean by this, they'll think it is in reference to some sort of committee with the three divine beings. But the Bible never uses it in such a way. No where in the Bible is 'Godhead' ever used to denote a committee of divine beings. Ellen White also understood this. And this can be seen if we just interchange divinity with Godhead when she uses it. For example, she stated:

*'When Christ bowed his head and died, he bore the pillars of Satan's kingdom with him to the earth. He vanquished Satan in the same nature over which in Eden Satan obtained the victory. The enemy was overcome by Christ in **his human nature**. **The power of the Saviour's Godhead was hidden**. He overcame in human nature, relying upon God for power. This is the privilege of all. In proportion to our faith will be our victory.'* - {YI April 25, 1901, par. 10}

Notice Ellen White contrasts the two natures of Christ (human nature & Godhead). She says the power of Christ's 'Godhead' was hidden. So if we just interchange it with divinity, it still makes perfect sense! *'The power of the saviour's **divinity** was hidden.'* This would make no sense if it was to be read as the power of the Saviour's 'trinity' or saviour's members of the committee.

She says again concerning Christ:

*'In Him is gathered all the glory of the Father, the fullness of the **Godhead** (Divine nature). He is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person. The glory of the attributes of God is expressed in His character.'* - {COL 115.1}

We see the same thing in another statement we've already looked at earlier.

*'And that doctrine that denies the absolute **Godhead** (divinity) of Jesus Christ, denies also the **Godhead** (divinity) of the Father; for no man knoweth the Son but the Father.'* - {ST June 27, 1895, par. 3}

So again, we notice that she says *'the doctrine that denies the absolute Godhead of Jesus Christ.'* In other words, 'the doctrine that denies the absolute Deity/divinity of Jesus Christ.' This makes perfect sense. It would not make sense to read this as saying that 'the doctrine that denies the absolute trinity or committee of Jesus Christ.' Ellen White used the word in the Biblical way, not to denote some sort of committee in heaven.

As stated already, 'Godhead' is not a completely unbiblical view or word. It is Biblical but the concept people have of it is unbiblical because we never see it used in the Bible in such ways,

nor is that what the word actually means. So to summarise, it can be thought of as thus; Godhead = Divinity, deity or Divine nature.

Nevertheless, many Adventists still maintain that when the pioneers spoke out against the doctrine of the trinity, they were just simply speaking out against the traditional understanding of the trinity, and what they actually believed in was the 'Godhead' three in one, which is the three beings that are one God because they're in agreement. But is this really the point the pioneers were making? Is this really what their understanding of God was? When they spoke out in opposition to the trinity, were they just speaking out against the belief that God is three persons in one being, and instead were advocating the belief that God is three beings that are one in agreement? We've already thoroughly looked at what the pioneers believed about God, and it is evident that this was not the case. However, for the sake of further clarification, we'll investigate this a bit further. Thankfully, the pioneers were aware of the notion of God being three beings, thus, we can see how they actually perceived this understanding. For example, J.H Waggoner spoke out on the topic of three divine beings. He stated:

***‘Those who will have the patience to read the writers of the early centuries in their controversies over the doctrine of the Trinity, must agree in this, that very much which was then written on the subject was an interminable jargon, a bitter contention over words to no profit; made up more largely of invectives and personal criminations than of argument; showing more zeal for party success than piety... The creed was formulated and the faith defined by Athanasius. Previous to that time there was no settled method of expression, if, indeed, there was anywhere any uniformity of belief. Most of the early writers had been pagan philosophers, who, to reach the minds of that class, often made strong efforts to prove that there was a blending of the two systems, Christianity and philosophy. There is abundance of material in their writings to sustain this view. Bingham speaks of the vague views held by some in the following significant terms:— "There were some very early that turned the doctrine of the Trinity into Tritheism, and, instead of three divine persons under the economy of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, brought in three collateral, co-ordinate, and self-originated beings, making them three absolute and independent principles, without any relation of Father or Son, which is the most proper notion of three gods..."*** Who can distinguish between this form of expression and that put forth by the Council of Constantinople in A. D. 381, wherein the true faith is declared to be that of "an uncreated and consubstantial and co-eternal Trinity"? The truth is that we find the same idea which is here described by Bingham running through much of the orthodox literature of the second and third centuries. ***There is no proper "relation of Father and Son" to be found in the words of the council... Three baptisms are contrary to the express words of the Scripture, and contrary to the Scripture ideas Of baptism into the death and resurrection of Christ. We must determine, and that to a certainty, that three baptisms is that erroneous form which was made to correspond to the doctrine of three co-eternal beings, which did not regard the true relation of Father and Son, and which gave rise to a rejection of the baptism of the gospel, into the death of Christ.***<sup>128</sup> - (J.H Waggoner, 'The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald', June 6, 1878, p. 1/177)

Waggoner here highlights the on-going fighting that had been taking place in the early centuries of the church to define God. He mentions that the eventual formulation of the 'orthodox' doctrine came about as a result of *'blending... Christianity and philosophy.'* Waggoner then references historian Joseph Bingham to point out that there had been attempts early on in the church to bring in *'Tritheism'*, which taught that there are *'three collateral, co-ordinate, and **self-originated beings**'*, and this was *'the most proper notion of three gods'* according to this source that Waggoner referenced. Waggoner goes on to explain how the practice of *'three baptisms'* began to be taught in order *'to correspond to the doctrine of three co-eternal beings, which **did not regard the true relation of Father and Son**'*. Notice that the historian points out that this teaching was brought about in an effort to turn *'the doctrine of the Trinity into Tritheism'*. Satan had attempted very early on to bring in the notion of three divine, self-originated, and co-eternal beings. But this couldn't really take off in the Church because it was so clearly the *'notion of three gods'*. The best compromise for this was to retain the idea of three distinct, divine, and co-eternal individuals, but rather than say three beings, just say three persons that constitute the one being (one God), and thus leave monotheism intact. We can see from J.H Waggoner's view of this idea of 'three beings', that the Adventist Church of the first 50 years did not ascribe to such a doctrine at all. For the pioneers and most Christians at large, even 'traditional' trinitarians, such a teaching was polytheism in the fullest sense.

So we've seen the SDA theologians above proclaim that there *'are three divine beings (who are) lined up together in such a way as to point to their **oneness of purpose**'*, and thus for them, this doesn't *'constitute... three gods, but one God'*. Those who ascribe to the so-called 'Godhead' belief basically teach that there are three independent, co-eternal, and self-originating gods, thus they teach that there are three sources of divinity. And the only thing that makes these three beings one God is the fact that they agree with each other, and never clash. So One God just means mutual agreement and working together. What does the word 'God' itself even refer to then for those who ascribe to this? It simply means unity, and that's it. According to this understanding, the word God is essentially just another word for team. There is one team, three gods, but one team, so it is one God (team), because they're united. Such a belief is a further dismantling of Christ's true Sonship.

The idea that the One God of the Bible consists of three co-eternal gods (beings) united in purpose, completely damages any idea of the One God actually having a Son, hence we've seen Waggoner proclaim that, *'the doctrine of three co-eternal beings... did not regard the true relation of Father and Son.'* Father and Son is non-existent in this belief, rather, these are just simply words allocated to these beings, they are just role playing, and it's not a reality. And we see that the literature of the SDA Church today is riddled with this perverted concept. For example, in 1996, the Adventist review put out a study concerning the 'Godhead' in the role of salvation. It sated:

*'In God's foreknowledge and great love, such a provision had already been made. A plan of salvation was encompassed in the covenant **made by the Three Persons of the Godhead**, who possessed the attributes of Deity equally. In order to eradicate sin and rebellion from the universe and to restore harmony and peace, **one of the divine Beings** accepted, **and entered into, the role the of Father** [sic], **another the role of the Son. The remaining divine Being, the Holy Spirit**, was also to participate in*

*effecting the plan of salvation. All of this took place before sin and rebellion transpired in heaven. By accepting the roles that the plan entailed, the divine Beings lost none of the powers of Deity... As sin progressively developed in heaven and later, on earth, so the plan to deal with it was progressively revealed—the divine Beings entered into the roles they had agreed upon before the foundations of the world were laid (see 1 Peter 1:20).'*<sup>129</sup> - (Gordon Jenson, Adventist Review, Readings for the week of prayer, October 31, 1996, p. 12)

So according to this publication, there were three persons of the Godhead who decided to choose roles to take for the plan of salvation. So Christ could have equally been the Father, and the Father the Son because these aren't literal relations they have to each other, they're both just two self-originating eternal beings who have always existed alongside each other. No one came from the other. And the Holy Spirit is thrown in as another divine being too. The statement of Waggoner rings true, that '*the doctrine of three co-eternal beings*' does **'not regard the true relation of Father and Son.'** For those that ascribe to such views, there is no distinction between the Father and Son, they are exactly the same, and their roles could be reversed. In fact, a Sabbath school quarterly even stated that the Father could have taken the role of the Son and be sent down to earth, and Jesus could have taken the role of the Father. According to the quarterly, this would have made no difference at all. It states:

