

*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

*"The hour has come, the hour is striking, and striking at you,
the hour and the end!"*

Eze. 7:6 (Moffau)

The End-Time Crisis

Page 2

An Australian "Voice"

Page 3

Which?

Page 5

Distortion of Truth

Page 6

Editor's Preface

This issue of WNN with its several separate articles actually is discussing only two major areas of religious controversy. The lead article along with the article asking "Which?" discusses the Sunday Law, and its application to "the mark of the beast." When we were preparing the special issue on "Our Wonderful God," we noted there was another article on the Sabbath School Bible Study Guide which due to lack of space, we could not discuss. In this issue it is the second article. Then as we were nearing the end of the rough draft of this issue, the publication, *Old Paths*, came in the mail with an article on the Holy Spirit. This fitted well into the Godhead discussion of the second article. The little bit of space left on page 7, we used for a "Let's Talk It Over" which has been missing for several issues.

There can be no question as to where we are in the stream of time. Honest evaluation of what Jesus had to say about the days of Noah and of Lot leads to only one conclusion, we are in the days of the coming of the Son of man. The hours just prior to that event are defined in the Writings as "the last remnant of time." In those final hours of probationary time, things will move swiftly, but with all the delusional power the Enemy of the ages can muster. Truth and truth alone will keep us at that hour. But if we cannot discern truth from error now, how will we be kept then? God is not going to perform a miracle on our thinking in that hour, when we have nurtured and cherished error in its various forms, and those who propagate it now.

Probably one of the most dangerous errors being promulgated as either "present truth" or "new light" is the despise being done to the Holy Spirit. It seems to escape those so disposed that all manner of sin will be forgiven men, but blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven now or ever. (Matt. 12:32) Perhaps it can be pled that ignoring or denying His reality does not reach "the high crimes and misdemeanors" category of blasphemy, but what difference is there between denial of His reality and outright rejection of His pleadings?



The End-Time Crisis

The Scripture clearly indicates that the end-time crisis involves worship. The "image of the beast" is to cause all that would not "worship the image" of itself "should be killed" (Rev.13:15). God's message of warning - the Third Angel's Message - declares that "if any man worship the beast and his image ... the same shall drink of the wine" of His wrath (14:9-10). Interestingly, that in this announcement of things to come, the "mark in his forehead, or in his hand" follows the worship of the beast and the image (v. 9). The question arises - Does the act of worship bring "the mark"? It is obvious, if the order as given in Scripture has any meaning, "the mark" does not precede the act of worship.

This concept and the factors involved are emotionally charged issues in the Community of Adventism. It must be asked, if Sunday is the "mark," then what is the nature of the worship which precedes it? How does that "worship" place a "mark" on one? Further, is the object of worship, a "what" or is it a "who"?

The issue of Sunday observance did not originate with Constantine. A. Paiva, a Portuguese writer on the subject of Mithraism, stated that "the first day of the week, Sunday, was consecrated to Mithra since times remote, as several authors affirm. Because the sun was god, the Lord *par excellence*, Sunday came to be called the Lord's day, as was later done in Christianity." (*Sunday in Roman Paganism*, p. 149) The Sun god of Mithraism, as well as the chief god in all pagan religions, was the fallen angel, Lucifer (I Cor. 10:20). The issue in Old Testament times was who was to be worshipped. The Sabbath was the day for the worship of Jehovah. It was not the day that was worshipped, but the God who designated the day as His day. The line was clearly drawn. In Ezekiel the apostates of Judah "turned their backs toward the temple of the Lord, and their faces toward the east, and they worshipped the sun toward the east" (8:16). The day is not mentioned, but the symbol of *whom* was worshipped is! And his day was Sunday. You can have a Sunday Law, but unless it is followed by a worship dictum, and that dictum is heeded, no "mark" is received.

