

Historical Teachings on the Human Nature Christ Took in the Incarnation

by Jerry Finneman

http://www.gospel-herald.com/finneman/nat_christ/nc1.htm

Fact number one: "That within the Seventh-day Adventist Church, for the past fifty years, there have been essentially two opposing teachings concerning the kind of human nature Christ assumed in the incarnation."

I chose the word "essentially" because those who contend that "Jesus took Adam's sinless human nature" [1] before the fall and that he bore our fallen nature "vicariously" [2] as in *Questions on Doctrine* and those who opt for two kinds of human nature — partly pre and partly post-lapsarian— assumed by Christ are united in the following two concepts: **a)** that Christ got tired and hungry; and **b)** that Christ was not tempted from within as we are, because He did not inherit tendencies to sin, as do all other descendants of Adam. In essence the "sinless human nature" and the pre and partly post-fall teachings are the same. The most central and material part of both are the same. Both are opposed to the teaching of Jones and Waggoner —that Christ took our fallen human nature with all its liabilities, including inherited tendencies to sin through the law of heredity.

The second fact to consider is "that there was a deliberate change in our Church's teaching with regard to Christ's humanity during the 1950's." This change first appeared in *Bible Readings*, 1949 (See Appendix A), in *Ministry*, September, 1956 and April, 1957; next in *Questions On Doctrine*, 1957; and then in *Movement of Destiny*, 1971.

Reformed Scholar Geoffrey Paxton observed that at that time "the book *Questions on Doctrine*, was a real breakthrough with past Adventist teaching on Christology, especially the matter of the sinful human nature of Christ." [3]

He continued, that to his knowledge there was not one open acknowledgment of this to either the rank-and-file members of the Adventist Church or to the evangelical Protestant world. Why? Why was it covered up by saying that only a few on the "lunatic fringe" held and taught what had actually been the Adventist position before that time? [4]

In July of 1962, Robert Lee Hancock wrote a term paper which he presented to the faculty of the Department of Church History at Andrew's University. The following is part of his summary and conclusion:

"Regarding the specific question of Christ's humanity, this study has revealed that:

- From its earliest days the Seventh-day Adventist Church has taught that when God partook of humanity He took, not the perfect, sinless nature of man before the Fall, but the fallen, sinful, offending, weakened, degenerated nature of man as it existed when He came to earth to help man. ...
- That during the fifteen year period between 1940 and 1955 the words "sinful" and "fallen" with reference to Christ's human nature were largely or completely eliminated from denominational published materials.
- That since 1952, phrases such as "sinless human nature," "nature of Adam before the fall," and "human nature un-defiled," have taken the place of the former terminology. ...

The findings of this study warrant the conclusion that Seventh-day Adventist teachings regarding the human nature of Christ have changed and that these changes involve concepts and not merely semantics." [5]

Some have felt that the discovery of Ellen White's letter to William Baker warranted the change in our Christology during the fifties. Some think that Ellen White addresses the human nature of Christ more specifically, directly and extensively in that letter than any other place in her writings. In reality, her classic on the life of Christ, *The Desire of Ages*, deals with the kind of human nature that He took more specifically, directly and extensively than any other place. Some find it curious that church administrators and scholars would change their view on this topic primarily from this single source as a "proof text" in the face of the many other clear statements written by Ellen White. (See Appendix B for a discussion about the Baker letter).

Fact number 3: is that "there was at least one attempt to change the Church's teaching previous to the 1950's." That attempt was the promotion of the "Holy Flesh" doctrine at the turn of this century. The information disseminated, at that time, was designed to gain entrance into the Adventist Church, ostensibly to prepare its members for translation. In reality it would have led us into the Pentecostal Holiness revival movement.

Through A.F. Ballenger's influence in the late 1890's the seeds of the Holiness Movement sprouted within the Adventist church. In 1898, Ballenger spoke at the Indiana Camp Meeting. One who became the leading advocate of "Holy Flesh," S.S. Davis, was particularly moved by Ballenger's statement that "It was too late to sin in thought, word or action; for it is time to receive the Holy Ghost in all of his [sic] fullness." [6]

In his work with the "Helping Hand" welfare mission in Evansville Davis contacted a number of Pentecostal Christians. He was deeply impressed by their enthusiasm,

remarking to a fellow Adventist worker, "they have the 'spirit'; we have the truth, and if we had the 'spirit' as they have, with the truth we could do things." [7]

That mixture of holiness experience with Adventist doctrine was more consistent with Rome than with the Reformation.

There were two issues connected with the Holy Flesh Movement. One was experiential; the other doctrinal. The experience was this: they believed that in order to overcome sin, in conversion, one had to have a change in sinful human nature so that inherited tendencies to sin would be eradicated. They were to experience what they called "holy flesh." They claimed that Christ had taken "holy flesh" and that was the kind they needed in order to have an experience that would translate them to heaven. The experience was based on their doctrine which was that Christ took Adam's sinless human nature in the incarnation. This same doctrine was later accepted in the 1950's.

In the Holy Flesh Movement there were three related concepts regarding the kind of sinless nature Christ took in the incarnation:

- Christ took the nature of Adam before He fell.
- Christ took a fallen physical and deteriorated human body but not our fallen spiritual nature.
- Christ was preserved from the law of heredity in conception by the power of the Holy Spirit.

Elder Breed and Elder Haskell attended the Muncie, Indiana Camp Meeting. Haskell discussed the humanity of Christ with the leaders of the Conference. These men opposed him and misrepresented what he said. Elder Haskell wrote to Ellen White immediately after the meetings, informing her about the specific point of the "holy flesh" advocates' doctrine concerning their belief on the human nature of Christ and the consequent experience of the Holy Flesh Movement:

It is the greatest mixture of fanaticism in the truth that I ever have seen. I would not claim that we managed it the best way in everything, and yet I do not know where I made any mistake. We tried to do the very best we could, and had they not have talked against us and misrepresented our position, there would have been no confusion with the people. But when we stated that we believed that Christ was born in fallen humanity, they would represent us as believing that Christ sinned, notwithstanding the fact that we would state our position so clearly that it would seem as though no one could misunderstand us.

Their point of theology in this particular respect seems to be this: They believe that Christ took Adam's nature before He fell; so He took humanity as it was in the garden of Eden; and thus humanity was holy, and this was the humanity which Christ had; and now, they say, the particular time has come for us to become holy in that same sense, and then we will have "translation faith"; and never die". [8]

This letter was written September 25, 1900. One week later, on October 2, he wrote an editorial in the *Review and Herald* entitled "Christ in Holy Flesh, or A Holy Christ in Sinful Flesh." His employment of alternative propositions marked the specific stage when rival interpretations were being advanced for consideration. The entire article was devoted to the second alternative: "A Holy Christ in Sinful Flesh." He quoted both the Bible and *The Desire of Ages*. He used *The Desire of Ages* to refute the doctrine of Christ in sinless human nature. Following are quotations he used:

. . . [O]n pages 361, 362 [our present edition 311, 312]: "Christ is the ladder that Jacob saw, the base resting on the earth, and the topmost round reaching to the gate of heaven, to the very threshold of glory. If that ladder had failed by a single step of reaching by a single step of reaching the earth, we should have been lost. But Christ reaches us where we are. He took our nature and overcame, that we through taking his nature might overcome. Made 'in the likeness of sinful flesh,' he lived a sinless life. Now by his divinity he lays hold upon the throne of heaven, while by his humanity he reaches us." [\[9\]](#)

Then he commented: "This is fallen humanity with all its hereditary inclinations. He who was as spotless while on earth as when in heaven took our nature, that he might lift man to the exaltation of himself by his righteousness."

Quoting further:

Again, on page 119, 120 [present edition page 112], of the same book, we read: "Notwithstanding that the sins of a guilty world were laid upon Christ, notwithstanding the humiliation of taking upon himself OUR FALLEN NATURE, the voice from heaven declared him to be the Son of the Eternal." [\[10\]](#)

Because the "holy flesh" advocates believed that Christ took Adam's pre-lapsarian human nature, Haskell again quoted from *The Desire of Ages*:

Once more, in speaking of the condition of Adam, the writer says, on pages 49, 50 [present edition page 49]:

It would have been an almost infinite humiliation for the Son of God to take man's nature, even when Adam stood in his innocence in Eden. But Jesus accepted humanity when the race had been weakened by four thousand years of sin. Like every child of Adam, he accepted the results of the working of the great law of heredity. What these results were is shown in the history of his earthly ancestors. He came with such a heredity to share our sorrows and temptations, and to give us the example of a sinless life." [\[11\]](#)

Two months later A.T. Jones wrote a series of articles in the *Review* entitled, "The Faith of Jesus." They began December 11, 1900 and continued until January 29, 1901. (Those articles, and his editorials about Christ's human nature, became the basis for his book about Christ in Hebrews: *The Consecrated Way*). In those articles, Jones repeatedly dealt with the foundational doctrinal issue of the "holy flesh" advocates, by presenting Christ

as having taken mankind's fallen nature. So, both Jones and Haskell addressed the Christological issue raised by Elders Davis and Donnell of the Indiana Conference.

Donnell, president of the Indiana Conference, countered Jones by writing his own article entitled "The Faith of Jesus" in the *Indiana Reporter*. This view was in opposition to the series written by Jones. Donnell presented Christ with Adam's unfallen nature.

He (Jesus) must possess that which He offers us. . . . If Christ proposes to restore man to his first estate, he must come to man standing in that estate himself. He must come standing where Adam, the first owner, stood before he fell" —Article One", p. 4.

The only reason why God does not dwell in man is because sin is there, and in order for God to again dwell in man sin must be eradicated. The body of Christ was a body in which God was incarnate, and as God and Satan cannot dwell together, the body of Christ must have been a body from which even every tendency to sin must have been wholly eradicated" — "Article Two", p. 6.