*"Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father" (NIV)... The above passages put Christ on an equal footing with the One whom **we have come to call "God the Father."** And this all measures up with Jesus' own declarations when He walked the dusty streets of Palestine. In John 10:30, for example, He declared: "I and the Father are one" (NIV). The neuter form of the Greek used here for "one" implies a union as close as our minds can conceive. Jesus and the Father are of one substance, one nature, yet not one and the same Person (in which case He would have used the masculine gender). If you have trouble plumbing the depths of all this, you have lots of company. The deeper you probe the subject, the more keenly you understand the depths of your ignorance. **But imagine a situation in which the being we have come to know as God the Father came to die for us, and the one we have come to know as Jesus stayed back in heaven** (we are speaking in human terms to make a point). **Nothing would have changed, except that we would have been calling each by the name we now use for the other.** That is what equality in the Deity means.'<sup>130</sup> - (SDA Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly, 'The Mystery of His Deity', Lesson 2, April 10, 2008)*

So according to this quarterly, it could have just as easily been the Father who came down to earth as the Son instead of Jesus. Jesus could have been the Father who sent the one 'we have come to call "God the Father."' Jesus being the Son and His Father being the Father was essentially just a flip of a coin. Jesus would have been the God of the Father and Head of the Father. This completely destroys everything the Bible reveals. This also makes the headship of men over women meaningless. It is just allocated roles based upon random allocation. But

this is the only logical conclusion that one can arrive at when they believe that there is no true distinction between the Father and Son, and no one is before the other. If the Father and Son are just a pair of co-eternal beings, then there is no real reason that one would be the Father of the other, nor head of the other. It makes everything that we read in the Bible about the Son's relationship with the Father fake and pretend. It turns them into actors. It makes God a liar (1 Jhn 5:10). Where in God's Holy Word does it even hint that the Father & Son took on roles at some point to be labelled as what we call them? Why would God confuse us by using expressions (Father & Son) that we must not understand as just that? We've seen that it is considered great heresy to actually believe that God is the Father of Christ and Christ comes from Him. The SDA Church has blurred the distinction between the Father and Son and have made them into twins, with a third been thrown in also, so triplets. They have stripped the Father of His glory as the Only True and Living God, and Christ as begotten of the Almighty God. Such beliefs, thinking, and teachings demonstrate complete intoxication from the wine of Babylon. Anyone who can read these sorts of teachings as presented in the above Sabbath school quarterly and see no issue with it are clearly drunk with the rest of the harlots and no not where they are going.

Overall, it is clear that Ellen G. White and the pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist Church did not believe that God is a trinity nor did they believe that God is a word for a unity of three co-eternal divine beings. Spirit of prophecy and the early Adventists truly believed that God is One, and Jesus Christ is truly His Son. We've seen that Mrs White warned over and over again that we are not to enter into controversy concerning the personality of God, and the understanding they had then was correct. But we did not take heed to that warning. Wolves and apostates in the church kept agitating for a revamp on our understanding of the personality of God, and now we have arrived where we are today in the Church. We have joined with Rome and turned God into a philosophical catastrophe. The SDA Church has turned away from the True God and put a strange god in His place, who we call a 'mystery,' *'the **mystery** of the Most Holy Trinity.'* And we've seen that this mystery god binds us together with *'... **MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.**'* - (Rev 17:5)

The trinity, tritheism, and all the various forms of them rob the Father of His glory and honour as the only absolute True and Living God. They remove the Father from His position as the Almighty and source of everything, to being just a member of a trio that is called God. And they destroy the relation between the Father and Son, thus destroying the sole qualification of Christ's Deity; That God is literally His Father. When you say God is three or three is God, you're no longer saying God is a Person because you're saying God is three persons. You can't make persons into one person, nor beings into one being. You're saying God is a committee, you're saying God is the name of three individual persons that come together. So in the world of the Trinity or tritheism, God isn't a Who, but a what. *'**The religious bodies all over Christendom will become more and more closely united in sentiment. They will make of God a peculiar something** in order to escape from loyalty to **Him** who is pure, holy, and undefiled, and who denounces all sin as a production of the apostate.'* - {20 LtMs. Ms 181, 1905, par. 9} We've seen that Ellen White stressed that *'in every case, clear, powerful light has been given that God is the eternal, self-existent One. From my girlhood I have been **given plain instruction that God is a***

**person.** Ellen White came from a trinitarian background having been a Methodist, and God wanted the one who He would raise up as His prophet to have a clear understanding of who He is. He had to cement the truth of the matter in His messenger's head *'in every case, clear, powerful'* that He is a Person, not three persons. It is obvious that Satan would hold great resentment towards the Almighty Jehovah for not having grafted him into the Divine counsels. Therefore, Satan has sought to diminish the true position of the One Supreme Almighty God, for Satan despised His sovereignty. Hence, we've seen Ellen White warn that *'there will be, even among us, hirelings and wolves in sheep's clothing who will persuade some of the flock of God to sacrifice unto **other gods before the Lord.**'* These wolves will do the bidding of the devil, and be one's, like Satan, *'who **despise the sovereignty of the Ancient of Days** and place on the throne a false god, a being of their own defining... these will be agents in Satan's hands to corrupt the faith of the unwary.'* We've also seen in great detail from inspiration that any attack on the truth of Christ's Sonship is a direct attack from Satan himself, for the obscuration of Christ being God's Son originates from Satan's rebellion in heaven. And we've seen that any effort to place a third being on the throne of Majesty besides the Father and Son is an agitation from Satan, for he sparked war in heaven for being excluded from the Divine counsels, and coveted after the honour and glory that had been *'devolved on Christ alone'*, God's only begotten Son.

---

## **Conclusion:**

In conclusion, it is clear that the Trinity and every form of it was completely foreign to the Apostles. Moreover, it is clear that it was also foreign to early Seventh-day Adventism. The SDA pioneers held no such doctrine. Furthermore, the pioneers didn't only reject the trinity, but they firmly believed that it was just another ingredient added to the strong wine of Babylon. They listed this doctrine alongside SUN-day worship, and immortality of the soul along with other Papal dogmas that Protestants have refused to let go of. For the pioneers, the trinity was a fruit of the great apostasy, and we've touched on how this trinity god was developed and formulated by those who were heavily involved in pagan Greek philosophy. Moreover, it's clear that the trinity wasn't a doctrine that the SDA Church eventually adopted based on conviction, but it was to heal the bad image we had in the evangelical world and bring us closer to the harlot churches.

The change to the trinity doctrine in the SDA Church took place very slowly over many decades. It hadn't become official until 117 years after the Church was officially founded as a denomination. Apostasy always creeps in slowly just like the Sunday movement and other pagan beliefs that entered Christianity.

*'In view of this lengthy process of doctrinal development in which lay people as well as ministers took an active part, it is not so surprising that **some teachings assumed by most Christians were rather late in receiving attention from this small but rapidly growing Christian denomination.** The Adventist understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity came about through a long process of scrutiny, **initial rejection, and eventual acceptance.** The early Adventists had no question about the biblical testimony regarding the eternity of God the Father, the deity of Jesus Christ "as Creator, Redeemer and Mediator," and the "importance of the Holy Spirit." However, **they weren't initially convinced that the relation between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is best described by the word "trinity."**<sup>131</sup> - (Jerry Moon, 'Heresy or Hopeful Sign?: Early Adventists' Struggle with the Truth about the Trinity,' Review & Herald, 1999)*

Yet, we are made to believe that this change in the Church was a step in the right direction and a correction on the mistake of the pioneers concerning the God they worshipped. We must ask ourselves if the Adventist pioneers were truly the remnant and led by Jesus Christ? If they were, then Adventists must believe that they had come out of Babylon in their teachings because that is the ultimate mark of the Remnant. The 'remnant' could not call others out of Babylon if they themselves were still in great confusion and ignorance, especially concerning who God is, whilst those in Babylon had a correct understanding of God's identity. This just doesn't make sense. If rejecting the Trinity is such a heresy as we're told by prominent people in the church, how could God have led the 'remnant' people to initially reject it? It's one thing to continue believing in the trinity and believe the pioneer's stance on who God is was an error, but then we shouldn't continue professing to be their successors and touting them to have been mighty workers for God whilst condemning their positions and understanding of who God is. It is essentially saying that God's remnant were heretics. Such is self-contradictory. It is impossible to hold to the same profession of faith as the pioneers whilst teaching and believing that the One True God is a Trinity, and Jesus is a metaphorical son, which is what the Church teaches today. It's a massive contradiction within the current SDA Church.

