

*"Watchman,
what of the night?"*

"BEHOLD, THE BRIDEGROOM!
Come out to meet Him."

(Matt. 25:6 RSV)



GULLEY'S CHRISTOLOGY

Offers False Christ as Basis for Unity of Church

In six consecutive issues of the Adventist Review, beginning with the January 18, 1990 issue, a series of articles by Dr. Norman R. Gulley of Southern College on Christology was featured. The editors prefaced the series with this comment:

This article begins a series in which the author examines Christ's dual role as example and substitute. He suggests that a meeting of minds on this question can bring us together as a church. In part I he lays the foundation for the other segments, with a call for unity. (p. 8)

These articles by Gulley contain truth mingled with much error. They are but a thinly veiled attack on the doctrine of the incarnation as was once held by the Church, and emphasized by both A. T. Jones and E. J. Waggoner in their 1888 Message. In part I of the series, Gulley notes the issue in 1888 as a balance between the righteousness of Christ and the law. Without once noting the Christology as taught by Jones and Waggoner, he slides into the present and seeks to make the issue - a "balance between two functions of Christ's ministry - substitution and example." (p. 9)

Using a wheel as an example, he closes his first article with the suggestion that one may be able to "get by with a bent spoke or two, but when the hub is off-center, the wheel is in jeopardy." Observe carefully his comment which follows:

That is our doctrinal predicament today in the church. Our greatest need is to understand the truth as it is in Jesus - to grasp the full balanced truth about the God-man, giving place both to the fullness of His divinity and the fullness of His humanity, both to His role as example and substitute." (p. 10)

It is true that the hub is off-center today in

official Adventism. But "unity" is not obtained by keeping it off-center, under a guise of restoration, but rather by returning to the concept of the God-man held at the point of departure. The assault on the doctrine of the incarnation as held and taught by the Church in the time of the 1888 Message has come from two sources, one without the mainstream of Adventism in the Holy Flesh Movement, and the other within the mainstream of the Church at its highest administrative levels. We shall discuss the Holy Flesh teaching of the incarnation later, but first we will focus on the attacks from the highest levels of official Adventism into which category Gulley's articles can be placed, given the space and prominence allotted to them in the Adventist Review.

The official statements of belief up to and including the 1914 Statement read that Christ "took on Him the nature of the seed of Abraham for the redemption of our fallen race." (1914 Yearbook, p. 293) In the 1931 Statement, this was modified to read - "While retaining His divine nature, He took upon Himself the nature of the human family." (SDA Encyclopedia, p. 396) However, each of these statements say one thing in common - Christ took upon Himself the nature of man after the Fall.

The first major attempt to alter this teaching came in 1949, when Dr. Denton E. Rebok, then president of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, was requested by the Review & Herald to revise Bible Readings for the Home Circle. According to Froom, he altered the statement which Froom alleges was placed in the 1914 edition by W. A. Colcord. (Movement of Destiny, p. 428) Yet what was written in the 1914 edition of Bible Readings was in accord with the 1914 Statement of Beliefs. However, Froom refers to Colcord's statement as an "erroneous minority position." (Emphasis mine)

The statement in Bible Readings read:

"God, in Christ, condemned sin, not by pronouncing against it merely as a judge sitting on the judgment-seat, but by coming and living in the flesh, in sinful flesh, and yet without sinning. In Christ, He demonstrated that it was possible, by His grace and power, to resist temptation, overcome sin, and live a sinless life in sinful flesh." (p. 116)

Rebok revised it by omitting that which we emphasized. It should also be noted that this revision was in the chapter on "The Sinless Life," and the note quoted was commenting on the question - "Where did God, in Christ,

condemn sin, and gain the victory for us over temptation and sin?"

The next attack on the doctrine of the incarnation came in the book, Questions on Doctrine issued in 1957 following the compromises made at the SDA-Evangelical Conferences in 1955-56. The book stated:

It could hardly be construed, however, from the record of either Isaiah [53] or Matthew [8], that Jesus was diseased or that He experienced the frailties to which our fallen human nature is heir. But He did **bear** all this. Could it not be that He bore this **vicariously** also, just as He bore the sins of the whole world?