Where did Adam stand before his fall?. . . He was holy. Now, in order to pass over the same ground that Adam passed over, Christ would most assuredly have to begin just where Adam began! Now, we know that his divinity was holy, and if his humanity was holy, then we do know that that thing which was born of the virgin Mary was in every sense a holy thing, and did not possess the tendency to sin—R.S. Donnell, "Article Two", pp. 6,7. [\[12\]](#)

After dismissal from his duties as president of the Indiana Conference Donnell wrote of his belief concerning the human nature of Christ:

He took a body which showed by its deteriorated condition, that the effects of sin was shown by it, but His life proved that there was no sin in it. It was a body which the Father had prepared for Him. Heb. 10:5. Christ's body represented a body redeemed from its fallen spiritual nature, but not from its fallen, or deteriorated physical nature. It was a body redeemed from sin, and with that body Christ clothed His divinity. [\[13\]](#)

Elder I.J. Hankins succeeded Elder Donnell to the presidency of the Indiana Conference. He wrote to S.S. Davis asking him certain questions about his beliefs. Eight questions were asked. Half of them were concerned with the incarnation. Following are two of them:

"Question #4: Please state in a few words your views on the nature of Christ. Answer—'Luke 1:35 That holy thing.'

"Question #7: Is every child born into the world naturally inclined to evil, even before it is old enough to discern between good and evil? Answer —'Yes, unless preserved from the law of heredity in conception by the power of the Holy Ghost.'"

[\[14\]](#)

Following are statements from two others who understood the doctrinal issue:

Accompanying the sinless flesh doctrine is another we will now consider, viz., that at conversion the desires, inclinations, and propensities of the flesh, and the hereditary tendencies are all taken away; that the warfare with the flesh ceases and that from thenceforth our temptations are all from without—none coming from within. [15]

After the camp meeting, Sister White, Elder Eugene Farnsworth and others, came to the Indianapolis church. Sister White bore decided testimony against this error. She stated that the workers who had been involved should not remain together, but that they should separate, and at the close of her discourse, said, "When I am gone from here, none are to pick up any points of this doctrine and call it truth. There is not a thread of truth in the whole fabric." [16]

It was during the time of the General Conference of April 2-23, 1901, that the Holy Flesh Movement was dealt a death blow. It was stopped from spreading within Adventism, at least for the time. But Ellen White wrote to Haskell that the erroneous theories, methods and experience of the Holy Flesh Movement will repeat itself again within Adventism.

The things you have described as taking place in Indiana, the Lord has shown me would take place just before the close of probation. Every uncouth thing will be demonstrated. There will be shouting, with drums, music, and dancing. The senses of rational beings will become so confused that they cannot be trusted to make right decisions. And this is called the moving of the Holy Spirit. . . .

[L]ast January the Lord showed me that erroneous theories and methods would be brought into our camp meetings, and that the history of the past [context: 1844 and 1900] would be repeated. I felt greatly distressed. I was instructed to say that at these demonstrations demons in the form of men are present, working with all the ingenuity that Satan can employ to make the truth disgusting to sensible people; that the enemy was trying to arrange matters so that the camp meetings, which have been the means of bringing the truth of the third angel's message before multitudes, should lose their force and influence. . . .

The third angel's message is to be given in straight lines. It is to be kept free from every thread of the cheap, miserable inventions of men's theories, prepared by the father of lies, and disguised as was the brilliant serpent used by Satan as a medium of deceiving our first parents. Thus Satan tries to put his stamp upon the work God would have stand forth in purity. [17]

During that Conference the two most vocal opponents, publicly, of that movement were E.J. Waggoner and Ellen White. Waggoner spoke several times. He addressed the doctrinal issue concerning the nature of Christ. Ellen White also warned against their teaching and addressed the false experience.

The evening of April 16, E.J. Waggoner spoke pointedly and decisively. Hebrews 10:4-10 was the text he used. This was one of the key texts used by the advocates of the Holy Flesh doctrine. Upon reading the text, he said:

After speaking here the last time that I was here, there were two questions handed me, and I might read them now. One of them is this: "Was that Holy Thing which was born of the Virgin Mary born in sinful flesh, and did that flesh have the same evil tendencies to contend with that ours does?". . . .

Before we go on with this text, let me show you what there is in the idea that is in this question. You have it in mind. Was Christ, that holy thing which was born of the virgin Mary, born in sinful flesh? Did you ever hear of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the immaculate conception? And do you know what it is? . . . The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is that Mary, the Mother of Jesus, was born sinless. Why?—Ostensibly to magnify Jesus; really the work of the devil to put a wide gulf between Jesus the Saviour of men, and the men whom He came to save, so that one could not pass over to the other. That is all.

We need to settle, every one of us, whether we are out of the church of Rome or not. There are a great many that have got the marks yet. . .

Do you not see that the idea that the flesh of Jesus was not like ours (because we know ours is sinful) necessarily involves the idea of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary? Mind you, in him was no sin, but the mystery of God manifest in the flesh, . . . is the perfect manifestation of the life of God in its spotless purity in the midst of sinful flesh. . . .

Please let everybody who have held a mistaken idea have that idea obliterated from your mind, just for your own sakes, that you may be saved from error, and not simply from theoretical error, but from sin. Think of this for yourselves, that the idea of sinless flesh mankind is the deification of the devil, because sinlessness belongs only to God, but sin is of the devil. . . . Sinlessness is an attribute of Deity. Sinless flesh, therefore, would mean that the spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience, in the lusts of the flesh, is God. But it is not. [\[18\]](#)

The next day Ellen White presented a testimony concerning the holy flesh experience and its teaching:

Instruction has been given me in regard to the late experience of brethren in Indiana and the teaching they have given to the churches. Through this experience and teaching the enemy has been working to lead souls astray.

The teaching given in regard to what is termed "holy flesh" is an error. All may now obtain holy hearts, but it is not correct to claim in this life to have holy flesh. The apostle Paul declares, "I know that in me, (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing." Rom. 7:17. To those who have tried so hard to obtain by faith so called holy flesh, I would say, you cannot obtain it. Not a soul of you has Holy flesh now. No human being on earth has holy flesh. It is an impossibility. . . .

While we cannot claim perfection of the flesh, we may have Christian perfection of the soul. Through the sacrifice made in our behalf, sins may be perfectly

forgiven. Our dependence is not in what man can do: it is in what God can do for man through Christ. . . .

We may enjoy the favor of God. We are not to be anxious about what Christ and God think of us, but what God thinks of Christ, our Substitute. Ye are accepted in the Beloved. . . .When human beings receive holy flesh, they will not remain on earth, but will be taken to heaven. While sin is forgiven in this life, its results are not wholly removed. It is at his coming that Christ is to "change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body." (Phil. 3:21). When Christ shall come with a great sound of a trumpet, and shall call the dead from their prison house, then the saints will receive holy flesh." [19]

It is of special interest to note that Ellen White's strongest statements on the human nature of Christ came during the time of the Holy Flesh Movement. She wrote that He took "the offending nature of man, "a nature "degraded and defiled by sin," "the nature of Adam, the transgressor."

An Offending Nature

The love of Christ manifested cannot be comprehended by mortal man. It is a mystery too deep for the human mind to fathom. Christ did in reality unite the offending nature of man with his own sinless nature, because by this act of condescension he would be enabled to pour out his blessings in behalf of the fallen race. Thus he has made it possible for us to partake of his nature. [20]

A Nature Degraded and Defiled by Sin

Think of Christ's humiliation. He took upon Himself, fallen, suffering human nature, degraded, and defiled by sin. He took our sorrows, bearing our grief and shame. He endured all the temptations wherewith man is beset. He united humanity with divinity: A divine spirit dwelt in a temple of flesh. 'The word was made flesh, and dwelt among us,' because by so doing He could associate with the sinful, sorrowing sons and daughters of Adam. [21]

The Nature of Adam the Transgressor

In Christ were united the divine and the human —the Creator and the creature. The nature of God, whose law had been transgressed, and the nature of Adam, the transgressor, met in Jesus —the Son of God, and the Son of man. [22]

Within two years of the Holy Flesh Movement she wrote to Kellogg that Jesus came "as a man, with all the evil tendencies to which man is heir."

When Christ first announced to the heavenly host His mission and work in the world, He declared that He was to leave His position of dignity and disguise His holy mission by assuming the likeness of a man, when in reality He was the Son of the Infinite God. And when the fulness of time was come, he stepped down from His throne of highest command, laid aside His royal robe and kingly crown, clothed His divinity with humanity, and came to this earth to exemplify what humanity

must do and be in order to overcome the enemy and to sit with the Father upon His throne. Coming as He did, as a man, with all the evil tendencies to which man is heir, He made it possible for Himself to be buffeted by human agencies inspired by Satan, the rebel who had been expelled from heaven. [23]

Should the above statements of Ellen White be understood as mere poetic utterances—not to be interpreted literally?

This brings us to the fourth and last factual point to be made in this paper. "that the attempted change in doctrine was considered by those who opposed that change as a switch to a teaching more compatible with the Catholic doctrine of the Immaculate Conception." Waggoner addressed the issue with these words:

Did you ever hear of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the immaculate conception? And do you know what it is? ... The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is that Mary, the Mother of Jesus, was born sinless. Why?—Ostensibly to magnify Jesus; really the work of the devil to put a wide gulf between Jesus the Saviour of men, and the men whom He came to save, so that one could not pass over to the other. That is all.