The triune god that is worshipped in the SDA Church today is a different god to who the pioneers worshipped, for they rejected a triune god. If the pioneer's position on the identity of the True God is invalid, then why promote anything that they taught? If they could be so wrong on something so fundamental: The very God that they worshipped, doesn't that put everything else in question? Keep in mind that Ellen White went to the same assembly, prayed, and worshipped the same God with all these people that openly rejected the Trinity. Her own husband who she worked alongside with in the mission field; James White, said the doctrine of the Trinity is antichrist, and it destroys the personality of the Father and Son. And those around Ellen White had no quarrels over any of her supposed 'trinitarian' statements. We are to believe that Ellen White made such a monumental shift in her belief about who God is near the end of her life, yet such a thing was never pronounced by her.

When it comes to the belief of who God is, the pioneers were either heretics or not. There is no middle ground. As SDA trinitarian authors and theologians state in their book, 'the trinity':

*'A further question has arisen with increasing urgency: was the pioneers belief about the Godhead right or wrong? As one line of reasoning goes, **either the pioneers were wrong and the present church is right**, or the pioneers were right and **the present Seventh-day Adventist Church has apostatized from biblical truth.**'<sup>132</sup> -*

(Woodrow W. Whidden, Jerry Moon, John W. Reeve, 'Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships', Review and Herald Publishing Association, (2002), p 190)

It's one or the other, there is no grey area. Now of course leaders, theologians, and most SDA's of the present Church at large would agree with the former, that '*the pioneers were wrong and the present church is right*', and haven't '*apostatized from biblical truth.*' The authors of the book above firmly believe that the pioneers were in great error, thus they believe that those who converted to Adventism and left the trinity doctrine were indoctrinated by the early Adventists of that time. They stated:

*'From about 1846 to 1888 the majority of Adventists rejected the concept of the Trinity- at least as they understood it. **All the leading writers were anti-Trinitarian**, although we find scattered references to members who held the Trinitarian views. Ambrose C. Spicer, the father of General Conference president William Ambrose Spicer, had been a Seventh Day Baptist minister before his conversion to Adventism in 1874... He evidently remained Trinitarian, because W.A Spicer recounted to A. W. Spalding that his father "**grew so offended at the anti-trinitarian atmosphere in Battle Creek that he ceased preaching**" (Burt, p. 3). S. B. Whitney had been Trinitarian, **but in the course of his indoctrination as an Adventist**, evidently in 1861 **he became a convinced anti-trinitarian**. His experience gives us evidence that at least **some ministers taught anti-Trinitarianism as an essential element in the instruction of new converts.**'<sup>133</sup> - (Woodrow W. Whidden, Jerry Moon, John W. Reeve, 'Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships', Review and Herald Publishing Association, (2002), p. 191-192)*

So, these SDA Adventist theologians point out that from 1846 to 1888, '*all the leading (Adventist) writers were anti-Trinitarian*'. They also then refer to a man named S. B Whitney who was a trinitarian and converted to Adventism. According to the authors, he had gone through a course of '*indoctrination as an Adventist*', and thus '*became a convinced anti-trinitarian.*' Notice they use the negative term '*indoctrination*' to explain Whitney's experience of conversion into the Advent faith. Indoctrinate is another word for brainwash. So they're ultimately saying that he had been brainwashed by the Seventh-day Adventists of his time, and that's why he departed from his trinitarian belief. Again, we see an illustration of inconsistency from SDA's. We believe that the early Adventist Church was raised up by God, yet those who adopted the same belief about God as the Adventists must have been brainwashed? This illustrates the point that has been raised: either the pioneers were wrong or the SDA Church has departed from the truth of who God is. Ministers and theologians in



the Church today may say that the latter is not so, many Adventists will even believe that the latter can't be so, yet we've seen that Ellen White received a message from God that this was going to be so. She proclaimed that *'the principles of truth that God in His wisdom has given to the remnant church, would be discarded,... (and) the fundamental principles that have sustained the work for the last fifty years would be accounted as error.'* Over and over again, Ellen White stressed the importance of not departing from the principles of faith that were established in the *'last fifty years'*, and not to forget the way we were led in our history. She stressed the importance of us knowing and understanding that God truly did lead the brethren during the early Advent movement.

*'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...** We are to follow on to know the Lord, that we may know that His going forth is prepared as the morning. Our souls need the quickening from the Source of all power. **We may be strengthened and confirmed in the past experience that holds us to the essential points of truth which have made us what we are—Seventh-day Adventists. 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.'* - {20LtMs, Lt 326, 1905, par. 2, 3}

*'**In reviewing our past history**, having traveled over every step of advance to our present standing, I can say, **Praise God! As I see what the Lord has wrought**, I am filled with astonishment, and with confidence in Christ as leader. **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.**'* - {LS 196.2}

As Seventh-day Adventists, we must understand that the Advent movement was truly prophetic, it was truly of Divine origin, the Lord Himself was behind this movement and the establishment of the Church. We must understand what it actually means to be the remnant. The 'remnant' isn't just simply a catchword or slogan that we attach to our Church name. The remnant is that last little group of believers who uphold the same doctrine and faith that was held by the Christian Church in its infancy and purity; the 1<sup>st</sup> century Church. We've established that there is no triune god in Scripture. Moreover, we've touched on the fact that

history testifies that there was no trinity in the 1<sup>st</sup> century Church. The evidence just isn't there.

***'The doctrine developed gradually over several centuries and through many controversies.*** Initially, both the requirements of monotheism inherited from the Hebrew Scriptures and the implications of the need to interpret the biblical teaching to Greco-Roman religions seemed to demand that the divine in Christ as the Word, or Logos, be interpreted as subordinate to the Supreme Being. An alternative solution was to interpret Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as three modes of the self-disclosure of the one God but not as distinct within the being of God itself. The first tendency recognized the distinctness among the three, but at the cost of their equality and hence of their unity (subordinationism). The second came to terms with their unity, but at the cost of their distinctness as "persons" (modalism). The high point of these conflicts was the so-called Arian controversy in the early 4th century. In his interpretation of the idea of God, Arius sought to maintain a formal understanding of the oneness of God. In defense of that oneness, he was obliged to dispute the sameness of essence of the Son and the Holy Spirit with God the Father. ***It was not until later in the 4th century that the distinctness of the three and their unity were brought together in a single orthodox doctrine of one essence and three persons.***<sup>134</sup> - (Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Trinity". *Encyclopedia Britannica*)

*'It is understandable that the importance placed on this doctrine is perplexing to many lay Christians and students. **Nowhere is it clearly and unequivocally stated in Scripture. The doctrine of the Trinity developed gradually after the completion of the N.T. in the heat of controversy. The full-blown doctrine of the Trinity was spelled out in the fourth century at two great ecumenical councils: Nicea (325 A.D.) and Constantinople (381 A.D.)**... Patristic trinitarian theology is grounded in a number of significant foundations... Both the practices and documents of the church finally led early Christian leaders to propose a trinitarian model of God, but the formation of this model took place of over many years and in many contexts... **The conclusion of the Church, reached in ecumenical council towards the end of the fourth century CE, was that God must exist as both a unity and a trinity.** Fourth-century theologians such as Athanasius argued that the Scripture, the practice of the church in worship, and the drama of salvation itself demonstrated the necessity for a trinitarian view of God... **Defenders of a trinitarian paradigm troubled other fathers, however, with their decision to employ new terms not found in the Bible**... **The conclusions reached at Nicea (325 CE) were debated and not infrequently rejected for a period of more than fifty years.***

*Some fathers rejected Nicea because... they felt its newly coined terms... **went too far beyond boundaries of the biblical testimony itself.** These theologians... longed to see creedal statements more firmly tied to the Bible... What we do find in the writings of Christian leaders during roughly the first sixty years of the second century CE? As we expect, **we do not find the developed trinitarian language or theology that will***

***blossom from fourth century on.***<sup>135</sup> - (Roger E. Olson, Christopher A. Hall, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2002 pp. 1-2, 15-16)

Notice that throughout this document, we keep finding that it was during the 4<sup>th</sup> century that the doctrine of the trinity really began to formulate. The only reason the trinity became the 'orthodox' belief about God is because Constantine I wanted to unite the Roman empire that was in decline under one universal umbrella of Christianity, and thus, he couldn't have all the differing views, so he made his final decision that it was to be the trinity that would win the deciding factor. This is what the foundation of the trinity is; a decree set forth by Constantine in a council, and anyone who disagreed was banished and had their works that opposed the trinity burned, and even then, *'the conclusions reached at Nicea (325 CE) were... not infrequently rejected for a period of more than fifty years'*, but it was only *'towards the end of the fourth century CE'* that more on-going Church councils finally solidified the stance *'that God must exist as both a unity and a trinity.'* Even after Nicea 325 (which laid down the co-eternality of the son), the debate had still been persisting, and it wasn't until the 6th century that the Trinity was completely formulated in its fullness, and imposed upon the Church as a key doctrine of orthodoxy. This is just history. Surely this is a shaky foundation for such an important doctrine; the God we worship. As pointed out, the fact that the most widely held and accepted belief in Christendom today was completely foreign to the 1<sup>st</sup> century Church is startling. Most Christians today are unaware of this history and only see the trinity in Scripture because that's what their minds are wired to see, even though no such description of God is mentioned in the Bible. When you have an embedded idea and doctrine that you are trying to defend, you'll see it everywhere you look. Whether it's there or not is irrelevant because that's the idea you have in your mind. The Trinity was simply a doctrine that was slowly developed over the first few centuries of Christianity as a result of Greek philosophical influence.