These weaknesses, frailties, failings are things which we, with our sinful, fallen natures, have to bear. To us they are natural, inherent, but when He bore them, He took them not as something innately His, but He bore them as our substitute. He bore them in His perfect, sinless nature. Again we remark, Christ bore all this vicariously, just as vicariously He bore the iniquities of us all. (pp. 59-60; emphasis theirs)

Although born in the flesh, He [Jesus] was nevertheless God, and was **exempt** from the inherited passions and pollutions that corrupt the natural descendants of Adam. (p. 383; emphasis mine)

The word, "exempt" has theological overtones. The Roman Catholic Dogma of the Immaculate Conception notes that "Unlike the rest of the children of Adam, the soul of Mary was never subject to sin, even in the first moment of its inception into the body. She alone was **exempt** from original sin." (The Faith of Our Fathers, 88 ed., p. 171; emphasis mine)

While Gulley ducks this point and substitutes for "exempt" the word, "unaffected," he still arrives at the same basic conclusion indicating that Jesus was exempt or "unaffected" due to a "**miraculous conception**." (AR, January 25, 1990, p. 14; emphasis his) In this he follows Froom using the exact language used by Froom. (The Virgin Birth, unpublished manuscript, p. 20) Yet Gulley would have the reader believe that this position he and Froom take is Biblical by stating - "that is designated by Scripture (e.g., Rom. 5)." (op. cit.) But Romans 5 says no such thing! We do not deny that the birth of Jesus was a miracle of divine grace, but the intent was not as indicated by Gulley or Froom to "exempt" Christ from the fallen nature of man.

The latest evaluation of the doctrines of the Church - SDA's Believe... - holds to a position on the incarnation as advocated by an Anglican clergyman, Henry Melville, who called his view, "the orthodox doctrine." (pp. 47, 57) This Gulley also notes in his articles. (See AR,

Feb. 1, 1990, p. 19 & Footnote #2, p. 22) However, the author of SDA's Believe... was more dependent on Gulley, than Gulley on the book. The acknowledgment reads:

A Christ-centered manuscript on Adventist Doctrines prepared by Norman Gulley, professor of religion at Southern College of Seventh-day Adventists, provided both inspiration and material for this volume. (p. v)

What Is Sin?

In laying the ground work to nullify the doctrine of the incarnation as once held by the Church, Gulley begins with a discussion of the sin problem. If one can enlarge the definition of sin sufficiently to include the results of sin as sin itself, one must accept the Roman Catholic and apostate Protestant concept of the human nature of Christ, in other words, the false Christ.

Gulley asks, "How should we define sin?" Observe most carefully his answer and the context of time in which he frames it. He wrote:

"Within contemporary Seventh-day Adventist thinking, sin is variously defined as breaking the law (act); broken relationship (relationship); and corrupt nature (nature)." (AR, Jan. 25, 1990; emphasis mine)

"Contemporary" Adventism is not historic Adventism. While Gulley recognizes that "The Bible does define sin as an act - 'transgression of the law' (I John 3:4), or 'lawlessness'" (VIV, RSV)," he asks, "But is this all there is to sin?" (Ibid., p. 13) But let us go back in time prior to "contemporary" Adventism and see what was taught. Gulley was my immediate predecessor as head of the Bible Department at Madison College. While chairing the department, he authored a syllabus for Sanctuary Course - 350. Chapter 2 of this syllabus was captioned, "The Sin Problem." His first question reads - "What is sin?" In the answers as outlined, I John 3:4 is quoted and the statement from Ms. 27, 1899, (7BC:951) with this emphasis - "'Sin is the transgression of the law.' THIS IS THE ONLY DEFINITION OF SIN." (p. 7) Interestingly he also notes the concept of "separation" but phrases it - "separation between God and man" - and quotes Isaiah 59:2 - "But your iniquities (acts) have separated between you and your God, and your sins (acts) have hid His face from you, that He will not hear." [the word, "acts" supplied by writer] He also quoted from Steps to Christ with this emphasis - "But this small matter [eating of the forbidden fruit] was the transgression of God's immutable and holy law, and it SEPARATED MAN FROM GOD..."