We need to settle, every one of us, whether we are out of the church of Rome or not. There are a great many that have got the marks yet. [24]

Elder Huntington recognized in the doctrinal issue the Papal foundation upon which it was established:

In adopting the theory of sinless flesh, though its advocates have ever been loathe to admit it, they are nevertheless, unconsciously led into the papal error of the immaculate conception and other heresies of the Catholic Church. The theory of sinless flesh is pre-eminently papal—the foundation upon which the Catholic Church stands. Remove this, and the whole structure of the papacy, as a religion, falls to the ground. [25]

The expression, "sinless flesh," is nowhere found in the Bible: Then why adopt such an expression . . . The record says that Christ was "made in the likeness of sinful flesh," (Rom. 8:3) "of the seed of David," (Rom. 1:3) "of the seed of Abraham" (Heb. 2:16). Then let us believe that it was just that way without trying to spiritualize these plain declarations to suit a perverted fancy, and by so doing entangle ourselves in an inextricable web of inconsistencies. [26]

About fifty years ago spiritual leaders within Adventism took doctrinal arguments concerning the human nature of Christ from Evangelical Protestantism. The Evangelical doctrine was simply a continuation of the dogma of Catholicism. The beginning of an ecumenical and traditional understanding of the doctrine of an unfallen and sinless human nature for Christ must begin with Mary and her place within Catholicism. So let's turn to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

The Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception

The term "the Immaculate Conception" refers to Mary's initial stage of existence in the womb of her mother and not to Jesus' conception in Mary's womb. However, the heart of the Catholic doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary is about Jesus her son. With regard to Jesus, according to this doctrine, it was in his human nature to be pure, and right, and loving as the primary consequence of Mary's immaculate conception. All His tendencies were towards goodness. His unconstrained life was holiness itself: He was "the holy child Jesus" because of Mary's human nature, rather than by His faith in God. The prince of this world found in him no fuel for the flame which he desired to kindle because of the kind of human nature inherited from Mary. There was neither inclination, nor tendency in the direction of sin in Him because of a special miracle that made Mary's flesh holy.

In discussing the human nature of Mary and consequently that of Jesus, emphasis is on the uniqueness and the differences between their nature and ours by the popes and the Magisterium (teaching authority). This is believed to a large extent by the laity of the Catholic Church as well.

Christ as man was made under the law; but he owed nothing to that law, for he was holy in His human nature. True, He was treated as if were a sinner, but only in the abstract. What we have in this doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary as it applies to Christ is perhaps best described in theoretical, academic, hypothetical, speculative terms. The central meaning shared by these adjectives is primarily with theories or hypotheses rather than practical considerations. The doctrine of an immaculate conception is based on —or restricted to— theory. It is neither practical, nor proven.

According to this teaching there were no tendencies in Mary towards evil in any form. In the rest of the human race there are always those tendencies because the taint of original sin is upon us. Consequently, the Sacramental Graces must be administered to the faithful for salvation by a priest. Another consequent of this doctrine is that the believer must govern himself and hold himself under stern restraint, or he shall rush headlong to destruction. Fallen nature tends to evil and needs to be held in by the faithful, as with bit and bridle. That person who can master himself is truly blessed and happy and (s)he can even earn merit that goes into the treasury of merit for others, as well as for themselves. If he can't master himself, he can take refuge in the Sacraments while he lives, and finally he can expiate his sins in Purgatory after he dies.

It was not until December 8, 1854 that Pope Pius IX in his Encyclical defined Mary's Immaculate Conception as an infallibly taught dogma of the Church. But the Pope did not pull this teaching out of thin air. There is a continuous history of belief in this teaching prior to his papal Bull. Mary was referred to as "holy," "innocent," "most pure," "intact," "immaculate" by many early writers such as Irenaeus, Ephraem and Ambrose. [\[27\]](#)

Because of popular belief in the "Virgin Mary," Pius IX bypassed both Council and Magisterium in producing a new infallible dogma. By his own authority he pronounced

as doctrine the Immaculate Conception of Mary, making the centuries old belief now incapable of error. All Catholics must accept this dogma. (In effect this declaration was a proclamation of papal infallibility. The pope now can impose infallible binding dogma upon all others, by his own authority, without consulting bishops or even a Council.)

Following are those sections of the original decree dealing with Mary and sinless human nature as issued by Pope Pius IX concerning the Immaculate Conception:

We declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which holds that the most Blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instance of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege granted by Almighty God, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Savior of the human race, was preserved free from all stain of original sin, is a doctrine revealed by God and therefore to be believed firmly and constantly by all the faithful. [28]

In that document the pope further declared:

They [the church Fathers and Roman Pontiffs, predecessors of Pius IX, especially Sixtus IV, Paul V, and Gregory XV] testified, too, that the flesh of the Virgin, although derived from Adam, did not contract the stains of Adam, and that on this account the most Blessed Virgin was the tabernacle created by God himself and formed by the Holy Spirit, truly a work in royal purple, adorned and woven with gold, which that new Beseleel [sic] made. [29]

According to Rome all Churches must receive this doctrine:

These truths, so generally accepted and put into practice by the faithful, indicate how zealously the Roman Church, mother and teacher of all Churches, has continued to teach this doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin. Yet the more important actions of the Church deserve to be mentioned in detail. For such dignity and authority belong to the Church that she alone is the center of truth and of Catholic unity. It is the Church in which alone religion has been inviolably preserved and from which all other Churches must receive the tradition of the Faith. [30]

The Assumption of Mary

There is a related doctrinal invention concerning Mary's so-called immaculate conception. It is the Assumption of Mary from earth to heaven. In times past these two fantasies existed only in the minds of the wistful within Catholicism. However, both have been pronounced as dogma in papal Constitutional Bulls. Both declarations were responses to the popular sentiments of Catholic believers.

Following from the Catholic premise of Mary's immaculately conceived human nature is the corollary doctrine of the Assumption of Mary. Since she was created with a sinless human nature and consequently lived a sinless life, she could not possibly remain earthbound. So the bodily assumption of Mary to heaven had to follow both of necessity and of consistency. It follows directly from the doctrine of the so-called immaculately

conceived nature of Mary. Mary was exempted from inherited degradation of original sin, and so it was most fitting that she should be exempted from corruption in the grave.

According to Catholic theology Mary was victorious over sin through her Immaculate Conception, over concupiscence (strong sexual desire) by her virginal motherhood, and over death by her so-called glorious Assumption.

And so it was that Pope Pius XII, in his Apostolic Constitution, *Munificentissimus Deus*, of November 1, 1950, proclaimed this dogma in the following carefully-selected words:

By the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own authority, we proclaim, declare and define as a dogma revealed by God: the Immaculate Mother of God, Mary ever Virgin, when the course of her earthly life was finished, was taken up body and soul into the glory of heaven. [31]

Scriptural support is sought for in the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, but no Scripture authority is appealed to for her so-called Assumption. It is well known that there is none, in Catholic circles. It is based on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception which some Catholics do feel is Scripturally sound. However, reduced to the basis of authority for existence, which is papal infallibility, it doesn't matter if these, or other, teachings are found in Scripture. According to Catholic philosophy the Bible is merely part of the larger Christian tradition. Marian doctrines are not biblical, but they come under the so-called larger tradition category. It is crucial to understand that Catholics need only demonstrate a so-called harmony of a doctrine with Scripture. It is not their view that every doctrine of the Christian faith must appear whole, explicit, and often, in the Bible. Along with "Sacred Tradition" there is the authority of the Magisterium. A belief such as the Immaculate Conception claimed as implicitly biblical is not necessarily anti-biblical or un-biblical in Catholic thinking. They feel that the Immaculate Conception of Mary is not only entirely possible, within their traditional and scriptural presuppositions, but that it is an infallible doctrine because it is so decreed by the papal Bull *Ineffabilis Deus*.

The common teaching in Catholic tradition is that Mary was free from stain of sin because she was impeccable in nature and thus incapable of sin. This is in order to preserve the sinlessness of human nature both of Mary and, ultimately, of Christ.

Rome teaches that Mary was like us in that she got hungry, thirsty, and tired as we do, but morally she was exempt from fallen human nature by the Holy Spirit through God's grace and thus she was unique in the sinlessness of nature and of life. This, in turn, directly drives Rome's doctrinal system especially concerning Christology and consequent soteriology.

Mary's Similarity and Differences to Us

Mary had a "nature in common with them" meaning the rest of mankind. Notwithstanding that this statement alleges commonality of nature with us, in reality Marian doctrines are very careful to make clear the unbridgeable difference in essence between Mary and the rest of the fallen race. To them her sinlessness is "an entirely

unique holiness." According to Catholic theology there is no difference in kind (human) between Mary and Jesus and us, though an inconceivable difference of degree (theirs was a only a likeness [in that it was sinless] in relationship to the rest of mankind's sinful nature).

As to her uniqueness:

The "splendor of an entire unique holiness" by which Mary is "enriched from the first instant of her conception" comes wholly from Christ: she is "redeemed, in a more exalted fashion, by reason of the merits of her Son." The Father blessed Mary more than any other created person . . . [32]

For it was certainly not fitting that this vessel of election should be wounded by the common injuries, since she, differing so much from the others, had only nature in common with them, not sin.

God had to do a special miracle to make Mary different than us. Was Mary free from stain because she did not offend God, or because she was impeccable and incapable of sin? The latter is common teaching in Catholic tradition. According to this tradition, Mary was born without sinful human nature with inherent tendencies to sin caused by Adam's transgression. So this refers to Mary as not being under the weight of that curse, not because of WHO, but because of WHAT she was—as the immaculate, "bearer of God" and of Christ's immaculate human nature. [33]

Mary was given a pre-fall human nature in order for Jesus to be born with a sinless human nature, according to this teaching.

Implications of an Immaculate Conception

The erasure of fallen human nature in Mary elevates her to a level beyond humanity, for there has been no sinless human nature since the sin of our first parents. Accordingly, she provided the very nature that was necessary in the plan of salvation. For many Catholics even her blood was provided which was shed for us, through Jesus of course. Today we hear of the desires of many in the rank file of the Catholic community to officially make her the Redemptrix, Co-Redeemer, with Christ.

The official and "infallible" doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, as solemnly defined as an article of faith, by Pope Pius XII (in the papal Bull *Ineffabilis Deus*), speaking ex cathedra, in which he infallibly defined this doctrine as binding upon all Catholics, warned his people:

Wherefore, if any shall presume, which may God avert, to think in their heart otherwise than has been defined by us, let them know, and moreover understand, that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have made shipwreck as regards the faith, and have fallen away from the unity of the Church. [34]

Ludwig Ott wrote that the teaching of the Immaculate Conception of Mary was a long standing tradition.