*'In peace and harmony, and in accordance with the sacred institutions of their ancestors, without persecuting their fellow-citizens who cherished a different form of religious belief, these old Roman philosophers, whom Christians call "pagans," were content to adore the gods under auspices the Empire had been founded, and Rome made mistress of the world. But the Roman Bishops and Christian Emperors, from the guilty Constantine downward, have ever sought to fetter and enslave the mind—to dictate a form of religious belief which all must endorse, or suffer the persecutions that intolerant orthodoxy inflicts.*

*If Paganism was conquered by Christianity, it is equally true that Christianity was corrupted by Paganism. The pure Deism of the first Christians, (who differed from their fellow Jews only in belief that Jesus was the promised Messiah,) was changed, by the Church of Rome, into the incomprehensible dogma of the Trinity. Many of the pagan tenets, invented by Egyptians and idealized by Plato, were retained as being worthy of belief.*<sup>136</sup> - (Edward Gibbon, History of Christianity: Comprising All that

Relates to the Progress of the Christian Religion in "*The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*," and A Vindication of Some Passages in the 15th and 16th Chapters, New York, 1883, p. XV-XVI)

*'The respectable name of Plato was used by the orthodox, and abused by the heretics, as the common support of truth and error: the authority of his skillful commentators, and the science of dialectics, were employed to justify the remote consequences of his opinions and to supply the discreet silence of the inspired writers. The same subtle and profound questions concerning the nature, the generation, the distinction, and the equality of the three divine persons of the mysterious Triad, or Trinity, were agitated in the philosophical and in the Christian schools of Alexandria.'*<sup>137</sup> - (Edward Gibbon, *'The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,'* Abridged Edition, p. 405)

Can we not see the parallel between the primitive Christian Church and the remnant that God raised up in the 19<sup>th</sup> century? We've seen that there is no evidence of a trinity god being worshipped by the earliest Christians, and we then see that a trinity god wasn't worshipped by the early Adventists. Why is this? Clearly this reinforces the fact that those in the early Advent movement were truly the remnant! They left the vestiges of man-made doctrine and tradition, and thus, the trinity was one of the things they discarded, for this was not held by the primitive church. This is what it means to be the remnant; those who retain the pure primitive faith that isn't mingled with man-made falsehoods, even the wine of Babylon. We can see that there is a parallel with the acceptance of the trinity in the early Church and Adventist Church. We've seen above that trinitarian concepts were initially met with a lot of opposition after the first council of Nicea in 325, then gradually through the decades it became more widely accepted. And we've seen that this exact same trend took place in the SDA Church. We've seen SDA historians and theologians highlight that *'it took over 50 years for the doctrine of the Trinity to become normative'*, and *'the Adventist understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity came about through a long process of scrutiny, initial rejection, and eventual acceptance.'* Many theologians of the harlot Churches teach that the Trinity was developed by the leading of God, and the Church grew into a fuller understanding of who God is.

And we see that theologians and ministers of the present SDA Church teach the exact same thing concerning the eventual acceptance of the trinity in our Church, it was 'progressive truth.' And our official theological institutions affirm that the Seventh-day Adventist Church is in harmony with the 4<sup>th</sup> century creeds of the apostate Roman Church.

This is illustrated by BRI member and theologian, George W. Reid, in his *'brief review of the history and doctrines of the SDA church. Prepared for the dialogue with representatives of the Roman Catholic Church.'*<sup>138</sup> - ('Seventh-day Adventist Biblical Research Institute')

*'A reading of the above statements will show that with respect to their doctrine of God **Seventh-day Adventists are in harmony with the great creedal statements of Christendom, including the Apostles' Creed, Nicea 325), and the additional definition of faith concerning the Holy Spirit as reached in Constantinople (381). However, such was not always the case.** Many early Adventists came from churches holding to what is described as a semi-Arian position on the nature of Christ, making it the predominant view for almost a half-century. **Shortly before the close of the 19th century, however, as theological development took place, and with the encouragement of Ellen White, the church moved to a full trinitarian position.** Other classical teachings that came to be designated as heresies, such as forms of monarchianism and modalism, have not troubled Adventists.'*<sup>139</sup> - (George W. Reid, Seventh-day Adventists: A Brief Introduction to their Beliefs, p. 6)

Notice the above document was a review of the doctrines of the SDA Church to share with 'representatives of the Roman Catholic Church.' This was to present the Catholics a synopsis of what the SDA Church believes. This was clearly for ecumenical dialogue, as we have seen the Church is involved in. The document highlights that '*Seventh-day Adventists are in harmony with the **great creedal statements** of Christendom.'* And they include '***Nicea 325, and the additional definition of faith concerning the Holy Spirit as reached in Constantinople (381).***' The BRI is making it known to Rome that they are in harmony with them. They are indirectly declaring to Rome that they recognise the Apostolic succession of the Roman Catholic Church, just like the rest of the Protestant Churches, even the harlots. And they then make it very clear that they have completely disbanded from the 'semi-Arian position' of the 'early Adventists' which was then the '*predominant view for almost a half-century*' They are making it clear to Rome that they no longer hold to the beliefs that the Church originally had concerning God and Christ, rather, the Seventh-day Adventist Church has now become orthodox.

We must ponder and ask ourselves; If it was the Lord that was leading the pioneers during their rejection of the Trinity, who then was leading during the churches eventual acceptance of it? Of course we see Ellen White being touted as the initiator for this change, but we've clearly established that this was not the case. Rather, we've clearly seen that during the close of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and start of the 20<sup>th</sup>, she emphatically warned about the changes that were going to take place in the Church and warned about those who would come in with 'new theories' that contradict the light that had been given from the early days of the Advent movement. Even on her deathbed, she yet again received the message from God that great changes were going to take place in the Church, and she gave the warning. She stated on her deathbed:

*"I want to tell you. I hate sin (repeated three times). **I am charged to tell our people, that some do not realize, that the devil has device after device, and he carries them out in ways that they do not expect. Satan's agencies will invent ways to make sinners out of saints. I tell you now, that when I am laid to rest, great changes will take place.** I do not know when I shall be taken; and I desire to warn all against the devices of the devil. **I want the people to know that I warned them fully before my death. I do***

*not know especially what changes will take place; but they should watch every conceivable sin that Satan will try to immortalize.” - {25LtMS, Ms 1, 1915, par.1-5}*

God charged Ellen White to give this warning that great changes were going to take place after her death. She didn't know exactly what those changes were going to be, but she knew they were going to happen, and by the great mercies and grace of God, He revealed this to His prophet for us to be aware of: *'I want the people to know that I warned them fully before my death.'* The Trinity is one of the greatest deceptions to have entered the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and this has opened the gateway for further deceptions, to the point we have prominent and influential men in the Church who can boldly proclaim that Jesus isn't a real Son, and that God didn't really send His Son to die. Many false doctrines had entered the Christian Church to attack the personality of God and Christ but the trinity is what became the dominant one, the orthodox doctrine. Satan introduced the trinity doctrine to the Church in the early centuries, and the Christian world has still not been able to fully recover from this. It was important for Satan to lay a foundation in the Church that would destroy the relation between God and His Son, for we've seen that this is what he sought to do when he was still in heaven. This is why whenever major developments took place of people beginning to question this doctrine, it was immediately met with heavy persecution from both Catholics and Protestants. In the 4<sup>th</sup> century, Satan was able to officially trample upon God's Holy Sabbath in 321 AD, trample upon the true relation of the Father & Son in 325 AD. And in 381 AD, he was able to place himself in the divine counsels alongside God and Christ in the minds of believers by deceiving the Christian world to worship a third divine member that they believed also sat upon the throne. Christ led the pioneers to dismantle the work that Satan had achieved through Rome, *'That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water **by the word**, That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.'* - (Eph 5:26-27) But our leaders have forsaken Christ, and have trampled upon the foundations He set up through His servants, for the sake of unification with the Harlots and their Mother.