The crisis could come in one of two ways: 1) Forbidding worship on the Sabbath, or 2) Mandating attendance at a Eucharistic service on Sunday. The first in some form will occur. We have been warned of Satan's intents. He plans:

"I will so control the minds under my power that God's Sabbath shall be a special object of contempt. A sign? - I will make the observance of the seventh day a sign of disloyalty to the authorities of earth. Human laws will be made so stringent that men and women will not dare to observe the seventh-day Sabbath." (Prophets and Kings, p. 184)

This is exactly a part of the plan as outlined by Rome at the very time when God raised up this Movement. Louis Veuillot in his book, *The Liberal Illusion*, wrote:

When the time comes and men realize that the social edifice must be rebuilt according to eternal standards, ... Catholics will arrange things to suit said standards. ... They will make obligatory the religious observance of Sunday on behalf of the whole of society, and for its own good, revoking the permit for free-thinkers and Jews to celebrate, incognito, Monday or Saturday on their own account. (p. 63)

The second is envisioned in the Pope's recent Apostolic Letter, *Dies Domini*. The emphasis "to ensure that civil legislation respects" the Christian's "duty to keep Sunday holy" is connected with the celebration of the Roman Eucharist. The next sentence reads - "In any case, they are obliged in conscience to arrange their Sunday rest in a way which allows them to take part in the Eucharist." (Par. 67) Why? "This mystery [the Eucharist] is the very center and culmination of Christian life. It is the 'source and the summit of all preaching of the Gospel...the center of the assembly of the faithful.'" (*Handbook for Today's Catholic*, p. 34) And what is worshipped? A "day"? No! A piece of bread, a "what" declared to be a "who" - God incarnate by the word of the priest. Blasphemy!

A further note on this point goes to the heart of Rome's objective. In explaining "How to Receive Communion," today's Catholic is told:

Holy Communion may be received on the tongue or in the hand and may be given under the form of bread alone or under both species. When the minister of the Eucharist addresses the communicant with the words "The Body of Christ," "The Blood of Christ," the communicant responds, "Amen." When the minister raises the eucharistic bread or wine, this is the invitation for the communicant to make an Act of Faith, to express his or her belief in the Eucharist, to manifest a need and desire for the Lord, to accept the good news of Jesus' paschal mystery. A clear and meaningful "Amen" is your response to this invitation. In this way you profess your belief in the presence of Christ in the eucharistic bread and wine as well as in his Body, the Church. (Ibid., p. 42)

Consider a point or two of what you have just read: 1) The celebrant of the Mass is not designated as a "priest" but as a "minister," for the new Catholic; 2) The wafer may be received in "the hand." Note, that one of the "or's" in Rev. 14:9 is "or in his hand." 3) The wafer also can be placed on the tongue. Is there any connection between this and the fact that the fifth plague on "the seat of the beast" caused those of "his kingdom" to gnaw their tongues because of the pain? (Rev. 16:10) As stated above to Rome a simple "amen" signifies not only one's acceptance of "Jesus' paschal mystery," but also one's

"belief in" the Roman "Church," designated in the text just noted as "his kingdom"?

In this same Handbook, it cites the Vatican II document, *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, as stating that the Eucharist is a "sign of unity" (p. 34). It needs be only recalled that at the 1991 seventh Assembly of the WCC in Canberra, Australia, Cardinal Cassidy, then an archbishop, forbade the Catholics present from joining in the Assembly's communion service. As his reason, he stated that he "judged that sharing the eucharist is the 'ultimate sign and seal' of church unity, and thus a step with many and major doctrinal implications." (EPS 91.02.74) Already at that time, there was in the "works" a program to find common doctrinal grounds by which visible Christian unity might be expressed. The Faith and Order Commission, with 12 Catholic theologians "on board," was pursuing the acceptance of a common confession of faith the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed of AD 381. [This we discussed in some detail in the Special issue of WCN sent out in January. See article, "Whither Bound?"] The key word, in this attempt for visible unity is the "Apostolic" faith.

In his Apostolic Letter, *Dies Domini*, what the Pope did not say is as important to consider as what he did say. Gone were the proud boasts and challenges to Protestants. No where did the Pope after setting forth the Sabbath as given in the Decalogue (Par. 16), challenge - "Who gave you the authority to tamper with the fourth?" - as was done in the Clifton Tracts. No where did the Pope claim that the change in the day of worship was "a mark of her ecclesiastical power and authority in religious matters" as did the Chancellor of Cardinal Gibbons in 1895. Now the voice of Cardinal Edward Cassidy, president of the Vatican Council for Promoting Christian Unity, declares the Eucharist to be the "ultimate sign and seal." No where did the Pope declare as was done in *The Convert's Catechism of Catholic Doctrine*, that "the Catholic Church, in the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 336) transferred the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday" (p. 50). Instead John Paul II sought to place the observance of Sunday as close as possible to the Apostolic age (par. 23). He cited the timing of the Resurrection and Pentecost to Sunday, along with various "first day" references as evidence of its "apostolic" origin (Par. 19-21) He was but echoing the discussion on the Sabbath Commandment in the new *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (pp. 581-582).

