Compilers Note:—The following is where the inference is most drawn, that U. Smith wrote “Christ was created.” Here; below in Daniel and Revelation pg. 329.4, 330.3, 335.2 These result in him and other SDA pioneers being charged with being Arian or semi-Arian. You will see IF he does-is; or not? Those who make this charge end up with either a two person Godhead or the alternative of one being acting three different parts-manifestations. Explaining the God Head is an Impossible task, Not clearly revealed in OT Scriptures the lines between them are blurred—which is it that walked with Adam, and appeared to Moses? etc. Who was it? Not until the NT do we see the God Head Appear/evolve as separate/ distinct individuals Gen. 1:26. Yet Christ Said. “Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape” John 5:37, “Not that any man hath seen the Father” John 6:46, and the NT Scripture says “No man hath seen God at any time” John 1:18. Therefor an attempt must be seasoned by the listener with forbearance.

Note: Before the incarnation there could be no Christ—only the promise of, for He had the choice of not making the offering of His life for our salvation—He had not yet become Christ—it is in this sense that Christ—that manifestation of God did not exist, born of a woman—begotten—had a beginning. As Israel would say after the death of King Saul, King David slew Goliath, so we, who are after His first advent can say it was Christ that walked with Adam, talked with Moses, etc. Likewise these manifestations of God are what Smith and others writers wish to express, as a source of HOPE.

Uriah Smith on Arianism!

Such were the influences clustering around the bishop of Rome, and thus was everything tending toward his speedy elevation to the supreme spiritual throne of Christendom. But the fourth century was destined to witness an obstacle thrown across the path of this ambitious dream. Arius, parish priest of the ancient and influential church of Alexandria, sprung his doctrine upon the world, occasioning so fierce a controversy in the Christian church that a general council was called at Nicaea, by the emperor Constantine, A.D.325, to consider and adjust it. Arius maintained "that the Son was totally and essentially distinct from the Father; that he was the first and noblest of those beings whom the Father had created out of nothing, the instrument by whose subordinate operation the Almighty Father formed the universe, and therefore inferior to the Father both in nature and dignity." This opinion was condemned by the council, which decreed that Christ was of one and the same substance with the Father. Hereupon Arius was
banished to Illyria, and his followers were compelled to give their assent to the creed composed on that occasion. (Mosheim, cent.4, part 2, chap.4: Stanley, History of the Eastern Church, p.239.) {1897 UrS, DAR 144.2}

**Uriah Smith’s own Words**

**DANIEL AND THE REVELATION.**

**BY URIAH SMITH 1897 CHAPTER I**

**THE OPENING VISION.** page 329.4

*The Source of Blessing.*—”From him which is, and which was, and which is to come,” or is to be,—an expression which signifies complete eternity, past and future, and can be applicable to God the Father only. This language, we believe, is never applied to **Christ.** He is spoken of as another person, in distinction from the being thus described.

Note: the Point of importance is “Christ” which had a beginning—born of a woman—begotten, “in distinction from,” not distinct from!

page 330.3

*And from Jesus Christ.*—Then **Christ** is not the person who, in the verse before us, is designated as him which is, and which was, and which is to come. Some of the chief characteristics which pertain to Christ are here mentioned. He is,—

page 335.2

Here another speaker is introduced. Previous to this, John has been the speaker. But this verse has no connection with what precedes nor with what follows. Who it is who here speaks must be determined, therefore, by the terms used. Here we again have the expression, “Which is, and which was, and which is to come,” which has already been noticed as referring exclusively to God. But it may be asked, Does not the word **Lord** denote that it was Christ? On this point Barnes has the following note: Many MSS. instead of ‘Lord,’ read ‘God,’ and this reading is adopted by Griesback, Tittman, and Hahn, and is now regarded as the correct reading. Bloomfield supplies the word **God,** and marks the words “the beginning and the ending” as an interpolation. Thus appropriately closes the first principal division of this chapter, with a revelation of himself by the great God as being of an eternity of existence, past and future, and of almighty power, and hence able to
perform all his threatenings and his promises, which he has given us in this book.

Note: it will be noticed Smith nowhere says Christ was created etc., those things with which he is charged as being arian.