The seed of the woman was understood as referring to the Redeemer, and thus the Mother of the Redeemer came to be seen in the woman. Since the second century this direct messianic-marian interpretation has been expounded by individual Fathers, for example, St. Irenaeus, St. Epiphanius, . . . St. Cyprian, . . . St. Leo the Great. However, it is not found in the writings of the majority of the Fathers . . . According to this interpretation, Mary stands with Christ in a perfect and victorious enmity towards Satan and his following. Many of the later scholastics and a great many modern theologians argue, in the light of this interpretation . . . that: Mary's victory over Satan would not have been perfect, if she had ever been under his dominion. Consequently she must have entered this world without the stain of original sin." [35]

This conception is further defined by Catholic writers thus:

The ancient writing, "De Nativitate Christi," found in St. Cyprian's works says: Because (Mary) being "very different from the rest of mankind, human nature, but not sin, communicated itself to her."

Theodore, patriarch of Jerusalem, said in the second council of Nice, that Mary "is truly the mother of God, and virgin before and after childbirth; and she was created in a condition more sublime and glorious than that of all natures, whether intellectual or corporeal". [36]

This plainly puts the nature of Mary entirely beyond any real likeness or relationship to mankind or human nature as it is. Let's follow this line of thought in its next step as it relates to Jesus as given in the words of Cardinal Gibbons:

We affirm that the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Word of God, who in His divine nature is, from all eternity, begotten of the Father, consubstantial with Him, was in the fulness of time again begotten, by being born of the virgin, thus taking to himself from her maternal womb a human nature of the same substance with hers.

As far as the sublime mystery of the incarnation can be reflected in the natural order, the blessed Virgin, under the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, by communicating to the Second Person of the adorable Trinity, as mothers do, a true human nature of the same substance with her own, is thereby really and truly His mother Emphasis supplied. [37]

Desolidarized: Both Mary and Jesus

Mary was desolidarized and separated from that sin-laden humanity. . . . Had there been no Immaculate Conception, then Christ would have been said to be less beautiful, for He would have taken His Body from one who was not humanly perfect! There ought to be an infinite separation between God and sin. . . .

How could [Christ] be sinless if He was born of sin-laden humanity? If a brush dipped in black becomes black, and if cloth takes on the colour of the dye, would

not He, in the eyes of the world, have also partaken of the guilt in which all humanity shared? If He came to this earth through the wheatfield of moral weakness, He certainly would have some chaff hanging on the garment of His human nature. Emphasis supplied. [38]

As we place the above thoughts together we learn that the nature of Mary is defined as being not only "very different from the rest of mankind," but it is also "more sublime and glorious than all natures." Consequently she is "desolidarized and separated from that of sin-laden humanity." This puts her beyond any actual likeness to mankind as we really are.

Next comes the main point in this line of reasoning. Jesus is described as taking from his mother a human nature of the same substance as hers. From this it follows that in Christ's human nature Jesus is "very different" from the rest of mankind—"desolidarized and separated" from us. His human nature was immaculate like His mother's. His nature was so far separated from us as to be unlike that of mankind. His was a nature in which He could never be touched with the fellow-feelings of mankind.

Daniel prophesied that the "little horn" would "think to change times and laws." [39]

This attempted change in God's laws can be observed not only in the altered moral law, but also in the so-called exemption of God's law of heredity as it relates to Mary and to Jesus. It was the papacy who first attempted to exclude both Mary and Jesus from the law of heredity.

By the fourteenth century the Papacy, in its representative head, became the self-declared Lord and Savior of mankind. "We declare, say, and define, and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff."

In attempting to change God's moral law and His law of heredity the "little horn" power of Daniel 7, likewise, set himself against the gospel of Jesus Christ as Lord, Savior and Representative. In its struggle for dominion of the world the Papacy had to destroy the effectiveness of Christ as the only Savior of mankind. What better way than to present Him as one who cannot be touched "with the feelings of our infirmities," one exempt from inherited tendencies to sin. The Papacy has presented Jesus, always, as an incomplete Savior. It thought to change the law of heredity through the immaculate conception, and by so doing desolidarizing and separating Jesus from those whom He came to save.

But the Spirit of God presents Jesus in corporate solidarity with those He came to save. At the end of time, during the pre-advent judgment, just before the Elder Brother of the race—"the Son of Man"—returns to get His earth-bound believing brothers and sisters, as their Representative He receives from "the Ancient of Days" dominion, and power

and glory and the kingdom in the pre-advent judgment. He receives the dominion, not for Himself, but in behalf of His people whom He represents. (Daniel 7:13, 14, 26, 27).

Before Jesus could obtain a kingdom and dominion for us, He first had to overcome the world within us. That world is encapsulated within our corporate fallen nature. Christ had to overcome that world within human nature before He could obtain the earth as the "Son of Man," the Second Adam. He overcame through grace alone, by faith alone, because of God's word. He believed that the Father would keep Him from falling (Isaiah 49:5-9).

Thomas Torrance put the reason for the incarnation this way:

Perhaps the most fundamental truth which we have to learn in the Christian church, or rather relearn since we have suppressed it, is that the Incarnation was the coming of God to save us in the heart of our fallen and depraved humanity, where humanity is at its wickedness in its enmity and violence against the reconciling love of God. That is to say, the Incarnation is to be understood as the coming of God to take upon Himself our fallen human nature, our actual human existence laden with sin and guilt, our humanity diseased in mind and soul in its estrangement or alienation from the Creator. This is a doctrine found everywhere in the early church in the first five centuries, expressed again and again in terms that the whole man had to be assumed by Christ if the whole man was to be saved, that the unassumed is unhealed, or that what God has not taken up in Christ is not saved. . . . Thus the Incarnation had to be understood as the sending of the Son of God in the concrete form of our own sinful nature and as a sacrifice for sin in which He judged sin within that very nature in order to redeem man from his carnal, hostile mind. [\[41\]](#)

In these last days, God sent a message to counteract the false gospel proclaimed by the "little horn" power of Daniel seven. As Jones put it: "O, he is a complete Saviour. He is a Saviour from sins committed, and the conqueror of the tendencies to commit sins" [\[42\]](#)

Speaking about the importance of the human fallen nature Christ assumed, Jones taught that ". . . the salvation of God for human beings lies in just that one thing" A. T. Jones, "The Third Angel's Message", No. 13, General Conference Bulletin, 1895, p. 233. [\[43\]](#)

E.J. Waggoner, earlier, made the connection between our justification and the human nature of Christ: "God sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, to condemn sin in the flesh, that He might justify us." [\[44\]](#)

The doctrine of Christ as taking an unfallen human nature flows of necessity from the teaching of the Immaculate Conception of Mary and her actual sinlessness. The absence of fallen human nature for Mary breaks the chain of heredity and allows for instant holiness of nature both for Mary and Jesus and thereby denies the law of heredity. It is thus that Mary and Jesus overcame sin—by evading the law of heredity.

According to that theory, Jesus was victorious, not by faith, but through His partaking of Mary's immaculate nature. He, like Mary, could not possibly be tempted with

concupiscence. And like Mary He really didn't die. Death is the consequence of sin. Jesus, like Mary, was exempt both from sinful nature and from "original sin" and thus from death. Immunity from sin and death were theirs because they were excused from the liability to which all others are subject—the law of heredity. What happened, then, when it appeared that Jesus died on Calvary? It was only an appearance. He didn't really die. Where did He go? He went on a missionary journey into Hell to save Adam and Eve among others. So we read:

He has gone to search for Adam, our first father, as for a lost sheep. Greatly desiring to visit those who live in darkness and in the shadow of death, he has gone to free from sorrow Adam in his bonds and Eve, captive with him—He who is both their God and the son of Eve. . . . "I am your God, who for your sake have become your son. . . . I order you, O sleeper, to awake. I did not create you to be a prisoner in hell. Rise from the dead, for I am the life of the dead." [45]

The Apostles' Creed confesses in the same article Christ's descent into hell and his Resurrection from the dead on the third day. . . ." [46]

The frequent New Testament affirmations that Jesus was 'raised from the dead' presuppose that the crucified one sojourned in the realm of the dead prior to his resurrection. This was the first meaning given in the apostolic preaching to Christ's descent into hell: that Jesus, like all men, experienced death and in his soul joined the others in the realm of the dead. But he descended there as Savior, proclaiming the Good News to the spirits imprisoned there.

Jesus did not descend into hell to deliver the damned, nor to destroy the hell of damnation, but to free the just who had gone before him.

According to the implications of this fanciful teaching, the cross was not necessary. Mary came equipped by an immaculate conception in order to overcome sin. In turn, she passed this immaculacy on to Jesus. This dogma denies the death of Jesus, because sinless nature is not subject to death.

Adam, as originally created, was immune from death. He was likewise immune from temptation from within. Redeemed mankind, at the Second Advent of Christ, will be again immune from death and from inherited tendencies to sin. They then will not be tempted from within.

But between the two Edens, man is neither immune from death nor from temptation from within. And from neither of these could Christ be exempted. The fact that He died demonstrates His mortality which He assumed consequential to His taking fallen flesh. He could not have died had He not taken sinful nature. Had He merely taken Adam's sinless nature, the devil could not have put Him to death. Christ was obligated to take mortality upon Himself. And mortality comes only through fallenness. Death would never, could never, occur in sinless nature. This is an impossibility.

If Christ could not and did not really die, because He was sinless in nature, then human beings can never be justified and reconciled, for reconciliation and justification are

linked directly to the death of Christ (Romans 5:9, 10; 2 Corinthians 5:19). Any Immaculate Conception doctrine, of Mary or of Jesus denies, or at least undermines, the gospel. What is at stake here is the gospel, as well as God's law.