This new approach of the Roman Church to the Sabbath question dare not be overlooked in our zeal to emphasize that John Paul II suggested Pope Leo XIII's dictum that "Sunday rest" is "a worker's right which the State must guarantee" (par. 66), and that "Christians will naturally strive to ensure that civil legislation respects their duty to keep Sunday holy" (par. 67). But what does keeping Sunday "holy" mean to John Paul II? "The Sunday assembly is the privileged place of unity: it is the setting for the celebration of the sacramentum unitatis which profoundly marks the Church as a people gathered 'by' and 'in' the

unity of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit" (par. 36). Placed together in this one statement are the concepts covered by "Apostolic," "visible unity," "Trinity," "Eucharist," and "Sunday." Let us be very careful lest our traditional emphasis blind our eyes to any of these facets of the end-time crisis.

"Sunday is coming," but let us not be so naive as to think that the devil is going to seek to accomplish his agenda in a way that will be openly obvious to the professed people of God. Christ has warned us that the delusions of the final crisis will be such that, if possible, "they shall deceive the very elect" (Matt. 24:24). Further, let it be understood that a "Sunday Law" *per se*, is not the "mark" or "sign" of anything. We have had "Sunday closing laws" among the legal statutes of various states and city ordinances regulating Sunday commerce on the community level. This is not the aspect of Sunday laws that should concern us. It is as Louis Veulliot defined such legislation that we should be watching. His call was for the "religious observance" of Sunday. This involves the Eucharist in the end-time crisis as has been stated in the recent Papal Apostolic Letter. #

An Australian "Voice"

The lead article in *The Remnant Herald*, November, 1998 charged - "Scripture Denigrated by the Sabbath School Quarterly." The editor, Dr. Russell Standish, cited a paragraph from the Teacher's edition which called attention to a "gloss" in I John 5:7-8. He did not take issue with the fact that the Lesson upheld the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Trinity. He evidently believes that teaching himself, for he writes that these verses are "a powerful testimony to the truth of the Son and the Holy Spirit" in the context of the Trinity teaching. He laments that "since the Sabbath School Quarterly is read by a series of readers prior to publication, it is alarming that this error [the recognition of the gloss] was permitted to go to print."

Standish considers the recognition of this "gloss" as an attempt "to cast doubt upon the Word of God." He says that "if the Bible contains one gloss, then we are entitled to inquire how many more glosses there are in Scripture." This is indeed a surprising position for Dr. Standish to take in view of the veneration he and his brother give to the Writings, and the high place they accord Ellen G. White as a "major" prophet. (OFF, April 1989, p. 15) Ellen White herself broached this very issue. She wrote:

Some look to us gravely and say, "Don't you think there might have been some mistake in the copyist or in the translators?" This is all probable, and the mind that is so narrow that it will hesitate and stumble over this possibility or probability would be just as ready to stumble over the mysteries of the Inspired Word, because their feeble minds cannot see through the purposes of God. (SM, bk I,

p. 16)

I saw that God had especially guarded the Bible; yet when copies of it were few, learned men had in some instances changed the words, thinking that they were making it more plain, when in reality they were mystifying that which was plain, by causing it to lean to their established views, which were governed by tradition. (The Story of Redemption, p. 391)

I John 5:7-8 is a perfect example of such a "gloss," which was inserted to sustain the non-Scriptural teaching of the Trinity. The Standishes join in sustaining the "gloss," thus taking their stand with the Roman teaching of the Godhead instead of standing with truth. This is not the only Romish tinted error they seek to promote. Purposefully? That is doubtful. Why, then? Because they do not know their Bibles, nor even the Writings which they reverence, as is evidenced by the position taken by the article in *The Remnant Herald*.

In *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Bruce M. Metzger, "on behalf of and in co-operation with the Editorial Committee of the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament, discusses at length the gloss which the Standishes seek to defend. We reproduce his comments in full:

"After μαρτυρουντες (witness or record [KJV] I John 5:7) the Textus Receptus adds the following: εν τω ουρανω, ο Πατηρ, ο λογος, και Αγιον Πνευμα: και ουτοι οι τρεις εν ειση. (8) και τρεις εισιν οι μαρτυρουντες εν τη γη. That these words are spurious and have no right to stand in the New Testament is certain in the light of the following considerations.