(Chapter, "Repentance," p. 33)

Basically, the gulf between "contemporary" and "historic" Adventism is over the definition of sin. The evidence is that Gulley has been converted after the modern order of things. Historic Adventism had only one definition for sin - the Biblical - with the concepts of separation from God and the fallen nature, recognized as the results of the first sin. Continued transgression only intensified and broadened those results.

Historic Adventists could understand clearly the results of sin as a separation from God, but they had trouble with the second result - the fallen nature - and this due to the "original sin" concept of Augustine now held by "contemporary" Gulley. This concept teaches "that both the effect and guilt of Adam's sin are imputed to the race." (AR, Jan. 25, p. 12) Guilt and effect need to be separated. The Bible is plain - "And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image." (Gen. 5:3) We are not only conceived in the heat of passion (Ps. 51:5, Heb.) and receive by birth the fallen nature of our parents, even as Seth did from Adam; we also are born into the environment of sin. But the question is the imputation of guilt. Is the fallen nature which makes acts of sin inevitable for us, the basis of condemnation?

God does not condemn us because of what we are through no choice of our own. Condemnation results when we sin willfully and do not take advantage of the grace provided through the love of God, and the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Gulley seeks to make Romans 5 teach that guilt comes upon the race due to Adam's sin. But the text reads in both instances that Adam's offence worked upon all men "unto condemnation" because of the effect of sin, in that all men have sinned, and therefore are condemned. (Rom. 5:16, 18, 12) To teach that God condemns us because of our fallen nature is to cast aspersion upon the character of God and echo the accusations of Satan that God is not a just God.

Further, to teach that the fallen nature is a definition of sin, and so if Christ in His humanity assumed such a nature, He would thus be a sinner and in need of a saviour and could not be a holy "Substitute" is to deny the teaching which the sanctuary reveals. The law of the sin offering reads:

This is the law of the sin offering: In the place where the burnt offering is killed shall the sin offering be killed before the Lord: it is most holy. The priest

that offereth it for sin shall eat it: in the holy place shall it be eaten, in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation. Whatsoever shall touch the flesh thereof shall be holy. (Lev. 6:25-27)

With "contemporary" Adventism denying the truth of the sanctuary doctrine, it is easy for them to imbibe the errors of the evangelicals. But consider the force of the law of the sin offering. By the confession of the individual upon the head of the sacrifice, it became not only a sin bearer, but the very symbol of the sin itself. It was to be killed. "The wages of sin is death." The ministering common priest was to eat it. And where? - in the court, a symbol of earth where the great antitypical Substitute would be offered. But note that symbol which became verily the sinner was declared to be "most holy." The priest though having partaken of the flesh wherein the nature of sin resides was not declared unholy, because he did not the sin. Failure that in any way blurred the significance of this ritual was condemned. Moses chided the sons of Aaron:

Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin offering in the holy place, seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord." (Lev. 10:17)

The common priests bore it by partaking of it. Of Jesus as a common priest, the Scriptures teach that "forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He likewise took part of the same." (Heb. 2:14) God "hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin." (II Cor. 5:21)

What Nature Did Christ Take?

Gulley following the Augustinian concept of "original sin" stresses Psalm 51:5 quoting from the interpretive evangelical version (NIV) David's confession - "I have been... sinful from the time my mother conceived me." This verse he indicates gives "the clearest Old Testament insight into hereditary roots for sin." (AR, Jan. 25, 1990, p. 13) For the "contemporary" Gulley, this makes it impossible for Christ to have taken as His human nature, our fallen nature. Evidently in his zeal for Romans 5, he has forgotten Romans 1:1, 3 where Paul states what is part of the Gospel. This reads: "... the gospel of God,... concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh." The only body of flesh which Mary could form in her womb was a flesh with the nature she received from David plus all the rest of her fathers and mothers between herself and David. The body that Christ took

was subject to the human inheritance of "the seed of David."

Now there was a Divine intervention in the formation of the body which was to be the human body of Jesus. The Scriptures plainly teach, putting the words as from Jesus - "A body hast Thou prepared Me." (Heb. 10:5) For Mary to have conceived without the introduction of the male sperm would have produced a female body. The Bible declares that she knew no man. (Luke 1:34) However, the victorious Christ is stated to be a "man child" - a male, sexually. (Rev. 12:5; Greek, arsen) The power of God introduced the y-chromosome.