Paul presented the human nature of Christ as the gospel. The gospel is "concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom 1:1-3). David's flesh or nature was sinful. He could only pass on to his descendants, including Mary, a sinful human nature. The word translated "seed" is spermatozoa. David's DNA—the nucleic acid in which encoded genetic information was transmitted to Jesus through Mary. While it is true that the sequence of nucleotides determined the individual hereditary characteristics of Jesus from David through Mary, it is also true that those same nucleotides carried the tendencies of David's sinful human nature which he in turn received from his ancestors reaching all the way back to Adam. The hereditary linkage between Jesus and the rest of the race is the scandal of the gospel. But in this very scandal is proclaimed the salvation of mankind! This is what is denied in the doctrine of any immaculate conception, whether the doctrine refers to Mary or to Jesus. The Church of Rome opted for a "desolidarized and separated" Christ from the rest of humanity. Because of this she invented another plan of saving man. A different Christology means a different consequent soteriology.

The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception begins to blur the line between Christ and fallen man. The idea that Christ took unfallen human nature obscures the line between the nature of the fallen race and the nature of Christ.

The Church of Rome presents a Christ, through an immaculate conception, who was like us in nature, but not really the same. It was of the "same substance with" Mary His mother. [47]

By Rome's teaching, her nature was "very different from the rest of mankind" although it was still "human nature." [48]

This is not the teaching of Scripture. It says unequivocally concerning Jesus that "as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same;" that God sent "His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh;" that "in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren;" that He "Himself took our infirmities" and was touched "with the feeling of our infirmities," being tempted in all points like as we are. If Christ was not as we are in human nature, He could not possibly be tempted "like we are." But Scripture declares that He was "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." The only way He could possibly be tempted in all points like we are tempted is to be made like we are. That Christ took the common human nature of fallen mankind with its inherent tendencies to sin is as clear in Scripture as are two other doctrines—the Sabbath and the non-immortality of the soul. [49]

The "Holy Flesh" doctrine at the beginning of the century and that same doctrine since the 1950's embraced the theory that Christ was exempted from the law of hereditary concerning tendencies to sin. During both time periods advocates taught "similarities" and "differences" concerning Christ's human nature. Both sets of interpreters presented

Christ as truly human in that He became tired and hungry and thirsty as all humans do. However, in regard to overcoming sin, reached diametrically opposite conclusions. The early century advocates decided that since they were to overcome sin as Christ overcame, and since He took the holy flesh of pre-fall Adam (exempted from tendencies to sin), it followed consistently that they must gain an experience that would eradicate sinful nature from themselves and thus become like Jesus and Adam before he fell and thereby overcome sin. Their teaching and consequent experience were based largely on the popular subjective experience of the Pentecostal movement of the day.

On the other hand, the mid-century advocates decided that since Jesus overcame in the holy flesh of pre-fall Adam (exempted from tendencies to sin), and since we do have tendencies to sin, it follows consistently that we cannot overcome sin. Hence their teaching and experience reflects the popular objective teachings of original sin and grace found in modern Evangelicalism. They reason that if Christ took unfallen Adam's nature, fallen man cannot overcome as Christ did. [50]

They conclude that Christ must somehow wink at this aspect of salvation. His righteousness, they think, is sufficient to save them in their sinning.

In both the early and the mid-century theology, within Adventism, the Christology was similar. In soteriology they were eternally different.

At the close of the last Primacy meeting, the suggestion was proposed that Woodrow Whidden's (II [title page] III [page 95]) book entitled *Ellen White on the Humanity of Christ* be read for this meeting.

Brother Whidden attempts

"to grasp the issue at its very core. The more traditional post-Fall interpreters have tended to read Ellen White as emphasizing the similarities, seeing Christ as sinful in nature (though not in action), while the seeming majority of more recent interpreters are pre-Fall and have emphasized the *differences* between His nature and ours. Their accent falls on the *uniqueness* of the sinlessness of His nature and life." Emphasis original. [51]

Whidden's observations seem dependent on Anglican minister Henry Melvill's definitions deduced by careful researchers such as Ronald Graybill, Warren Johns, Tim Poirer and Eric Webster. Admittedly, there is no evidence produced that Ellen White used Melvill's terminology in describing the human nature Christ took in the Incarnation as Tim Poirer clearly states, and as cited by Whidden: "Ellen White did not quote the words [of Melvill] (such as 'innocent infirmities,' 'sinful propensities' and 'prone to offend')." However, Poirer, as cited by Whidden, surmised and "*suggested* . . . the sentiments of Melvill could very well reflect Ellen White's own conviction." Emphasis supplied. [52]

Does it not appear that Anglican minister Henry Melvill's teachings on "sinless infirmities" regarding Christ and recent Adventist interpreters about "innocent

infirmities" "similarities" "differences" and "uniqueness" are an echo of classic Catholic theology?

According to Whidden, Jesus, though fully human, did not take a human nature with tendencies toward sin. In this he does not waver a hair's breadth from the position on the human nature of Christ which was taken by Elders Froom, Anderson and Read during the 1950's when through their instrumentality, our position as Adventists on the nature of Christ was changed to meet the approval of the popular Evangelical doctrine.

Comments

Pre-lapsarians do not accept the notion that God can dwell in sinful fallen human nature without becoming polluted. They do not believe He subjected Himself to the working of the law of heredity in fallen humanity specifically with respect to temptations which come from within fallen nature through inherited tendencies to sin.

At this point, let's consider God's relationship to the believer today. Is a person's sinful nature eradicated when the Holy Spirit causes him to be born again? The answer, of course, is no. Then, does God dwell in the believer even though he still has a sinful nature? Yes. Since God dwells now in the fallen nature of the believer, it follows that the possibility exists that Christ dwelt in sinful human nature 2,000 years ago. The skeptic asks how we can believe that God took sinful, fallen nature. The question would be embarrassing if we accepted the following propositions: **(1)** that there is no need for being saved from sinning; **(2)** that sin did not have to be condemned in its tendency as well as in its action; **(3)** that there is another way of salvation than that Christ had to be made sin for us; **(4)** that righteousness by faith means justification only; **(5)** that salvation comes through pre-lapsarian nature only; **(6)** that redemption was somehow withheld from some, while extended to others.

So, our first choice must be between pre- and post-lapsarian views. These views cannot co-exist. They are mutually exclusive concepts. If the pre-lapsarian view is to be accepted as correct, then we have a right to demand that every single thing should be such that we see, in general, how it can be explained in terms of the total plan of salvation. If any one thing exists which is of such a kind that we see in advance the impossibility of ever giving it that kind of explanation, then the pre-lapsarian doctrine would be in ruins. If any one thing is allowed to exist in any degree of independence from the plan of salvation, then the pre-lapsarian view must be abandoned.

To be consistent it appears that if a person holds the pre-lapsarian doctrine s(he) must accept the following teachings also: **(1)** an immaculate conception; **(2)** a Christ exempted from the law of heredity. (This means that it would not have been possible for Him to take fallen human nature; **(3)** that His righteousness in humanity was through inheritance by nature and not by faith; **(4)** that He could not have been tempted just as we are; **(5)** that there has been no Example of faith-obedience; **(6)** that Christ did not come to demonstrate that man in fallen nature through grace can obey; **(7)** that no power for fallen mankind to obey God's law has been given; **(8)** that salvation is possible while willfully sinning against God; **(9)** that humanity cannot be perfected; **(10)** that

there is no sealing of God's people; **(11)** that there is no cleansing of the sanctuary (therefore no need of an investigative judgment); **(12)** that Sabbath keeping is an impossibility in sinful human nature; **(13)** that Sabbath observance as a test of loyalty is meaningless; **(14)** that it makes no difference which day of the week is kept. The result of this teaching is that it will be convenient to give up the Seventh-day Sabbath when threatened with economic sanctions, slavery, and the penalty of death (Revelation 13:15-17).

Christ did not have to become a man at all unless He had so chosen. Since the incarnation happened, the kind of nature Christ took is the central issue in the plan of redemption. This is no peripheral issue. Let me repeat: Christ did not have to take upon Himself human nature at all, unless He chose to do so. But having chosen manhood, He had to take the only kind of human nature available. There was no other kind than fallen, sinful human nature. A higher nature was not possible through the law of heredity, unless there really was an immaculate conception to exempt Him from that law.

If the law of heredity is a necessary truth, exemption cannot break it. If the law is right, exemption is wrong; if the exemption is right, the law is wrong. Or considered thus: if the law of heredity is truth, exemption is a false doctrine; if the exemption is true, then the law is a fraud and there is no need for an exemption.

God did not break His own law of heredity. He evidently created a miraculous spermatozoon (although this would not be necessary) in the womb of a virgin. This creation did not proceed to break any laws. The laws of nature took it over. Pregnancy followed, according to these normal laws, and nine months later the Christ Child was born. The virgin birth was not a contradiction to, nor did it outrage nature.

In nature there is exhibited for us, in favor of virgin birth, a process known as parthenogenesis. Natural parthenogenesis typically involves the development of eggs from virgin females without fertilization by spermatozoa. It occurs chiefly in crustaceans, worms, and certain insects.

A miraculous, as well as a natural, conception leads to pregnancy. It does not violate the law. A miracle is not an act of suspending the pattern to which events naturally conform. The miraculous conception of Christ was the feeding of new events into the God-ordained law of heredity. If this law was altered by supernatural power, then God is open to the charge of changing His law of heredity. (An immaculate conception violates God's law).

The cause of the conception in Mary was the activity of God; but its results followed according to the law of heredity. The process of God incarnating in human flesh was the miracle of the ages, but it was not a deviation from God's law. It did not disregard legal, moral, or ethical considerations as would an immaculate conception.

We need to think carefully about a believer's relationship with Christ, today, in comparison with the incarnation. Christ, by His Spirit, dwells now within temples of sinful human flesh. This union is not an anomaly, but is a faint reflection of the

incarnation of Christ. Although in a very minor key, it is the same theme. What can we learn from this? Since Christ is united with sinful nature, today, through faith on the part of the believer, it follows that He could have dwelt in a fallen temple of flesh when He took upon Himself humanity in the incarnation.