"(A) External Evidence. (1) The passage is absent from every known Greek manuscript except four, and these contain the passage in what appears to be a translation from a late recension of the Latin Vulgate. These four manuscripts are ms. 61, a sixteenth century manuscript formerly at Oxford, now at Dublin; ms. 88, a twelfth century manuscript at Naples, which has the passage written in the margin by a modern hand; ms. 629, a fourteenth or fifteenth century manuscript in the Vatican; and ms. 635, an eleventh century manuscript which has the passage written in the margin by a seventeenth century hand.

"(2) The passage is quoted by none of the Greek Fathers, who, had they known it, would most certainly have employed it in the Trinitarian controversies (Sabellian and Arian). Its first appearance in Greek is in a Greek version of the (Latin) Acts of the Lateran Council in 1215.

"(3) The passage is absent from the manuscripts of all ancient versions (Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Arabic, Slavonic), except the Latin; and is not found (a) in the Old Latin in its early form (Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine), or in the Vulgate (b) as issued by Jerome (codex Fuldensis

[copied A.D. 541-46] and Codex Amiatinus [copied before A.D. 716]) or (c) as revised by Alcuin (first hand of codex Vercellensis [ninth century]).

"The earliest instance of the passage being quoted as a part of the actual text of the Epistle is in the fourth century Latin treatise entitled *Liber Apologeticus* (chap. 4), attributed either to the Spanish heretic Priscillian (died about 384) or to his follower Bishop Instantius. Apparently the gloss arose when the original passage was understood to symbolize the Trinity (through the mention of the three witnesses; the Spirit, the water, and the blood), an interpretation which may have been written first as a marginal note that afterwards found its way into the text. In the fifth century the gloss was quoted by Latin Fathers in North Africa and Italy as part of the text of the Epistle, and from the sixth century onwards it is found more and more frequently in manuscripts of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate. In these various witnesses the wording of the passage differs in several particulars. (For example of other intrusions into the Latin text of I John, see 2:17; 4:3; 5:6, and 20.)

"(B) Internal Probabilities. (1) As regards transcriptural probability, if the passage were original, no good reason can be found to account for its omission, either accidentally or intentionally, by copyists of hundreds of Greek manuscripts, and by translators of ancient versions.

"(2) As regards intrinsic probability, the passage makes an awkward break in the sense.

"For the story of how the spurious words came to be included in the Textus Receptus, see any critical commentary on I John, or Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, pp. 101 f; cf. also Ezra Abbot, "I John v.7 and Luther's German Bible," in *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel and Other Critical Essays* (Boston, 1888), pp. 458-463"

[The story of how these spurious words came to be included in the Textus Receptus can be found in the *Seventh-day Adventist Commentary*, Vol. 7, p. 675.]

Returning to the article in *The Remnant Herald*, Dr. Standish expresses concern, and rightly so, for the present concerted attempt by "voices" both in Australia and the United States to denigrate the Lord Jesus Christ to a lesser Being than the Father, and to blaspheme the Holy Spirit by denying His existence other than an extended influence of the Father and the Son. This latter position is treading on exceedingly dangerous ground. Satan who was once Lucifer, the covering cherub, knows well the Beings of the Godhead, and doesn't mind which extreme position you believe, the Trinity, or the anti-Trinitarian view being expressed today in the Community of Adventism just so long as you do not believe the truth as given in the Scriptures, the high point being revealed in the capsheaf Gospel of John.

It cannot be denied that in this area of theology we have a deep mystery. This mystery centers in the Incarnation, not as an actual happening, but "how" it could happen. We are loath to accept the reality of the fact that Jesus Christ as a God-man was a new Being never before known in the universe, and that He as that God-man was exalted into the Godhead making it "the Heavenly Trio." We have difficulty, and rightly so, in relating this God-man and the Eternal Spirit. It is a mystery in the fullest sense of the meaning of the word in the English language. The book of Revelation symbolizes this mystery as "a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God" (5:6). This could well be the highest symbolic language found anywhere in the Scriptures.