There is another key factor in the revelation of the God-man that dare not be overlooked. Jesus Christ was pre-existent! In this He was indeed different from any other person of human origin. "The Word was God,... and the Word was made flesh." (John 1:2, 14) The Divine Identity who had co-existed with God throughout all eternity, by a painful process known alone to God and Himself, divested Himself of the "form" of God and united the body prepared in the womb of Mary to Himself. That body is declared to have been "the slave form" of man. (Phil. 2:7, Greek) Again the picture emerges: The unfallen Adam did not have a slave form, but the fallen Adam so became. This "slave form" Adam passed to all his children through "the great law of heredity." From this law, Christ was not "exempt."

The Writings give a very interesting picture of the union between the Divine and the body formed in the womb of Mary. It states of Christ - "He united humanity with divinity: a divine spirit dwelt in a temple of flesh. He united Himself with the temple." (YI, Dec. 20, 1900; 4BC:1147) This casts light on what would be an otherwise difficult text. The angel told Mary - "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy [spirit] which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." (Luke 1:35) The word, "thing" as in the KJV is supplied not being in the Greek text. The quotation from The Youth's Instructor helps us to fill in the right word.

The reason for the nature that Christ assumed can be viewed from another angle. The last enemy to be destroyed will be death. (I Cor. 15:26) By Whom and through what means? We read "that through death" Jesus would destroy him that "had the power of death" and "deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." (Heb. 2:14-15)

TEXTS & REFERENCES

Since the articles by Gulley appeared in the *Adventist Review*, I have received a letter from one who was following each issue closely. The person was perplexed about Gulley's suggestion that Christ used His divine power in the conflict with sin. He used a reference from the Writings in the form of a question that "Christ's humanity alone could never have endured" the test in the wilderness, "but His divine power combined with the humanity gained in behalf of man an infinite victory." (*AR*, Feb. 1, 1990, p. 22) This was footnoted and other references from the Scriptures as well as the Writings were given but **not** quoted. We do well to look at these texts and references.

Jesus said - "I can of mine own self do nothing." (John 5:30) To His disciples, He revealed the secret of His power. He told them in the upper room - "The Father that dwells in Me, He doeth the works." (John 14:10) It was God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. Christ had emptied Himself to be only an instrument of divine grace and truth. (John 1:14) Herein is the example. As God was in Christ, so Christ by His Spirit is to be in us, the hope of glory. (Col. 1:27) But there must be the same emptying as He emptied Himself.

The references in the Writings are worth noting. They read:

When Jesus was awakened to meet the storm, He was in perfect peace. There was no trace of fear in word or look, for no fear was in His heart. But He rested not in the possession of almighty power... That power He had laid down, ... He trusted in the Father's might. It was in faith - faith in God's love and care - that Jesus rested, and the power of that word which stilled the storm was the power of God. (*DA*, pp. 335-336; 1935 ed.)

Christ in His humanity was dependent upon divine power. (*Ibid.*, p. 675)

Stress is placed by Gulley on the fact that one of Christ's severest temptations was to keep to the level of humanity. This is true, but in what way since He laid aside His divine powers? In Heaven He was Commander. He could summon, and hosts of angels would respond. To resist the use of this authority is noted in the Bible. But even this while in humanity was through the Father. (Matt. 26:53)

We seem not to sense what the incarnation actually was. Let me illustrate: If that indefinable thing called self identity which is "me" were to operate in and through another body which was not restricted to the limitations of earth, what could I do differently than I can do now? Much in every way! In Christ's incarnation, He - the Divine Identity that had existed prior to Bethlehem as Michael - came to exist in a body prepared in the womb of Mary. The divine prerogatives resultant from the form of His eternal existence, He laid aside. In the "likeness of men" (Phil. 2:7) what could He do? Just what He said - "I can of mine own self do nothing" because He was not existing in the form by which to do.