*'Those who can ignore all the evidences which God has given them, and change that blessing into a curse, should tremble for the safety of their own souls. Their candlestick will be removed out of its place unless they repent. The Lord has been insulted. The standard of truth, of the first, second and third angels' messages has been left to trail in the dust. If the watchmen are left to mislead the people in this fashion, God will hold some souls responsible for a lack of keen discernment to discover what kind of provender was being given to His flock. **Apostasies have occurred, and the Lord has permitted matters of this nature to develop in the past in order to show how easily His people will be misled when they depend upon the words of men instead of searching the Scriptures for themselves**, as did the noble Bereans, to see if these things are so.*

***And the Lord has permitted things of this kind to occur that warnings may be given that such things will take place.** There is a decided testimony to be borne by all our ministers in all our churches. **God has permitted apostasies to take place in order to show how little dependence can be placed in man. We are always to***

**look to God.** *His Word is not Yea and Nay, but Yea and Amen.* ' - {12LtMs, Ms 185, 1897, par. 7-8

God wanted to entrust a people with His special messages for these last days, and He wanted these to be a people who understood who He was, and understood who His Son was. He wanted a people that had no longer been corrupted by the stains of popery, confusion, and doctrines that align with Satan's doctrines from his rebellion in heaven. Ellen White says that we are to repeat the words of the pioneers. The Seventh-day Adventist Church was truly the remnant, they truly left the vestiges of popery, and wolves have brought our church right back under the Roman yoke, under the guise of 'progressive truth.' Yet we've seen that this so called 'progressive truth' of the trinity is the glue that unites us with Rome and her daughter's, for 'Unity is grounded in the being of God who is Trinity: a unity in Trinity... (and) Seventh-day Adventists support Christian unity as they join the Triune God.' But God will still have a faithful body of believers in these last days.

*'I saw that God has honest children **among the nominal Adventists** and the fallen churches, and before the plagues shall be poured out, **ministers and people will be called out from these churches and will gladly receive the truth. Satan knows this; and before the loud cry of the third angel is given, he raises an excitement in these religious bodies, that those who have rejected the truth may think that God is with them. He hopes to deceive the honest and lead them to think that God is still working for the churches.** But the light will shine, and **all who are honest will leave the fallen churches, and take their stand with the remnant.**' - {EW 261.1}*

We must reclaim our true position as Seventh-day Adventists, and move forward with the work that God has entrusted us with: To preach the three angels' messages, expose Rome of all her abominations and false doctrine, and point the world to the Only True God, and His Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

---

## The Truth about God and His Son

## **References:**

<sup>1</sup> 21<sup>st</sup> century Reformation, This Is Us, [HOME | 21st Century Reformation \(21stcr.org\)](http://21stcr.org)

<sup>2</sup> UPCE Articles of Faith, p. 1-2,  
<https://www.upce.org.uk/download/8955648c-8458-11e8-902c-3b59f784798c/>

<sup>3</sup> UPCE Articles of Faith, p. 2,  
<https://www.upce.org.uk/download/8955648c-8458-11e8-902c-3b59f784798c/>

<sup>4</sup> Grace Baptist Partnership, '*Statement of faith*', No. 2,  
<http://www.gracebaptistpartnership.org.uk/about-gbp/statement-of-faith/>

<sup>5</sup> Faith Baptist Church, '*Statement of Faith - Faith Baptist Church*', No. 2,  
<https://faithbaptistchurch.co.uk/statement-of-faith>



<sup>6</sup> The Lutheran Church Missouri Synod, '*Belief and Practice*',  
<https://www.lcms.org/about/beliefs>

<sup>7</sup> The people of The United Methodist Church, '*Our Christian Beliefs: God*',  
<https://www.umc.org/en/content/our-christian-roots-god>

<sup>8</sup> '*Seventh-day Adventist 28 Fundamental Beliefs*', (2015 Edition, No. 2, p, 3),  
[https://szu.adventist.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/28\\_Beliefs.pdf](https://szu.adventist.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/28_Beliefs.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> World Council of Churches, '*What we do*', <https://www.oikoumene.org/what-we-do>

<sup>10</sup> ELDER J. H. WAGGONER, '*The Atonement AN EXAMINATION OF A REMEDIAL SYSTEM IN THE LIGHT OF NATURE AND REVELATION*', REVIEW & HERALD: BATTLE CREEK, MICH. (1884) p, 118/168, [https://www.smyrna.org/Books/The%20Atonement/The\\_Atonement.pdf](https://www.smyrna.org/Books/The%20Atonement/The_Atonement.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> '*Seventh-day Adventist 28 Fundamental Beliefs*', (2015 Edition, No. 4, p, 3),  
[https://szu.adventist.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/28\\_Beliefs.pdf](https://szu.adventist.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/28_Beliefs.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> 'Was Jesus Created? with Pastor Doug Batchelor',  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oh90pOMNXcU&t=394s>, [Mins 05:56-06:56]

<sup>13</sup> E. J. Waggoner, '*Christ and His Righteousness*', p. 19/21-22,  
[https://www.whitehorsemedia.com/docs/christ\\_and\\_his\\_righteousness.pdf](https://www.whitehorsemedia.com/docs/christ_and_his_righteousness.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> E. J. Waggoner, '*Christ and His Righteousness*', p. 10/9,  
[https://www.whitehorsemedia.com/docs/christ\\_and\\_his\\_righteousness.pdf](https://www.whitehorsemedia.com/docs/christ_and_his_righteousness.pdf)

- <sup>15</sup> A. T. Jones, *The Signs of the Times*, (March 25, 1886), Page. 10/186, [ST18860325-V12-12.pdf](https://documents.adventistarchives.org/ST18860325-V12-12.pdf) ([adventistarchives.org](https://documents.adventistarchives.org/))
- <sup>16</sup> ‘SDA Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly’, Lesson 4, (October 1936), p. 13, <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/SSQ/SS19361001-04.pdf>
- <sup>17</sup> ‘SDA Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly’, Lesson 4, (October 1936), p. 12, <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/SSQ/SS19361001-04.pdf>
- <sup>18</sup> John G. Matteson, ‘Review & Herald, (October 12, 1869) p. 123, <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18691012-V34-16.pdf>
- <sup>19</sup> William Barclay, ‘*Many Witnesses, One Lord*’, (1963), p. 16/16-17/17, [Many Witnesses. One Lord](https://www.sabda.org/many-witnesses-one-lord) ([sabda.org](https://www.sabda.org/))
- <sup>20</sup> James Edson White & Alonzo L. Baker, ‘*The Coming King*’, p. 27, <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Books/TCK1932.pdf>
- <sup>21</sup> James Edson White & Alonzo L. Baker, ‘*The Coming King*’, p. 17, <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Books/TCK1932.pdf>
- <sup>22</sup> ‘*Handbook for Today’s Catholic*’, Fully indexed to the Catechism of the Catholic Church, Revised Edition, p. 19, [https://www.liguori.org/amfile/file/download/file\\_id/511/product\\_id/5086/](https://www.liguori.org/amfile/file/download/file_id/511/product_id/5086/)
- <sup>23</sup> ‘Was Jesus Created? with Pastor Doug Batchelor’, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oh90pOMNXcU&t=394s>, [Mins - 02:18 - 02:55]

<sup>24</sup> James Edson White, *'Past, Present, and Future'*, (1909), p. 52,  
<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Books/PPF1914.pdf>

<sup>25</sup> SDA Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly, 'In These Last Days: The Message of Hebrews', Lesson 3, (January 2022), [Jesus, the Promised Son - Sabbath School Lesson 3, 1st Qtr 2022 \(ssnet.org\)](https://www.ssnet.org/lesson-3-january-2022)

<sup>26</sup> J. R. Hoffman, Ministry Magazine, (June 1982), P. 24, [MIN1982-06.pdf \(ministrymagazine.org\)](https://www.ministrymagazine.org/archive/1982-06)

<sup>27</sup> Woodrow W. Whidden, Jerry Moon, John W. Reeve, *'Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships'*, Review and Herald Publishing Association, (2002), p. 106

<sup>28</sup> 'David Asscherick Answers a Question on SDA trinity', [Mins 0:03-01:21],  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QqaAGX0Xubc&list=WL&index=197>

<sup>29</sup> Ángel Manuel Rodríguez , *'Bible Institute (BRI) General Conference of Seventh-day Adventist'* (2015), <https://adventistbiblicalresearch.org/materials/a-question-of-sonship/>