Theologically, the relationship has been expressed by the words, *after ego*. Commenting on the Greek text of I John 5:6 (the verse just before the gloss), David Smith in *The Expositor's Greek Testament* (W. Robertson Nicoll, Editor) wrote as follows on the verse: ["This (ουτος) is He that came (ο ελθων) by (δια) water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by (εν) water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth"]

"Ver. 6. ουτος, i.e. this Jesus who is the Son of God, the Messiah whom the prophets foretold and who "came" in the fullness of the time. ο ελθων, [the One who came] not ο ερχομενος [the coming One]. His Advent no longer an unfulfilled hope but an historical event. δια [through] of the pathway or the vehicle of His Advent. ... εν [in]: He not only "came through" but continued "In the water and the blood," i.e. His ministry comprehended both the Baptism of the Spirit and the Sacrifice for sin. ... Jesus called Himself "the Truth" (John xiv. 6), and the Spirit came in His room, His *alter ego* (xiv. 16-18)." (Vol. V, p. 195)

This designation, *alter ego*, is the best that human language can devise to express the relationships resultant from the manifestation of God in the flesh as described in the Scriptures. However, to sustain a textual gloss because it confirms a doctrine of Romanism which one chooses to accept as a part of his own confession of faith, and then claim to be a "herald" of truth can be defined by only one phrase, a "voice" of deception. #

Which?

The *LA Times* January 3, 1999, carried a feature article by Kevin Phillips, publisher of *American Political Report*. The essay was captioned - "Cultural Tide Gathers for a Puritan Revival." The first two paragraphs set the tone for his whole thesis. They read:

January 1999 is not just any old January. The Western

world is now in a countdown to the millennium, a 12-month world watch already freighted with global economic jitters, the potential collapse of Russia, moral and political crusades and an eerie mix of technology and doomsday superstition.

Americans in particular, face the possibility that the continuing upheaval in Washington could bring about a religious revival and a related neo-Puritanism. The first-ever impeachment trial of an elected U. S. President, amid what is already described as a cultural civil war, could be leading toward a moral and ideological Gettysburg.

Phillips indicates that there is a resurgence of fundamentalism in the United States which is "labelled neo-Puritanism" The moral and legal issues the Senate faced in its trial of the President are only "one litmus test." The moral shift is international. Phillips noted that in Pakistan there is a move toward "a code of Islamic justice in which rapists are executed within 24 hours. Even nonreligious China has drafted new laws to crack down on adultery."

Noting that current polls show that Americans "seem to prefer adultery, perjury and a rising stockmarket to any sort of a neo-Puritan crusade," Phillips asks, "but will they feel this way in April or May, if the Dow has dropped by 30% and the Senate trial revelations have Clinton's rating on a similar curve?" He recognizes that "despite talk about the rise of fundamentalism and the emergence of the Christian Right since the 1970s, the last three decades have seen a far larger counter development" in the sexual revolution which began in the 1960s. He stated that though religious leaders have tried to call "the shots in American culture," they have not been able to do so, but rather the "liberals and centrists have." However, "these polarizations of lifestyle, culture and conscience are central to the way U.S. politics since the 1960s has resembled an intermittent civil war," the most recent in 1994. The struggle over Clinton's fate is "a vital campaign for both cultural armies." Phillips contends that if "one set of moral, sexual, religious and legal views prevails in the U.S. Senate, the vote could produce a latter-day Gettysburg - the decade's potentially decisive confrontation between the 'moralists' and the 'permissives.'"

Phillips cites some past history of interest in Adventist thinking. It is better directly quoted than summarized. He wrote:

In the United States of the 1790s, reaction against moral and political radicalism nurtured a traditional counterreaction, beginning in the small towns of New England, which grew into the Second Great Awakening. Through the 1850s, a related cultural warfare wracked U.S. politics with demands for prohibition of liquor sales and unseemly amusements on the Sabbath. Missions and Bible societies proliferated. Puritanism even spread to cuisine, with the invention of the graham cracker and the organization in New England cities of Female Retrenchment Societies to

defend women against tea, coffee, rich cake and pastry.

One does not have to see cappuccino chocolate eclairs and Sunday shopping in jeopardy to suspect the gathering of another religious or traditionalist countertide. ... Few questions are more important in America's millennial countdown than whether the current peacetime imitation of civil war is heading in a similar direction.