When we get to the bottom line, the issue is not about His divinity. He was eternally divine. But what is the meaning of "He took upon Himself the form of a servant"? The Greek indicates that form to be a "slave form." Then there is the other closely related text - "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh." (Rom. 8:3) Gulley does not put these two together. He associates Romans 8:3 with the brazen serpent of the wilderness, writing - "Just as that brazen serpent only looked like a serpent, so the sinless Jesus only took the 'likeness of sinful flesh.'" (*AR*, Feb. 8, 1990, p. 9; emphasis his) While he seeks to justify this association by a quotation from the Writings, it is doubtful that the application he makes of the comparison was the true intent of the statement.

In Romans 8:3, the word for likeness in the Greek is, *homoiōmati*. This same word, in the same dative form, is used by Paul in Philippians 2:8 in the phrase - "in the likeness of men." Now is Gulley going to say that Jesus in His humanity only looked like a man, but really wasn't a man - just a phantom! What seems so utterly impossible to perceive is that Christ in taking our fallen, sinful nature did not sin. We look at things seen - our fellow associates that are daily with us, and we see sinners even in the best of them. But the Word says that in the "likeness of sinful flesh," Jesus did not sin! This is by faith, and that is what the victory is all about.

Gulley calls for "balance," and he quoted liberally from the Writings in seeking to sustain his positions. Gulley is not ignorant and knows what all researchers come to know in studying the Writings on major theological subjects. The question is why did he not quote some of the following available statements on the nature

LET'S TALK IT OVER

To take issue with a person one has known and respected over past years is much more difficult than to "cross swords" with one known only by name. The contact with Elder Gulley began prior to my following him as head of the Bible Department at Madison College. We had joined together with Elder W. D. Frazee on the Wildwood Campus for a study of certain basic concepts of Adventism which were placed in jeopardy as a result of the release of the book, Questions on Doctrine. It was a deeply rewarding experience with each presenting a topic followed by a give and take discussion of each one's topic.

When invited to follow Elder Gulley on the Madison College campus, I felt very comfortable in teaching the classes which he had taught because I knew that students would not be challenging me with "Elder Gulley didn't teach that," or "Elder Gulley said it was this way." I also became aware that during his time at Madison, he prepared various syllabi for the classes, some of which I have kept in file. Besides this, for students in the upper classes, he assigned the preparation of commentaries on various books of the Bible. These commentaries consisted of verse by verse comments taken from the Writings of Ellen G. White.

After leaving Madison College, Elder Gulley took graduate work at the Edinburgh University in Scotland where he received his doctorate. The evidence indicates that it was during this advanced study that his theological thinking changed so as to accommodate to "contemporary" Adventism. In 1982, the Review & Herald published for him the controversial book, Christ Our Substitute. In the "Preface," he wrote - "Beyond the credits given in the book, I am indebted to a year's class in Christology from Professor T. F. Torrance of Endinburgh University; ..."

Gulley may reply that the change in his theological thinking from his teaching days at Madison College to the present represents a "growth in grace." But "growth in grace is not a retreat into heresy. One results from the guidance of the Spirit of truth into a greater discerning of truth; the other is a work of the flesh (Gal. 5:20) so as to avoid "the offence of the cross." While it is true that everyone upon whom "the light of present truth" has shown is accountable to develop

"that truth on a higher scale than it has hitherto been done," it does not mean that we are to present concepts which our spiritual forefathers knew to be heresy and call it truth. It is to be the development of "that truth" which we have received to a clearer perception. This is to be our duty!

In the Fall of 1987, a group of Andrews University professors set in motion the formation of an Adventist Theological Society. A year later, the Religion Department of Southern College took action to invite the faculty of the Seminary to the college campus to develop a constitution and bylaws for such a society. Dr. Norman Gulley served as secretary pro tem of this organizational committee. Already there had been established at Southern College an Ellen G. White Memorial Chair in Religion. Further in connection with this, as a part of creating a better church "image" for the college, a new publication was launched - Adventist Perspectives - edited by Gordon M. Hyde. In all of this activity, Norman Gulley is very conspicuous. He is listed as a "contributor" to the journal, and if I have all of the issues, there is to be found in each, a major article by Gulley.

I have followed carefully these various articles. His article in the Adventist Perspectives (Vol. II, No. 2) was a detailed presentation of which the second article in the Adventist Review series was but a summary. At the time of the release in 1988, I gave it careful study intending to devote an issue of WWN in response. However, this series in AR has afforded a better opportunity with an abbreviated reply which can be better understood by the average lay reader.