<sup>30</sup> Adventist Review, *'What Seventh-day Adventists Believe Brief discussions of 27 fundamental beliefs'*, Vol. 158, No. 31, p. 4, [1981],  
<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH19810730-V158-31.pdf>

<sup>31</sup> Max Hatton, *'Understanding the Trinity'*, P. 11,  
<http://bookparadise.cloud/pdf?title=Understanding+the+Trinity&geo=en&i=OTc4LTE4NzM3OTY5MzE%3D&src=google>

<sup>32</sup> Benjamin Baker, *'Foy, William Ellis (1818–1893)'*. ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS, (2021), <https://encyclopedia.adventist.org/article?id=9CEN>

<sup>33</sup> Trinity Truth - *'Ted Wilson stating the Catholic Trinity'*, <https://youtu.be/8NO95n1jdho>

<sup>34</sup> *'Adventist pastor teaches his church to pray directly to the Holy Spirit!'*, <https://youtu.be/pVyX-SOU5wg>, [Mins 00:09-00:45]

<sup>35</sup> Catholic Answers,, *'Holy Ghost The Third Person of the Holy Trinity'*, Catholic Encyclopedia, <https://www.catholic.com/encyclopedia/holy-ghost>

<sup>36</sup> *Catechism of the Catholic Church, 'I BELIEVE IN THE HOLY SPIRIT'*, No. 685, 691, [https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/\\_P1Y.HTM](https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_P1Y.HTM), [https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/\\_P21.HTM](https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/_P21.HTM)

<sup>37</sup> Kenneth Baker, S.J., *'Worship of the Holy Spirit'*, Catholic Education Resource Center, (1995), <https://www.catholiceducation.org/en/culture/catholic-contributions/worship-of-the-holy-spirit.html>

<sup>38</sup> John Paul Thomas, *'My Catholic Faith!'*, (2019), Ch.6, <https://mycatholic.life/the-my-catholic-life-series/my-catholic-faith/the-holy-spirit/>

<sup>39</sup> *'Seventh-day Adventist 28 Fundamental Beliefs'*, (2015 Edition), No. 5, p, 4,) [https://szu.adventist.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/28\\_Beliefs.pdf](https://szu.adventist.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/28_Beliefs.pdf)

<sup>40</sup> A.T Jones, E.G Waggoner, *Lessons on Faith*, p. 101,  
<https://www.adventbeliefs.com/assets/BBR/23/Lessons-on-Faith-E-J-Waggoner-A-T-Jones-1890.pdf>

<sup>41</sup> A.T Jones, *1893 GC Bulletin – A.T Jones Sermons on the Third Angels Message*, NO.11, p.110/246, <http://sdawatchmen.org/resources/1893GeneralConferenceBulletin-Jones.pdf>

<sup>42</sup> E. J. Waggoner, *Christ and His Righteousness*, p. 10/9,  
[https://www.whitehorsemedia.com/docs/christ\\_and\\_his\\_righteousness.pdf](https://www.whitehorsemedia.com/docs/christ_and_his_righteousness.pdf)

<sup>43</sup> E. J. Waggoner, *Christ and His Righteousness*, p.17-19/19-22),  
[https://www.whitehorsemedia.com/docs/christ\\_and\\_his\\_righteousness.pdf](https://www.whitehorsemedia.com/docs/christ_and_his_righteousness.pdf)

<sup>44</sup> E. J. Waggoner, *Christ and His Righteousness*, p.10-12/9-12,  
[https://www.whitehorsemedia.com/docs/christ\\_and\\_his\\_righteousness.pdf](https://www.whitehorsemedia.com/docs/christ_and_his_righteousness.pdf)

<sup>45</sup> E. J. Waggoner, *Christ and His Righteousness*, p.17/19,  
[https://www.whitehorsemedia.com/docs/christ\\_and\\_his\\_righteousness.pdf](https://www.whitehorsemedia.com/docs/christ_and_his_righteousness.pdf)

<sup>46</sup> E. J. Waggoner, *Christ and His Righteousness*, p.20/23,  
[https://www.whitehorsemedia.com/docs/christ\\_and\\_his\\_righteousness.pdf](https://www.whitehorsemedia.com/docs/christ_and_his_righteousness.pdf)

<sup>47</sup> E.J. Waggoner, *The Everlasting Covenant*, p. 99/100,  
[https://www.1888mpm.org/files/The%20Everlasting%20Covenant\\_1.pdf](https://www.1888mpm.org/files/The%20Everlasting%20Covenant_1.pdf)

<sup>48</sup> G.I Butler, 'Advent Review and Sabbath Herald'. August 22, 1893, p.7/535, 8/536,  
file:///home/chronos/u-ee7933e6198164ae65417f73676f64fff09f559e/MyFiles/Downloads/Advent  
%20Review%20and%20Sabbath%20Herald%20\_%20August%2022,%201893%20%20.pdf

<sup>49</sup> G.I Butler, 'Advent Review and Sabbath Herald'. August 22, 1893, p. 8/536,  
file:///home/chronos/u-ee7933e6198164ae65417f73676f64fff09f559e/MyFiles/Downloads/Advent  
%20Review%20and%20Sabbath%20Herald%20\_%20August%2022,%201893%20%20.pdf

<sup>50</sup> G.I Butler, 'Advent Review and Sabbath Herald'. August 29, 1893, p.9/553,  
<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18930829-V70-35.pdf>

<sup>51</sup> G.I Butler 'The Oriental Watchman', Vol 7, NO.12 , December, 1904, p.7/183,  
<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/OW/OW19041201-V07-12.pdf>

<sup>52</sup> Gerald Wheeler, 'Haskell, Stephen Nelson (1834–1922)', ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SEVENTH-DAY  
ADVENTISTS, <https://encyclopedia.adventist.org/article?id=69G2>

<sup>53</sup> S. N. Haskell, 'The Advent Review and Herald of The Sabbath', (March 18, 1873), page  
3/107, <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18730318-V41-14.pdf>

<sup>54</sup> S. N. Haskell, Review and Herald, 'THE SANCTUARY QUESTION.' August 20, 1901, page  
2/536, <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH19010820-V78-34.pdf>

<sup>55</sup> J.N Andrews, 'EXAMINATION OF T. M. PREBLE'S FIRST DAY SABBATH', The Advent Review  
And Herald of the Sabbath, (February 13, 1872), Pages. 2-3/66-67,  
<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18720213-V39-09.pdf>

<sup>56</sup> J.N Andrews, 'Advent Review and Sabbath Herald'. (September 7, 1869), Page. 4/84,  
file:///home/chronos/u-ee7933e6198164ae65417f73676f64fff09f559e/MyFiles/Downloads  
/Advent%20Review,%20and%20Sabbath%20Herald%20\_%20September%207,%201869%20  
%20.pdf

<sup>57</sup> J.N Andrews '*The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath*', (January 27, 1874), Page.  
4/52, <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18740127-V43-07.pdf>

<sup>58</sup> Uriah Smith, Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, '*In the Question Chair*', (December 22,  
1896,) Page. 9/813,  
<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18961222-V73-51.pdf>

<sup>59</sup> Uriah Smith, Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, '*In the Question Chair*', (October 28,  
1890), Page. 8/664,  
<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18901028-V67-42.pdf>

<sup>60</sup> James White, The Signs of the Times, (April 25, 1878), Page. 4/124,  
file:///home/chronos/u-ee7933e6198164ae65417f73676f64fff09f559e/MyFiles/Downloads  
/Signs%20of%20the%20Times%20\_%20April%2025,%201878%20%20.pdf

<sup>61</sup> James White, 'Advent Review and Sabbath Herald', (January 4, 1881), Page. 2,  
<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18810104-V57-01.pdf>

<sup>62</sup> James White, '*The Parable*', Matthew XXV,1-12. Page. 22/16,  
file:///home/chronos/u-ee7933e6198164ae65417f73676f64fff09f559e/MyFiles/Downloads  
/The%20Parable.pdf

<sup>63</sup> Woodrow W. Whidden, Jerry Moon, John W. Reeve, *Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships*, Review and Herald Publishing Association, (2002), p. 190,

[https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=ym4Efps-ZuoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summy\\_r&cad=0#v=snippet&q=that%20most%20of%20the%20leading&f=false](https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=ym4Efps-ZuoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summy_r&cad=0#v=snippet&q=that%20most%20of%20the%20leading&f=false)

<sup>64</sup> J.H. Waggoner, *The Atonement An Examination of A Remedial System In The Light of Nature and Revelation*, Chapter VI, Doctrine of a Trinity Subversive of the Atonement, (1884), Pages. 115, 121/165, 173