One reader's response to this essay very accurately described the make up of today's American culture in challenging Phillips analysis. He wrote:

Kevin Phillips has it all wrong in his Jan. 3 article, "Cultural Tide Gathers for a Puritan Revival." Frankly, I think we are witnessing the death of puritanism.

Americans above all desire individual freedom. We are so diverse and multicultural now that no one religion, cult or evangelist could possibly appeal to a majority of the population. And the balance of the population would fight tooth and nail to prevent others' views being implemented universally.

Americans in large numbers are responding to public sexual indiscretions with resounding yawn. Many people emigrated here for freedom of religion; others did so to be free from religion and the resulting intolerance in their homelands. We are a patchwork of beliefs, increasingly secular, and with our free press and vast information systems the question is, why would anyone want to return to the less tolerant, more repressive ways of the past? Puritans loose, individual freedom triumphs!

From the viewpoint of fundamental Adventist teaching of end-time events based upon an interpretation of Revelation 13, the position taken by Kevin Phillips would be claimed as a correct understanding of what is to happen. However, the present cultural status and thinking in America is accurately described in the letter from a reader. Further honesty requires that we admit that we are interpreting the prophecy of Revelation 13 by the book, *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan*. At one point in the book, Ellen White describes what is defined as "the last remnant of time," and changes from events prophesied in Revelation 13 to an event noted in Revelation 16. If we are willing to follow her counsel and apply "time and place" to what she has written, will we come up with the same set of fulfillments 100 years from the time the book was written as would have been if the "the last remnant of time" had been reached in the 1890s? Certain basics, yes; the how of the accomplishment of those basics, no. Herein will lie the deception that, if possible, the very elect could be deceived.

Now let us consider some details that relate to the above questions and assumptions. The prophecy in Revelation 13:11-17 speaks of a "another beast coming up out of the earth." There is no question that the word, "earth" in

verse 11 is used as a symbolism. The problem we will face will be in the interpretation of this same word in verse 14. Is this also the symbolic use, or is "earth" the whole inhabited earth? This decision will affect one's perception of what the "image" is. Further, since the Third Angel's Message concerns this "image" as well as the first "beast," we need to get our "act" together so as to give this message in truth. It is so much easier just to take *Great Controversy* and read what it says and not relate the prophetic basics to a different time frame. However, to do so is deceptive, and prepares those who blindly accept such interpretations to be unprepared for the final delusion.

In the next to the final paragraph in the chapter on "Spiritualism" in *The Great Controversy* is found the phrase "the last remnant of time" (p. 561). With it is connected Revelation 16:13, 14. But we have said that this being a part of the sixth plague must come after the close of probation, but the context of the paragraph does not permit such a conclusion. After quoting from Revelation 16:13-14, Ellen White writes that the people are being "lulled" into a "fatal security" to be awakened "only by the outpouring of the wrath of God," and that begins with the first plague! From this must be drawn the conclusion that the present interpretations constitute a "fatal security." The only answer given of escape in that hour is to be "kept by the power of God through faith in His word" (p. 562). We better know what the "word" says, and watch carefully the unrolling of the scroll. "The last remnant of time" before "the outpouring of the wrath of God" will not give much time to make the preparation needful to stand. If we have not "unlearned" the many, many lessons of traditional perceptions, and learned in their place the lessons of truth we are in line to "be swept into the ranks of [the final] delusion" along with the rest of the world.

Distortion of Truth

Just as we were completing the various articles above, the February issue of *Old Paths* was in the postal box. In this issue was an article on "The Promised Comforter." One section was captioned - "Another Comforter." In this section the writer, Doug Goslin, avers that "the word 'another' should be considered here but not as another individual other than Jesus Christ" He interprets "another Comforter" as "the same person" but with "another experience." To arrive at this conclusion Goslin wrote that "Christ was born twice, but in two separate forms. The first was the form of God, the second was the form of man" (p. 7). In these premises, we have several distortions of truth. Let us consider them,

First, there is the linguistic distortion. The Greek word translated, "another" is *αλλος*. It does not mean "same" and denotes a distinct person separate from the one speaking. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*

by Arndt & Gingrich states under the art. αλλος: "1. other - a. different from the subject who is speaking or who is logically understood... (illustrations from Greek given)... b. different from previously mentioned subject or object." Thayer in his Lexicon indicates that from Homer on down, this Greek word means, "another, other." Then he contrasts αλλος with ἕτερος, indicating that αλλος "denotes numerical in distinction from qualitative difference" (p. 29). If Jesus had wished to indicate that the Comforter would be Himself and the difference would be in "experience" thus denoting a "qualitative" difference, He would have used the word, ἕτερος.