In accepting the post-fall nature, Christ took the temptability which comes from within that nature. "Tempted like as we are" would not, could not, occur in unfallen sinless human nature. Condemnation of sin in sinless flesh is an impossibility. Crucifying sinless flesh makes no sense. And overcoming the world within us cannot take place in unfallen flesh.

The reason God can now dwell within us and not become polluted is because He did so in our behalf, condemning sin in its tendency 2,000 years ago. If He did not then, He cannot now; if He would not then, He will not now. Only because He did so then, can He so do now.

Christ took the devil's strongest triumph, death, and made it the weapon by which He will destroy the devil (Hebrews 2:14). And likewise, Christ took the strongest temptations to sin—which come from within—and defeated them! He condemned them in our sinful nature (Romans 8:3). Christ either had to condemn sinful tendencies or to justify them.

Christ met, fought and conquered sin in its tendency. Because of this everything is different. Because of this, and only because of this, can man be justified and have the righteousness of the law fulfilled within his experience through faith.

In dealing with the law of heredity in relationship to Christ's human nature, any mention of His fallen nature makes some persons feel uneasy. It raises awkward questions. For, so long as belief in a sinless unfallen human natured Christ is held, one does not take seriously the law of heredity nor of overcoming sin. Christ's human nature then becomes an appearance sent from God to assure us of truths otherwise incommunicable. But what truths could these possibly be? If the truth is that in the incarnation Christ only appeared to have fallen nature, what more misleading way of communicating could possibly be found than this appearance, if we are to overcome as He overcame. With such a view, the nature of Christ, and even Christ Himself, would really be a hallucination.

Can we simply, and merely, drop the law of heredity? The answer is we can do so only if we regard the incarnation as a hallucination. Did God really send a holy hallucination to teach truth about our overcoming sin in sinful flesh? Is God such a bungler that He requires of us something Christ could not or would not do? If this is true, God is false and we might well be better off with the religious sophistry of an immaculately conceived Mary as our Mediatrix..

But if Christ is not a hallucination; if He did not come in phantom flesh, then a whole new mode of living has arisen in the universe: men in fallen flesh can obey God's holy

law. Then, and only then, loyalty to God in fallen nature is possible through the abounding grace of God.

"And what", you may ask, "does it matter?" "Do not such ideas only excite us and distract us from the more immediate and more certain things such as the love of God and of our neighbors, witnessing, self-denial, justification, obedience, etc.?" It matters much in every way. The above become meaningful only if viewed in the light of the concept that Christ "was made like unto His brethren in every respect." Then religion is removed from the ivory towers of theory and placed in the realm of the practical.

You cannot represent Christ as coming in the "likeness of men", "in the likeness of sinful flesh"; as being "touched with the feelings of our infirmities"; as being "tempted in all points like as we are"; as being obligated to be made "in every respect like His brethren" and not have Him take upon Himself our fallen nature. The mere idea of a human nature beyond and above human nature is not consistent with the laws of that nature.

What are some of the effects of the teaching of the fallen human nature which Christ took, upon the believer? He, too, may overcome. The non-believer? The concept ought to win his heart and fill him with hope. Upon Adam? He is without excuse.

What is the cardinal difficulty of the pre-lapsarian view? It makes a mockery of the message of righteousness by faith as given to us in the "loud cry" as presented by Jones and Waggoner. That message presented Christ as righteous by faith rather than by immaculate conception.

The pre-lapsarian view denies also the possibility of the obedience of faith by the believer, even with divine help. We then must overcome sin in a way different than did Christ.

The truth of the matter is that if the pre-lapsarian doctrine is correct, then Christ could not have overcome sin at all in sinless flesh. This is so because there is no sin in sinless flesh to overcome. If this is true, sin has not been conquered. And then it follows that Christ could not be a Savior of mankind at all. We then must become our own saviors.

Consider another difficulty related to this pre-lapsarian view: we are to have a living experience because of Christ's life in us. His life is to be manifested in our mortal flesh. (2 Corinthians 4:11). Mortal flesh is dying flesh. Dying flesh is fallen, sinful nature. Mortal flesh is the flesh of sin. If Christ did not come in the flesh of sin in the incarnation, it follows that He cannot dwell in you and me now!

Implications of the doctrine that Christ does not dwell and never did dwell in sinful human nature are observable in this manner: Christ's righteousness is only external, apart from the believer, and therefore does not penetrate sinful flesh; it does not touch Satan's stronghold, the tendencies within sinful nature. As a consequence of this teaching there can be no demonstration of the power of Christ's righteousness over sin in sinful flesh. The righteousness of Christ in this scheme of things becomes only a declaration made in heaven—the empty declaration of something which we are not and

cannot become. The righteousness of Christ then becomes nothing more than a phantom righteousness, a phantasm of truth.

Summary and Conclusion

The facts are in for all to see: **1)** that within the Seventh-day Adventist Church, for the past fifty years, there has been essentially two opposing teachings concerning the kind of human nature Christ assumed in the incarnation); **2)** that there was a deliberate change in our Church's teaching with regard to Christ's humanity during the 1950's; **3)** that there was at least one attempt to change the Church's teaching previous to the 1950's; and **4)** that the attempted change in doctrine was considered by those who opposed that change as a switch to a teaching more compatible with the Catholic doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

The message of Christ and His faithful righteousness as presented by Jones and Waggoner was inseparably connected and internally consistent with the post-lapsarian view on the kind of human nature He took in the incarnation. Not only did Christ take upon Himself fallen human nature with its inherent tendencies to sin, but that His doing so is essential to the plan of salvation according to Jones and Waggoner. He condemned sin in its tendency by never allowing it expression in motive, thought or action. Where sinful tendencies abounded in Christ's human nature, the grace of God did much more abound. Thus Christ is a complete Savior, saving not only from the penalty of sins committed, but also from inherited sinful tendencies. Their consistent soteriological doctrine was based on their Christological premise.

In closing, I want to leave this thought about the message of Christ and His faithful righteousness will go to the world, for God commanded it.

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; it invited the people to receive the righteousness of Christ, which is made manifest in obedience to all the commandments of God. Many had lost sight of Jesus. They needed to have their eyes directed to His divine person, His merits, and His changeless love for the human family. All power is given into His hands, that He may dispense rich gifts unto men, imparting the priceless gift of His own righteousness to the helpless human agent. 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. [53]

Appendix A

A change concerning the human nature Christ took was made in Bible Readings in 1949.

NOTE.—In His humanity Christ partook of our sinful, fallen nature. If not, then He was not "made like unto His brethren," was not "in all points tempted like as we are," did not overcome as we have to overcome, and is not, therefore, the complete and perfect Saviour man needs and must have to be saved. The idea that Christ was born of an immaculate or sinless mother, inherited no tendencies to sin, and for this reason did not sin, removes Him from the realm of a fallen world, and from the very place where help is needed. On His human side, Christ inherited just what every child of Adam inherits, —a sinful nature. On the divine side, from His very conception He was begotten and born of the Spirit. And all this was done to place mankind on vantage-ground, and to demonstrate that in the same way every one who is "born of the Spirit" may gain like victories over sin in his own sinful flesh. Thus each one is to overcome as Christ overcame. Rev. 3:21. Without this birth there can be no victory over temptation, and no salvation from sin. John 3:3-7. *Bible Readings for the Home Circle*, pp. 115, 116, 1914 edition.

NOTE.—Jesus Christ is both Son of God and Son of man. As a member of the human family "it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren"—"in the likeness of sinful flesh." Just how far that "likeness" goes is a mystery of the incarnation which men have never been able to solve. The Bible clearly teaches that Christ was tempted just as other men are tempted—"in all points . . . like as we are." Such temptation must necessarily include the possibility of sinning, but Christ was without sin. There is no Bible support for the teaching that the mother of Christ, by an immaculate conception, was cut off from the sinful inheritance of the race, and therefore her divine Son was incapable of sinning. Concerning this false doctrine Dean F. W. Farrar has well said:

"Some, in a zeal at once intemperate and ignorant, have claimed for Him not only an actual sinlessness but a nature to which sin was divinely and miraculously impossible. What then? If His great conflict were a mere deceptive phantasmagoria, how can the narrative of it profit us? If we have to fight the battle clad in that armour of human free-will . . . what comfort is it to us if our great Captain fought not only victoriously, but without real danger; not only uninjured, but without even the possibility of a wound. . . . Let us beware of contradicting the express teaching of the Scriptures, . . . by a supposition that He was not liable to real temptation."—*The Life of Christ* (1883 ed.), vol. 1, p. 57. *Bible Readings for the Home Circle*, pp. 143, 144, 1949 edition.

Appendix B

Thoughts Concerning The Baker Letter

There are some persons who attach great importance to a passage in a letter written by Ellen White to an Elder William Baker. Most admit that this is "a very controversial letter." One person stated that: "It's one in which Ellen White addresses the nature of

Christ more specifically, more directly, more extensively than just about any other place."

That is a highly interpretive statement. The place where she "addresses the nature of Christ more specifically, more directly" and "more extensively," than "any other place" is in *The Desire of Ages*. That book is a clear Biblical, theologically accurate and philosophically sound statement. And it was published for public use for the express purpose of giving the correct viewpoint on the nature of Christ. It was not private correspondence to correct an aberration of the doctrine of Christ. The Baker letter was. Let's consider, briefly, the historical and the literary context of the Baker letter. First:

The Historical Context

Presently we do not know Baker's exact teaching concerning the human nature of Christ. Therefore, the historical context of what was taught about Christ's nature during the time of the Baker letter is extremely important.