[https://www.smyrna.org/Books/The%20Atonement/The\\_Atonement.pdf](https://www.smyrna.org/Books/The%20Atonement/The_Atonement.pdf)

<sup>65</sup> James White, *The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath*, (June 6, 1871), Page. 5/197

<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18710606-V37-25.pdf>

<sup>66</sup> James White, *The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath*, (November 29, 1877), page. 4/172

<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18771129-V50-22.pdf>

<sup>67</sup> James White, *The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath*, (October 12, 1876), page. 4/116 <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18761012-V48-15.pdf>

<sup>68</sup> *The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath*, (June 27, 1878), page. 4

<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18780627-V52-01.pdf>

<sup>69</sup> 'QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS: Pastor. Walter Veith (Better Audio)', [Mins - 1:24:22 - 1:26:23],

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d6FblqQQZHU&t=1424s>



<sup>70</sup> E.J Waggoner, *The Present Truth*, Vol. 18 (1902) (January 2, 1902), Page 77,  
[http://www.centrowhite.org.br/files/ebooks/apl/all/EJWaggoner/The%20Present%20Truth,  
%20Vol.%2018%20\(1902\).pdf](http://www.centrowhite.org.br/files/ebooks/apl/all/EJWaggoner/The%20Present%20Truth,%20Vol.%2018%20(1902).pdf)

<sup>71</sup> W.H LittleJohn, 'Advent Review and Sabbath Herald', (April 17, 1883), Page. 10/250,  
file:///home/chronos/u-ee7933e6198164ae65417f73676f64fff09f559e/MyFiles/Downloads  
/Advent%20Review,%20and%20Sabbath%20Herald%20\_%20April%2017,%201883%20%20.  
pdf

<sup>72</sup> James White, *The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath*, (June 6, 1871), Page.  
4-5/196-197,  
<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18710606-V37-25.pdf>

<sup>73</sup> R.F Cottrell, *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, (June 1, 1869), Pages. 4-5/180-181  
file:///home/chronos/u-ee7933e6198164ae65417f73676f64fff09f559e/MyFiles/Downloads  
/Advent%20Review,%20and%20Sabbath%20Herald%20\_%20June%201,%201869%20%20.pdf

<sup>74</sup> *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, (July 6, 1869), Page. 2/10,  
file:///home/chronos/u-ee7933e6198164ae65417f73676f64fff09f559e/MyFiles/Downloads  
/Advent%20Review,%20and%20Sabbath%20Herald%20\_%20July%206,%201869%20%20.pdf

<sup>75</sup> R.F Cottrell, *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, (July 6, 1869), Page. 2-3/10-11,  
file:///home/chronos/u-ee7933e6198164ae65417f73676f64fff09f559e/MyFiles/Downloads  
/Advent%20Review,%20and%20Sabbath%20Herald%20\_%20July%206,%201869%20%20.pdf

<sup>76</sup> *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, (July 14, 1868), Page. 16/64,  
<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18680714-V32-04.pdf>

<sup>77</sup> E.J Waggoner, 'Present Truth', (July 30, 1903), Page. 3/483,  
<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/PT/PT19030730-V19-31.pdf>

<sup>78</sup> PAPAL ENCYCLICALS ONLINE, 'First Council of Nicaea – 325 AD', *THE PROFESSION OF FAITH OF THE 318 FATHERS*, No. 2, [First Council of Nicaea – 325 AD - Papal Encyclicals](#)

<sup>79</sup> PAPAL ENCYCLICALS ONLINE, 'First Council of Constantinople – 381: Council Fathers - 381' A.D., *The exposition of the 150 fathers*, [First Council of Constantinople 381 - Papal Encyclicals](#)

<sup>80</sup> THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 'The Creed of S. Athanasius', [The Creed of S. Athanasius | The Church of England](#)

<sup>81</sup> Alonzo T. Jones, 'THE TWO REPUBLICS OR ROME AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA', (1891), p. 527-528, [The Two Republics \(practicaprophetica.com\)](#)

<sup>82</sup> *THE ENACTMENTS OF JUSTINIAN. THE CODE.* Book I, Title 1. S.P.Scott, *The Civil Law*, XII, Cincinnati, (1932), [The Code of Justinian : Book 1 \( Scott \) \(univ-grenoble-alpes.fr\)](#)

<sup>83</sup> James White, 'The Day - Star', (January 24, 1846), page. 1/25,  
<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/AdvRelated/WMC/WMC18460124-V09-07.08.pdf>

<sup>84</sup> James White, 'The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath', (June 13, 1871), page. 4/204), <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18710613-V37-26.pdf>

<sup>85</sup> William G. Johnsson, 'Adventist Review', (January 6, 1994), page. 10,  
 file:///home/chronos/u-ee7933e6198164ae65417f73676f64fff09f559e/MyFiles/Downloads /Adventist%20Review%20\_%20January%206,%201994%20%20.pdf

<sup>86</sup> A.G. Daniells, The General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, (October 29, 1903), p. 1 - 4, [1903-10-29-AGDaniells-to-WCWhite-1.pdf - Google Drive](#)

<sup>87</sup> Letter from J. H. Kellogg to G. I. Butler, October 28, 1903, [Letter-1903-10-28-J.-H.-Kellogg-to-G.-I.-Butler.pdf \(gospelsoundersministry.org\)](#)

<sup>88</sup> G.I. Butler letter to J.H. Kellogg, April 5, 1904, [1904-04-05-GIButler-to-JHKellogg.pdf - Google Drive](#)

<sup>89</sup> Dwayne Lemon Trinity Question, [Mins - 0:12 - 2:21], [Dwayne Lemon Trinity Question - YouTube](#)

<sup>90</sup> A Revised Declaration of the Fundamental Principles Taught & Practiced by The Seventh-Day Adventists, STEAM PRESS OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION, BATTLE CREEK, MICH. (1889), No. 1-2, 19, p. 4 [1889 - Revised Statements of Belief.pdf \(7thdayhomechurch.org\)](#)

<sup>91</sup> 'Seventh-day Adventist 28 Fundamental Beliefs, (2020 Edition), No. 2, 4-5, p. 3-4, [ADV-28Beliefs2020.pdf \(adventist.org\)](#)

<sup>92</sup> George R. Knight, Ministry, 'Adventists and change,' (October 1993), page. 10, [https://cdn.ministrymagazine.org/issues/1993/issues/MIN1993-10.pdf?\\_ga=2.79876759.1837595328.1645377732-1883088313.1640040243](https://cdn.ministrymagazine.org/issues/1993/issues/MIN1993-10.pdf?_ga=2.79876759.1837595328.1645377732-1883088313.1640040243)

<sup>93</sup> Merlin D. Burt, *'History of Seventh-day Adventist Views on the Trinity'*, page. 2/126, Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 17/1 (Spring 2006): 125–139. 2006, <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1187&context=jats>

<sup>94</sup> Merlin D. Burt, *'History of Seventh-day Adventist Views on the Trinity'*, pages. 14-15/138-139, Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 17/1 (Spring 2006): 125–139. 2006, <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1187&context=jats>

<sup>95</sup> LeRoy Froom, *'Movement of Destiny'*, (1971), page. 322/324, <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Books/MOD1971.pdf>

<sup>96</sup> LeRoy Froom, *'Movement of Destiny'*, (1971), page. 19/17, <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Books/MOD1971.pdf>

<sup>97</sup> LeRoy Froom, *'Movement of Destiny'*, (1971), page. 424/422, <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Books/MOD1971.pdf>

<sup>98</sup> LeRoy Froom, *'Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine'*, (1957), pages. 28/31 - 29/32, <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Books/QOD19570101.pdf>

<sup>99</sup> Eleuterio F. Fortino, Ecumenical Commissions, *'Jesus Christ One Lord of All Christians: An Affirmation of the World Council of Churches'*, [https://www.vatican.va/jubilee\\_2000/magazine/documents/ju\\_mag\\_01031997\\_p-26\\_en.html](https://www.vatican.va/jubilee_2000/magazine/documents/ju_mag_01031997_p-26_en.html)

<sup>100</sup> Eleuterio F. Fortino, Ecumenical Commissions, *'Jesus Christ One Lord of All Christians: An Affirmation of the Second Vatican Council'*, [https://www.vatican.va/jubilee\\_2000/magazine/documents/ju\\_mag\\_01031997\\_p-26\\_en.html](https://www.vatican.va/jubilee_2000/magazine/documents/ju_mag_01031997_p-26_en.html)

<sup>102</sup> J.N. Loughborough, *'The Advent Review And Herald of the Sabbath'*, (May 9, 1871), page. 6/166, <https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18710509-V37-21.pdf>