Secondly, there is the problem arising from the concept of "form." Jesus returned to the Father and sent the Holy Spirit in His place because of the limitation of His "form." He could not be everywhere present. See John 16:7; *The Desire of Ages*, p. 669, par. 2) Now if He was to be the coming "Comforter" did He come in His exalted human form? "He would represent Himself as present in all places by His Holy Spirit, as the Omnipresent." (Letter 119, 1895) "Omnipresence" is an attribute of the "form of God." Is Jesus Christ operating in two "forms" or are their two operating each in His own "form"? The Greek noted in the above paragraph indicates the latter. It would be much simpler just to accept the explanation given in the *Expositor's Greek Testament* as cited on p. 4 of this issue of WWN. There is a mystery here which involves the incarnation. Let us leave the mystery alone, and accept the revealed fact: At Bethlehem a new Being came into existence, a God-man, Jesus. This God-man was exalted to the right hand of the Majesty on high, yet this God-man could be spoken of as "that eternal life which was (ην) with (προς not εν) the Father" (1 John 1:2). This brings us to the third distortion of truth.

In the article, Goslin avers that "Christ was born twice." If born twice, even if the first time was "in the form of God, He had a beginning and could not be "that eternal life which was with the Father." In seeking to deny the reality of the Holy Spirit, the assertion of John that "in Him was (ην) life" is thus denied, making Christ's pre-existent life derived, and His claim to be the "I AM" a false claim.

If the "alpha" of apostasy in the Adventist Church involved among other things the nature of God, and it did, could not this distortion of truth about the Holy Spirit, even to the point of doing theological gymnastics with the original text be considered a part of the "omega"? During the last decades we have seen the distortion of the character of God in the denial that He is a God of judgment. In this same period, we have seen a revival of anti-Trinitarianism mingled with Gnosticism. Now we see to what lengths this neo-Gnosticism will go, even to the distortion of the very text of the New Testament to justify the denial of the Holy Spirit as one Person of "the Heavenly Trio." We are faced with two extremes - a Trinitarianism based in Catholicism, and an anti-Trinitarianism which distorts the Word of God.

Let's Talk It Over

On the political scene in the United States we have seen a populace who by their attitude and voice prefer adultery and perjury to justice and moral rectitude. The evidence cited in the series of articles in this issue of WWN indicates that men will defend Scriptural "glosses" to support their Trinitarian beliefs which but echo the teachings of Rome. We have documented that those teaching against the Trinity concept of Rome are willing to distort the very Greek text of Scripture to sustain their theories. Then we see that there are many concerned Adventists who will sit at the feet of these "voices," thus encouraging them in their erroneous theories besides poisoning their own minds with such teachings.

Do we no longer believe that the righteousness of Christ will be the only acceptable entrance permit for the eternal world where the mysteries of redemption will be made plain as we sit at the feet of Jesus? Do we no longer accept the fact that Christ's righteousness is "pure, unadulterated truth" (TM, 65). It appears not. We accept "glitz," "names" and "distortion" in place of the clear word of God. When will we arouse from the stupefying slumber that is overtaking so many concerned Adventists?

"The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light" (Rom. 13:12).

whg

+++++

Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again;
Th' eternal years of God are hers;
But Error, wounded withes in pain,
And dies among his worshippers.

William Cullen Bryant

+++++

"Watchman, What of the Night?" is published monthly by the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 69, Ozone, AR 72854, USA.

Editor, Publications & Research

Elder Wm. H. Grotheer

Regional Contacts:

Australia - P. O. Box 5023, Wodonga Plaza, VIC 3690
Canada - P. O. Box 117, Thorne, ON POH 2J0
The Caribbean - P. O. Box GM 537, Castries, St. Lucia

Any portion of the Thought Paper may be reproduced without further permission by adding the credit line - "Reprinted from WWN, Ozone, Arkansas, USA."

Current copy free upon request; previous and duplicate copies - 50c.

800-4-LAYMEN (800-452-9636)
FAX - (501) 292-3745; Regular Calls - (501) 292-3721