William Baker worked in the Pacific Press in 1882. Later he was sent to Australia where he labored for many years as an evangelist; then as president of several Australian conferences. While an evangelist he taught an aberration of the doctrine of the human nature which Christ took. In late 1895 (or early 1896) Ellen White wrote a letter to Elder Baker and his wife about various things.

In that letter she cautioned him concerning his presentations about the humanity of Christ. Some critics of the teaching of Jones and Waggoner have wrongfully used the Baker letter to suggest that E.G. White was rebuking those two men for their teaching on this subject. However, not a shred of evidence has been given to support the allegation.

Ellen White knew the issues involved. She knew what the 1888 messengers and Prescott were presenting. No one to date has been able to produce any correspondence from her, to them, correcting them on their position.

George Knight refers to the discovery of the Baker letter as "one major stimulus for a shift in the position of several denominational thought leaders in the 1950's" (from the 1888 emphasis on the human nature of Christ to the popular evangelical christ)—*From 1888 to Apostasy*, p. 140.

Following is that part of the Baker letter which is being used to nullify the law of heredity in the human nature of Christ.

Be careful, exceedingly careful as to how you dwell upon the human nature of Christ. Do not set Him before the people as a man with the propensities of sin. He is the second Adam. The first Adam was created a pure, sinless being, without a taint of sin upon him; he was in the image of God. He could fall, and he did fall through transgressing. Because of sin, his posterity was born with inherent propensities of disobedience. But Jesus Christ was the only begotten son of God. He took upon Himself human nature, and was tempted in all points as human

nature is tempted. He could have sinned; He could have fallen, but not for one moment was there in him an evil propensity. He was assailed with temptations in the wilderness, as Adam was assailed with temptations in Eden.

Brother Baker, avoid every question in relation to the humanity of Christ which is liable to be misunderstood. Truth lies close to the track of presumption. In treating the humanity of Christ, you need to guard strenuously every assertion, lest your words be taken to mean more than they imply, and thus you lose or dim the clear perceptions of his humanity as combined with divinity ...

Never, in any way, leave the slightest impression upon minds that a taint of, or inclination to, corruption rested upon Christ, or that He in any way yielded to corruption. He was tempted in all points like as man is tempted, yet He is called that holy thing. It is a mystery that is left unexplained to mortals that Christ could be tempted in all points like as we are, and yet be without sin. The incarnation of Christ has ever been, and will ever remain a mystery. That which is revealed, is for us and for our children, but let every human being be warned from the ground of making Christ altogether human, such an one as ourselves: for it cannot be. The exact time when humanity blended with divinity, it is not necessary for us to know. We are to keep our feet on the rock, Christ Jesus, as God revealed in humanity.

I perceive that there is danger in approaching subjects which dwell on the humanity of the Son of the Infinite God. He did humble Himself when He saw he was in fashion as a man, that He might understand the force of all temptations wherewith man is beset —Letter 8, 1895.

During the time frame of the Baker Letter, at the General Conference (1895) A.T. Jones spoke very plainly about the nature of Christ. Not even a caution from Ellen White to Jones has been found concerning the way he presented the subject.

A.T. Jones (1895)

Thus all the tendencies to sin that have appeared, or that are in me, came to me from Adam; and all that are in you came from Adam; and all that are in the other man came from Adam. So all the tendencies to sin that are in the human race came from Adam. But Jesus Christ felt all these temptations; he was tempted upon all these points in the flesh which he derived from David, from Abraham, and from Adam. ... And there is such a thing as heredity.

Now that law of heredity reached from Adam to the flesh of Jesus Christ as certainly as it reaches from Adam to the flesh of any of the rest of us; for he was one of us.

Thus in the flesh of Jesus Christ —not in himself, but in his flesh—, our flesh which he took in the human nature—, there were just the same tendencies to sin that are in you and me. And when he was tempted, it was the ‘drawing away of these desires that were in the flesh.’ These tendencies to sin that were in his flesh, drew upon him, and sought to entice him, to consent to the wrong. But by the love of

God and by his trust in God, he received the power, and the strength, and the grace to say, 'No,' to all of it, and put it all under foot. And thus being in the likeness of sinful flesh, he condemned sin in the flesh ...

All the tendencies to sin that are in human flesh were in his human flesh, and not one of them was ever allowed to appear; he conquered them all. And in him we all have victory over them all.

Many of these tendencies to sin that are in us have appeared in action, and have become sins committed, have become sins in the open. There is a difference between a tendency to sin, and the open appearing of that sin in the actions. There are tendencies to sin in us that have not yet appeared; but multitudes have appeared. Now all the tendencies that have not appeared, he conquered. What of the sins that have actually appeared? 'The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all' (Isa. 53:6); 'Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree' 1 Pet. 2:24. Thus it is plain that all the tendencies to sin that are in us and have not appeared, and all the sins which have appeared, were laid upon him. It is terrible; it is true. But, O, joy! In that terrible truth lies the completeness of our salvation. .

..

O, he is a complete Saviour. He is a Saviour from sins committed, and the conqueror of the tendencies to commit sins —A.T. Jones, "The Third Angel's Message", No. 14, *General Conference Bulletin*, 1895, pp. 266, 267.

Speaking about the importance of the human fallen nature Christ assumed, Jones taught that ". . . the salvation of God for human beings lies in just that one thing" A.T. Jones, "The Third Angel's Message", No. 13, *General Conference Bulletin*, 1895, p. 233.

E.J. Waggoner earlier made the connection between our justification and the human nature of Christ: "God sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, to condemn sin in the flesh, that He might justify us." "Bible Study in the book of Romans" #12, *General Conference Bulletin*, 1891.

To insist that the Baker letter is a normative interpretive statement concerning an Adamic nature for Christ is to give the lie to the message of 1888 given by God through Jones and Waggoner.

During the time Ellen White wrote to Baker, Prescott preaching in Australia said: "This truth (concerning the kind of human nature Christ took) is the very foundation of all truth." Because of the considerations of time and place I quote at length from Prescott.

Prescott (1895, 1896)

He who had all glory with the Father, now lays aside His glory and becomes flesh. He lays aside His divine mode of existence, and takes the human mode of existence, and God becomes manifest in the flesh. This truth is the very foundation of all truth.

And Jesus Christ becoming flesh. God being manifest in the flesh, is one of the most helpful truths, one of the most instructive truths, the truth above all truths, which humanity should rejoice in.

I desire this evening to study this question for our personal, present benefit. Let us command our minds to the utmost, because to comprehend that the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, demands all our mental powers. Let us consider, first, what kind of flesh: for this is the very foundation of this question as it relates to us personally. [Heb. 2:14-18 quoted]. That through death, being made subject to death, taking upon Him the flesh of sin, He might, by His dying, destroy him that had the power of death ...

Now verily, He helps the seed of Abraham by Himself becoming the seed of Abraham. 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 revealed in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

So you see that what the Scripture states very plainly is that Jesus Christ had exactly the same flesh that we bear,—flesh of sin, flesh in which we sin, flesh, however, in which He did not sin, but He bore our sins in that flesh of sin. Do not set this point aside. No matter how you may have looked at it in the past, look at it now as it is in the word: and the more you look at it in that way, the more reason you will have to thank God that it is so ...

Jesus Christ came, of flesh, and in the flesh, born of a woman, made under the law; born of the Spirit, but in the flesh. And what flesh could He take but the flesh of the time? Not only that, but it was the very flesh He designed to take; because, you see, the problem was to help man out of the difficulty into which he had fallen, and man is a free moral agent. He must be helped as a free moral agent. Christ's work must be, not to destroy him, not to create a new race, but to re-create man, to restore in him the image of God . . . [Heb. 2:9 quoted].

God made man a little lower than the angels, but man fell much lower by his sin. Now he is far separated from God; but he must be brought back again. Jesus Christ came for that work; and in order to do it, He came, not where man was before he fell, but where man was after he fell. This is the lesson of Jacob's ladder. It rested on the earth where Jacob was, but the topmost round reached to heaven.

When Christ comes to help man out of the pit, He does not come to the edge of the pit and look over, and say, Come up here, and I will help you back. If man could help himself up to the point from whence he has fallen, he could help himself all the way; but it is because man is utterly ruined, weak, and wounded and broken to pieces, in fact, perfectly helpless, that Jesus Christ comes right down where he is, and meets him there. He takes his flesh and becomes a brother to him. Jesus Christ is a brother to us in the flesh: He was born into the family.

He came to redeem the family, condemning sin in the flesh, uniting divinity with flesh of sin. Jesus Christ made the connection between God and man, that the divine spirit might rest upon humanity—W. W. Prescott, Sermon: "The Word Became Flesh." Preached at Australian camp meetings at the end of 1895, and published in *Bible Echo*, Jan. 6, 1896, pp. 4, 5; and Jan. 13, 1896, pp. 12, 13.

Wilcox (1900)

Four or five years after the Baker letter was written, in an evangelistic magazine that was sent to the public in general, we find the use of the word "propensity" in relationship to Jesus in an editorial:

That body was His body of sinful flesh, taken in the womb of His virgin mother, and having within itself all the propensities to sin that the flesh of the sons of Adam have. He was not only made "in the likeness of sinful flesh," Rom. 8:3, but He bore the sinful flesh—W. C. Wilcox, editorial, *The Signs of the Times*, January 3, 1900, p. 1, col. 2.

It must be stated emphatically that there has been found no rebuke or even a caution from Ellen White to Elder Wilcox for his use of the term "propensity to sin" as used in his editorial!

The historical context of that which was taught by some of the leaders of the Adventist message concerning the kind of human nature Christ took is evidence that the then unknown Baker was presenting something other than that which they taught.

The Literary Context

The paragraph quoted above in historical context needs to be repeated here so that we may have it clearly in mind again in the literary context:

Be careful, exceedingly careful as to how you dwell upon the human nature of Christ. Do not set Him before the people as a man with the propensities of sin. He is the second Adam. The first Adam was created a pure, sinless being, without a taint of sin upon him; he was in the image of God. He could fall, and he did fall through transgressing. Because of sin, his posterity was born with inherent propensities of disobedience. But Jesus Christ was the only begotten son of God. He took upon Himself human nature, and was tempted in all points as human nature is tempted. He could have sinned; He could have fallen, but not for one moment was there in him an evil propensity. He was assailed with temptations in the wilderness, as Adam was assailed with temptations in Eden.