In the last issue for 1989 (Vol. III, No. 3), Gulley writes on "A Deeper Look at the Investigate Judgment." In reading this article, I noticed certain assumptions were made without Biblical validation. I wrote to Dr. Gulley asking for the Bible texts which supported these assertions. This was in November, 1989. There was no response. I followed up a month later. In reply, Gulley indicated he never received the letter, and the Postal Service did not return it to me. I made a copy of the first letter and forwarded the same to him. His response was a note at the bottom of my letter - "God bless you with His presence! We are nearing home. His coming is soon!" Still no Bible references! He referred me to some pages in Patriarch & Prophets. This is not the way a

gentleman and a scholar should or would respond; nor the way the Norman Gulley I had known in past decades would have responded.

The question must be raised: Is that which is taking place in the theological circles of the Church as reflected in the formation of the Adventist Theological Society, Southern College's Ellen G. White Memorial Chair in Religion, and Adventist Perspectives, symbolically portrayed in Gulley's response when demanded a "Thus saith the Lord" for a theological position taken? (See GC, p. 595, par. one) We have written to the Adventist Theological Society asking them to explain an incongruity in their bylaws. This request was written on December 29, 1989, and as of this date, April 1, 1990, there has been no reply even though a follow-up letter was sent. We expect to discuss more about the incongruity of the by-laws of the Society in a future issue of WVN.

#

"References & Texts" from p. 5, col. 2

Christ took, which the Bible calls the "slave form" of man. Here are a few:

The victory gained was designed, not only to set an example to those who have fallen under the power of appetite, but to qualify the Redeemer for His special work of reaching to the very depths of human woe. By experiencing in Himself the strength of Satan's temptation, and of human sufferings and infirmities, He would know how to succor those who should put forth efforts to help themselves. (EGW, R&H, March 18, 1875)

[Gulley - "Nowhere do inspired sources speak of Satan appealing to some fallen inclination within Jesus, for He was sinless by nature." (AR, Feb. 1, 1990, p. 21)]

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, meet in Jesus - the Son of God, and the Son of man." (Ms. 141, 1901; 7BC:926)

Think of Christ's humiliation. He took upon Himself fallen, suffering human nature, degraded and defiled by sin. (YI, Dec. 20, 1900; 4BC:1147)

#

ANNUAL FELLOWSHIP - July 30 - August 4. Already reservations are coming in. When our capacity is reached, the only openings will be cancellations. Besides the seminar on the Elijah Message, the afternoon Bible Study Hour will be devoted to study of the Biblical Basis of the Incarnation.

Gulley's Christology - from page 4, col. 2

What risk was demanded of Jesus to achieve this objective? "Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren." (Heb. 2:17) Death is the result of our "slave form." Jesus could not by-pass this and conquer death. But to be a sinless Substitute, He had to overcome the liabilities of that form, which had become to man an irresistible force and make it a conquered power. Jesus entered the house of the strong man, and bound him, then spoiled his goods providing for the release of his captives. (Matt. 12:29)

When Jesus prevailed, there was heard in Heaven "a loud voice" proclaiming - "Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of His Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down." (Rev. 12:10) Why do men want to rob Jesus of His great victory? Why do we pervert truth to deny Him the full salvation His own arm wrought - not only over acts of sin, but over the very nature which in all the rest of humanity breaks forth into sin?

Because He emptied Himself and took the slave form of man becoming "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross,... God hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name." (Phil 2:7-9) Then why do we go about doing Satan's work seeking to denigrate that glorious name under the guise that we are seeking to have a holy "Substitute." He is not only holy, but He is a "most holy" Sin Offering - a Brother to us in fallen humanity, and our Saviour in the sacrifice of Himself, the Victorious One!

#

Note: In the June issue of WVN, we will discuss the teaching of the Incarnation in the Holy Flesh Movement.

"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.

In Canada write - The Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Canada, P. O. Box 117, Thorne, Ont. P0H 2J0.

Editor Elder Wm. H. Grotheer
Contributing Editor Allen Stump

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

First copy free upon request; duplicate copies --- 50¢.