CHAPTER III
THE SEVEN CHURCHES CONTINUED.

page 371.2
These Things Saith the Amen.—This is, then, the final message to the churches ere the close of probation. And though the description of their condition which he gives to the indifferent Laodiceans is fearful and startling, nevertheless it cannot be denied; for the Witness is “faithful and true.” Moreover, he is “the beginning of the creation of God.” Some attempt by this language to uphold the error that Christ was a created being, dating his existence anterior to that of any other created being or thing, next to the self-existent and eternal God. But the language does not necessarily imply that he was created; for the words, “the beginning of the creation,” may simply signify that the work of creation, strictly speaking, was begun by him. “Without him was not anything made.” Others, however, and more properly we think, take the word to mean the “agent” or “efficient cause,” which is one of the definitions of the word, understanding that Christ, is the agent through whom God has created all things, but that the Son came into existence in a different manner, as he is called “the only begotten” of the Father. It would seem utterly inappropriate to apply this expression to any being created in the ordinary sense of that term. For “beginning,” read “beginner,”

LOOKING UNTO JESUS

. . . OR . . .

CHRIST IN TYPE AND ANTITYPE

BY URIAH SMITH 1898

CHAPTER II.
God alone is without beginning. At the earliest epoch when a beginning could be,—a period so remote that to finite minds it is essentially eternity,—appeared the Word. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” John 1:1. This uncreated Word was the Being, who, in the fulness of time, was made flesh, and dwelt among us. His beginning was not like that of any other being in the universe. It is set forth in the mysterious expressions, “his [God’s] only begotten Son” (John 3:16; 1John 4:9), “the only begotten of the Father” (John 1:14), and, “I proceeded forth and came from God.” John 8:42. Thus it appears that by some divine impulse or process, not creation, known only to Omniscience, and possible only to Omnipotence, the Son of God appeared. And then the Holy Spirit (by an infirmity of translation called .. the Holy Ghost”), the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, the divine afflatus and medium of their power, representative of them both (Ps.139:7), was in existence also.

This Son was in the likeness of the Father, and was equal with the Father. So Paul testified to the brethren at Philippi. Phil.2:5-8: “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: . . . and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.” The word “robbery” here signifies something to be “grasped after,” “held fast to,” or “preferred” to some other thing, placed in comparison therewith. Man had sinned, and must perish unless some means for his redemption could be devised. No one but Christ, the only being save God, above law, and therefore able to meet the demands of the law in behalf of the sinner, could rescue him. But would he do it? This was the question, so momentous to the human race, that troubled in the balance. Christ was there, the associate Majesty of heaven, equal with the Father, and sharing equally in the glory; and he could have “held fast to,” and have “preferred” to remain in, that condition. But in that case, man must perish. Shall he retain his position, and leave man to die? or shall he yield up his station, and go to the help of a rebel world? This was the question which was to manifest to an amazed universe the “mind of Christ.” Rejoice, O earth! He did not think it “robbery,” or something to be “chosen” or “preferred” to hold fast his position of equality with the Father in heaven, to which he was justly ordained, and leave the world to its ruin; but by a boundless impulse of love, he sprang at once to the relief of the perishing. He left his heavenly station, divested
himself of all his celestial environment, emptied himself of his glory and honor, made himself of no reputation, assumed the nature of the seed of Abraham, took the form of a servant among men, and obeyed, in man’s behalf, the demands of the law, even to the death of the cross, that whosoever would believe in him might not perish, but have everlasting life.

The apostle, in this passage, is contrasting the original exaltation of the Lord Jesus with the humiliation he was willing to suffer for the sake of man; but one whole side of the contrast is lost, unless Christ was, before he undertook man’s redemption, in such a position of equality with God. That he did hold such a position, therefore, Paul must be understood as plainly affirming. He corroborates the declaration of John, that “the Word was God.”

In this condition of glory, Christ Jesus antedated all things. In Rev.3:14, he calls himself by a title which the translators have rendered “the beginning of the creation of God,” and which some hold to mean that the work of creation was begun, not by, but with him, thus degrading him to the level of a created being; whereas, the meaning of the word would suggest rather the idea of “headship,” and present him, not as the “beginning,” but as the beginner, of the creation of God; and the demands of harmony with other scriptures hold us imperatively to this construction. No work of creation was accomplished till after Christ became an active agent upon the scene; for all this work was wrought through him. John says: “All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made.” Paul to the Hebrews corroborates the words of John. He says that God hath appointed his Son “heir of all things;” that he is the express image of his person,” the “brightness of his glory,” and that by him “he made the world.” Heb. 1:2,3. But to the Colossians he bears a still more definite testimony. In chapter 1:15-17, he says of Christ: “Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature: for by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist.”