<sup>103</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *'The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603'*, Ch 9, pages. 127 - 128

<sup>104</sup> *'The Douay Catechism of 1649'*, page. 130/125, <https://www.saintsbooks.net/books/The%20Douay%20Catechism%20of%201649.pdf>

<sup>105</sup> Apostolic Letter Dies Domini of The Holy Father John Paul II to the Bishops, Clergy and Faithful of The Catholic Church on Keeping The LORD'S Day Holy, 86 [https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost\\_letters/1998/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_apl\\_05071998\\_dies-domini.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_letters/1998/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_05071998_dies-domini.html)

<sup>106</sup> Rita Ferrone, *'Re-Reading 'Laudato si''*, LA CROIX international, Vatican City, (December 27, 2018), [Re-Reading 'Laudato si' \(la-croix.com\)](https://www.la-croix.com/News/World/Re-Reading-Laudato-si-2018-12-27)

<sup>107</sup> LIFE Magazine, Vol. 29, Number 18, October 30, 1950, page. 51

<sup>108</sup> Catechism of the Catholic Church: Paragraph 2. THE FATHER, 233-234, [https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/\\_\\_\\_P17.HTM](https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/___P17.HTM)

<sup>109</sup> Catechism of the Catholic Church: Paragraph 2. THE FATHER, 250 - 251, [https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/\\_\\_\\_P17.HTM](https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/___P17.HTM)

<sup>110</sup> Catholic Answers: Seventh-day Adventism,  
<https://www.catholic.com/tract/seventh-day-adventism>

<sup>111</sup> Catholic News Agency, (2014),  
<https://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/28820/ecumenism-a-spiritual-process-rooted-in-the-trinity-pope-says>

<sup>112</sup> Homily Of John Paul II At The Ecumenical Prayer Service, (31 May, 1999),  
[https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/travels/1997/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_spe\\_3105\\_1997\\_ecum-prayer.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/travels/1997/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_3105_1997_ecum-prayer.html)

<sup>113</sup> John Paul II, General Audience, (14 June, 2000),  
[https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/audiences/2000/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_aud\\_20000614.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/audiences/2000/documents/hf_jp-ii_aud_20000614.html)

<sup>114</sup> Rick Warren, CNSNews, Protestants, Catholics Must Unite to Defend Life, Sex, Marriage, February 4, 2015,  
<https://www.cnsnews.com/blog/michael-w-chapman/rick-warren-protestants-catholics-must-unite-defend-life-sex-marriage-we-re>

<sup>115</sup> George Miley, '*What is the Wittenberg 2017 Initiative?*', CHRIST CHURCH ANGLICAN, (August 4, 2017), [What is the Wittenberg 2017 Initiative? | Christ Church Anglican \(christchurchphoenix.org\)](http://www.christchurchphoenix.org/what-is-the-wittenberg-2017-initiative/)

<sup>116</sup> WITTENBERG 2017, CORE BELIEFS, [Core Beliefs \(wittenberg2017.us\)](http://www.wittenberg2017.us/core-beliefs/)

<sup>117</sup> Public Affairs and Religious Liberty: Seventh-day Adventist Church, Ganoune Diop, <https://www.adventistliberty.org/dr.-ganoune-diop>

<sup>118</sup> Ganoune Diop, Adventist Review: '*Why Adventists Participate in UN and Ecumenical Meetings*', (October 9, 2015), <https://adventistreview.org/news/why-adventists-participate-in-un-and-ecumenical-meetings/>

<sup>119</sup> Encyclical Letter Laudato SI': Of The Holy Father Francis on care for our common home, [https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco\\_2015\\_0524\\_enciclica-laudato-si.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_2015_0524_enciclica-laudato-si.html)

<sup>120</sup> '*Seventh-day Adventist 28 Fundamental Beliefs*', (2015) Edition, No. 14, p, 7, [https://szu.adventist.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/28\\_Beliefs.pdf](https://szu.adventist.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/28_Beliefs.pdf)

<sup>121</sup> Ekkehardt Mueller, '*Biblical Research Institute*', No. 23, (July, 2008), p. 8-9, [https://adventistbiblicalresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/BRI-newsltr-7-08-23\\_0.pdf](https://adventistbiblicalresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/BRI-newsltr-7-08-23_0.pdf)

<sup>122</sup> Paul Petersen, Biblical Research Institute, '*God in three persons — in the New Testament*', Andrews University, (May 2015), p. 4/3, [https://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/Release\\_11\\_Petersen-6-16-15.pdf](https://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/Release_11_Petersen-6-16-15.pdf)

<sup>123</sup> Adventist Review, '*Long-time Adventist Administrator Richard Leshar passes away*', (August 30, 2017), <https://spectrummagazine.org/article/2017/08/30/long-time-adventist-administrator-richard-lesher-passes-away>

<sup>124</sup> W. R. Leshar, *Adventist Review*, (April 23, 1980), p.14/518

<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH19800423-V157-20.pdf>

<sup>125</sup> Woodrow W. Whidden, Jerry Moon, John W. Reeve, *Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships*, Review and Herald Publishing Association, (2002), p. 74,

[https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=ym4Efps-ZuoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summy\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q=three%20divine%20beings&f=false](https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=ym4Efps-ZuoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summy_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q=three%20divine%20beings&f=false)

<sup>126</sup> Doug Batchelor , 'The Trinity', *Unity or Quantity?*, Amazing Facts, (2003),

<https://www.amazingfacts.org/media-library/book/e/77/t/the-trinity>

<sup>127</sup> Woodrow W. Whidden, Jerry Moon, John W. Reeve, *Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships*, Review and Herald Publishing Association, (2002), p. 192,

[https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=ym4Efps-ZuoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summy\\_r&cad=0#v=snippet&q=Unlike%20the%20multiple%20gods&f=false](https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=ym4Efps-ZuoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summy_r&cad=0#v=snippet&q=Unlike%20the%20multiple%20gods&f=false)

<sup>128</sup> J.H Waggoner, *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, (June 6, 1878), p. 1/177,

<https://documents.adventistarchives.org/Periodicals/RH/RH18780606-V51-23.pdf>

<sup>129</sup> Gordon Jenson, *Adventist Review*, Readings for the week of prayer, October 31, 1996, p.

12, [Adventist Review | October 31, 1996 | Adventist Digital Library](#)

<sup>130</sup> SDA Sabbath School Lesson Quarterly, *The Mystery of His Deity*, Lesson 2, (April 10, 2008), [Lesson 2 \(ssnet.org\)](#)



<sup>131</sup> Jerry Moon, 'Heresy or Hopeful Sign?: Early Adventists' Struggle with the Truth about the Trinity,' Review & Herald, (1999),  
<http://www.sdanet.org/atissue/trinity/Trinity%20Review%20art.htm>

<sup>132</sup> Woodrow W. Whidden, Jerry Moon, John W. Reeve, 'Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships', Review and Herald Publishing Association, (2002), p 190,  
[https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=ym4Efps-ZuoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_s ummary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q=were%20wrong&f=false](https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=ym4Efps-ZuoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_s ummary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q=were%20wrong&f=false)

<sup>133</sup> Woodrow W. Whidden, Jerry Moon, John W. Reeve, 'Trinity: Understanding God's Love, His Plan of Salvation, and Christian Relationships', Review and Herald Publishing Association, (2002), p. 191-192,  
[https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=ym4Efps-ZuoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_s ummary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q=were%20wrong&f=false](https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=ym4Efps-ZuoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_s ummary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q=were%20wrong&f=false)

<sup>134</sup> Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Trinity". *Encyclopedia Britannica*,  
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/Trinity-Christianity>

<sup>135</sup> Roger E. Olson, Christopher A. Hall, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2002 pp. 1-2, 15-16,  
[https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=ym4Efps-ZuoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\\_ge\\_s ummary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q=were%20wrong&f=false](https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=ym4Efps-ZuoC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_s ummary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q=were%20wrong&f=false)

<sup>136</sup> Edward Gibbon, History of Christianity: Comprising All that Relates to the Progress of the Christian Religion in "The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," and A Vindication of Some Passages in the 15th and 16th Chapters, (New York, 1883), p. XV-XVI

<sup>137</sup> Edward Gibbon, *'The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,'* Abridged Edition, p. 405

<sup>138</sup> Seventh-day Adventist Biblical Research Institute', p.6  
<https://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/materials/seventh-day-adventists-a-brief-introduction-to-their-beliefs/>

<sup>139</sup> George W. Reid, Seventh-day Adventists: A Brief Introduction to their Beliefs, p.6,  
[https://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/adventist-beliefs\\_0.pdf](https://www.adventistbiblicalresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/adventist-beliefs_0.pdf)