The literary structure of this passage of the letter contrasts the two Adams. The sentence "But Jesus Christ was the only begotten Son of God" does not refer to the previous sentence: "Because of his (Adam's) sin his posterity was born with inherent propensities of disobedience".

The disjunctive conjunction "but" refers back to the "first Adam" for its antecedent and not to the phrase "inherent propensities" in the preceding sentence. The antecedent

"the first Adam" is described as a created being. Then his sinless condition, his temptation, fall and the consequences of his sin are stated. The last half of the paragraph presents Christ in contrast to the first Adam. The next three paragraphs are cautions to Baker concerning his teachings about Christ's humanity and His divinity. The fourth paragraph again contrasts the two Adams.

Contrasts Between the Two Adams:

ADAM

- was created a pure, sinless being
- was . . . without a taint of sin upon him
- was assailed with temptations
- he could fall
- he did fall through transgression

JESUS

- took upon Himself human nature
- [no] taint of . . . corruption rested upon Him
- was assailed with temptations
- was tempted in all points as human nature is tempted
- He could have fallen
- He held fast to God and His Word

Another sentence that needs to be studied contextually is: "He could have sinned; He could have fallen, but not for one moment was there in Him an evil propensity".

". . . not for one moment . . ."

Christ "could have fallen, but not for one moment was there in Him an evil propensity" is not a statement exempting Him from the working of the law of heredity. The phrase "not for one moment" has to do with duration of time. Furthermore, it is not a denial of Christ inheriting tendencies to sin. That statement should be compared with the following found later in the letter:

". . . His faith in His Father's goodness, mercy, and love did not waver for one moment."

". . . not for one moment was there in Him an evil propensity" is equivalent to saying that "His faith . . . did not waver for one moment"

If Christ's faith had wavered "for one moment" there would have been "in Him an evil propensity" which would have caused His damnation and eternal destruction.

It must never cease to amaze us that scholarship, within the Adventist community since the 1950's, could accept a previously isolated sentence or paragraph within an unpublished letter addressing an unclear or unknown perversion of a teaching by a local conference evangelist concerning the divinity and the humanity of Christ and use it as the chief cornerstone upon which to build a doctrinal structure identical to the

evangelical teaching of an immaculate conception (one generation removed from the Papal doctrine of the same) which produces a Christ with no ability to meet sin in the devil's lair—our sinful human nature.

Endnotes

1. See Woodrow Whidden, "What Have We Thought and How Then should We Think About Christ's 'Sinful, Fallen Nature'?" p. 14-15. Whidden acknowledged that he was indebted to Jean Zurcher for the three categories. (This paper is a condensed version of a presentation given at the Sanctuary Bible Conference held at Berrien Springs, MI, June 11, 1997). ([return](#) to text)
2. In 1957, *Questions on Doctrine* (written by selected men in the General Conference) pages 59, 60 states that the sinful fallen nature of Christ took was borne "vicariously." "Again we remark, Christ bore all this [hereditary weaknesses, frailties and infirmities] vicariously just as vicariously He bore the iniquities of us all. It is in this sense that all should understand the writings of Ellen G. White when she refers occasionally to sinful, fallen, deteriorated human nature."

The authors of *Questions on Doctrine* used "vicarious" terminology to explain away Ellen White's clear statements concerning the kind of human nature Christ took. George Knight made copy of this expression and used it as a means to interpret Jones on this same topic:

"His use of language is often confusing. Jones's extremes in expression and thought do not help the situation. In addition to those problems, it is often impossible to tell exactly what he meant. For example, we can interpret many of his discussions of Christ's [human] nature to mean that Christ took our sinful nature vicariously, just as He bore our sins on the cross vicariously when He became sin for us." George Knight, *From 1888 to Apostasy*, p. 137. He repeats this in his latest, *A User-Friendly Guide to the 1888 Message*, p. 155.

That Christ took our fallen nature vicariously has to be the most untenable of all arguments devised, especially to explain apparent contradiction as in the case of *Questions on Doctrine*. By what authority do they make such a declaration? Not one statement from inspiration. The statements declare the opposite. ([return](#) to text)

3. Geoffrey Paxton, *The Shaking of Adventism*, p. 153. ([return](#) to text)
4. Ibid. ([return](#) to text)

5. Robert Lee Hancock, "The Humanity of Christ: A Brief Study of Seventh-day Adventist Teachings on the Nature of Christ," pp 26,27. This is a term paper which he presented to the faculty of the Department of Church History at Andrew's University, July, 1962. ([return](#) to text)
6. R.W. Schwarz, *Light Bearers to the Remnant*, p. 447. ([return](#) to text)
7. Ibid., p. 447. ([return](#) to text)
8. S.N. Haskell Letter to Ellen White, Battle Creek, MI, September 25, 1900 (DF 190, White Estate). ([return](#) to text)
9. S.N. Haskell, "Christ in Holy Flesh, or A Holy Christ in Sinful Flesh," *RH* October 2, 1900. ([return](#) to text)
10. Ibid. ([return](#) to text)
11. Ibid. ([return](#) to text)
12. R.S. Donnell, written while president of the Indiana Conference. In 1907 these were published in a tract entitled "What I Taught in Indiana." (DF 190, White Estate). ([return](#) to text)
13. R.S. Donnell, "The Nature of Christ and Man," an essay written from Memphis, TN, and sent to his colleague S.S. Davis (DF 190, White Estate). ([return](#) to text)
14. S.S. Davis, Letter to I. J. Hankins, Elnora, Indiana, March 15, 1903. ([return](#) to text)
15. S.G. Huntington, "The Son of Man", p. 13. A tract published by the Mission Press, La Fayette, Indiana about 1900. ([return](#) to text)
16. G.A. Roberts, "The Holy Flesh Fanaticism," June 11, 1923, (DF 190, White Estate). ([return](#) to text)
17. Letter 132, 1900 to Elder and Mrs. Haskell. (Recorded in See *Selected Messages*, Book Two, pp. 36, 37.) ([return](#) to text)
18. E.J. Waggoner, *GCB* 1901, pp. 403-405. ([return](#) to text)
19. Ellen G. White, *GCB* April 17, 1901, pp. 419-420. ([return](#) to text)
20. Ellen G. White, *RH* July 17,1900. ([return](#) to text)

21. Ellen G. White, *YI* Dec. 20, 1900 (4BC 1147). ([return](#) to text)
22. Ellen G. White, *MS* 141, 1901 (7BC 926). ([return](#) to text)
23. From Letter K. 303, September 4, 1903, (DF 63, White Estate). Handwritten in the margin, after the letter was typed, are found these words: "to meet and be subjected" and "working in every conceivable manner to destroy his faith." ([return](#) to text)
24. E.J. Waggoner, *GCB* 1901, pp. 403-405. ([return](#) to text)
25. S.G. Huntington, "The Son of Man", p. 3, (A tract published by the Mission Press, La Fayette, Indiana, 1900). ([return](#) to text)
26. Ibid. ([return](#) to text)
27. Pius XII, *Ineffabilis Deus*, December 8, 1854. (An edited edition is found in the new *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, paragraph 491). ([return](#) to text)
28. Ibid. ([return](#) to text)
29. Ibid. ([return](#) to text)
30. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Liguori, MO: Liguori Publications, 1994: 966 (this is the paragraph number of the book. Paragraph numbering from the *Catechism* will be used in this paper because of different paginations between hard and soft cover editions). ([return](#) to text)
31. Pius XII, *Ineffabilis Deus*. ([return](#) to text)
32. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*: 492. ([return](#) to text)
33. Pius XII, *Ineffabilis Deus*. ([return](#) to text)
34. *Catholic Belief*, page 214 [American ed.: June 5, 1884]. ([return](#) to text)
35. Ludwig Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, tr. Patrick Lynch, Rockford, IL: TAN Books & Publishers, 1974 (orig. 1952 in German), p. 200. ([return](#) to text)
36. Ibid.: 216, 217. ([return](#) to text)
37. James Cardinal Gibbons, *The Faith of Our Fathers*, NY: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, rev. ed., 1917, pp. 198,199. ([return](#) to text)

38. Fulton Sheen, *The World's First Love*, pp. 15, 16, 48. ([return](#) to text)
39. Daniel 7:25. ([return](#) to text)
40. Pope Boniface VIII, in the Papal Bull, *Unam Sanctam*, 1302 A.D. (return to text)
41. Thomas F. Torrance, *The Meditation of Christ*, Helmers and Howard Publishers, 1992, pp. 39, 40. ([return](#) to text)
42. A.T. Jones, "The Third Angel's Message", No. 14, *General Conference Bulletin*, 1895, pp. 266, 267. ([return](#) to text)
43. A.T. Jones, "The Third Angel's Message", No. 13, *General Conference Bulletin*, 1895, p. 233. ([return](#) to text)
44. "Bible Study in the book of Romans" #12, *General Conference Bulletin*, 1891. ([return](#) to text)
45. "Ancient Homily for Holy Saturday" cited in *Catechism of the Catholic Church*: 635. ([return](#) to text)
46. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*: 631. ([return](#) to text)
47. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*: 632. ([return](#) to text)
48. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*: 633. ([return](#) to text)
49. Hebrews 2:14; Romans 8:3; Hebrews 2:17; Matthew 8:17; Hebrews 4:15. ([return](#) to text)
50. Revelation 3:21. ([return](#) to text)
51. Woodrow W. Whidden III, *Ellen White on the Humanity of Christ*, p. 13. ([return](#) to text)
52. *Ibid.* p. 49. ([return](#) to text)
53. *Testimonies to Ministers*, pp. 91, 92. ([return](#) to text)