With the Son, the evolution of deity, as deity, ceased. All else, of things animate or inanimate, has come in by creation of the Father and the Son—the Father the antecedent cause, the Son the acting agent through whom all has been wrought. No ranks of intelligences, it matters not how high, above or below; no orders of cherubim or seraphim; no radiant thrones or extensive dominions, principalities, or powers, but were created by our Lord Jesus Christ. He was before them all, above
them all, and the supporter of all; for *by him all things consist.*” To the Hebrews the same apostle declares that he upholds “all things by the word of his power.” Heb.1:3. And the four and twenty elders in the heavenly world, in their adoration of him who sits upon the throne, exclaimed, “Thou are worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.” Rev.4:11. It is no marvel that Christ, in his last prayer for his disciples should make mention of the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, and express a desire that they, too, in his own good time, might have the privilege of beholding it with him. John 17:5,24.

Thus are we brought to the epoch of the creation of our world. The scriptures already referred to, show us the part Christ bore in this display of almighty power. When, in the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth (Genesis 1), Christ was the creative agent through whom it was accomplished: for “without him was not anything made that was made.” John1:3. When the Spirit of God moved, or brooded, upon the face of the waters, it was the Spirit of Christ, with its vivifying power, that hovered over the deep. When God said, “Let there be light” (Gen.1:3), and “light was,” it was Christ’s voice that spoke. “That God,” said Luther, “which speaks not out of Christ’s mouth, is not God.” And when God saw everything that he had made, and behold it was very good, it was Christ’s eyes that swept over the glorious scene. When he spoke, and it was done, and commanded, and it stood fast (Ps.33:6-9), it was Christ who pronounced the omnific word.

**Christ the Author of the Sabbath.**—The same being who wrought in the creation of this earth, and the arrangement of it for the habitation of man, who had ordained the marriage institution, and had placed the first human pair in possession of their goodly heritage, was the same one who spent the seventh day in holy rest and contemplation, and thus laid the foundation of the Sabbath for the new-fledged world. He then blessed the day and set it apart for holy use. Severing it by a boundary which never should be invaded, from all secular time, he dedicated it forever to the worship of himself, and the memory of his creative work; for, says the record, he “sanctified” it; that is, he put it under the guardianship of a definite statue, formulated to regulate its observance. To “sanctify” means nothing less than this. When Christ declared so emphatically to the people of his time that “the Sabbath was made for man” (Mark 2:27), he knew whereof he affirmed; *for he was*
the very one who performed the acts that made it, and he knew, better than man can know, its object and intent.

Christ Spoke the Law from Sinai.—As the Sabbath law proclaimed from Sinai was but a reiteration of the “sanctification” of the Sabbath pronounced in Eden; and as Christ was the one who there enshrined it in changeless precept for the human family, it follows that he must have been the one, also, who proclaimed it, with the other commandments of the moral law, from Sinai; not, indeed, independently of the Father, but in conjunction with him, as in all the other works in which they acted conjointly. That it was the voice of Christ that fell upon the ears of the people from the quaking mount, as the principles of God’s law were announced in such grandeur and power, is plainly stated by the writer of the book of Hebrews. Speaking of “Jesus the mediator of the new covenant,” and referring to the time when the law was proclaimed amid the thunder and flames of Sinai, he says: “Whose voice then shook the earth: but now he that promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven.” Heb. 12:26.

That this is spoken of Christ there can be no question. The earth bowed beneath the tread of Deity; and the awful voice that uttered the precepts of the moral law, was a voice which paralyzed with fear the Hebrew hosts. It caused even Moses to fear and quake exceedingly, and shook the whole solid earth. The whole world heard that voice, and trembled at its power, because the whole world lay within the purview of the law there uttered; and as that voice was the voice of Christ, it shows us his relation to that grand royal table of ten commandments; but that does not divorce the Father from the scene. Inseparable from the Father in the creation of all things, inseparable from him in the ordaining of law and the establishing of government through all his glorious realms, he is not to be separated from him in the awe-inspiring scenes of Sinai. Acting for the Father, in whatever in their united counsel they willed to do, so he spoke for the Father, in whatever they had occasion to proclaim. Equal in the authority by which law was enacted, they were equally concerned in its promulgation. Whatever God does, Christ does, because God does it through him; and whatever Christ does, God does, because Christ does it by him. And as in actions, so in words: God’s words are Christ’s words, because God speaks by him; and Christ’s words are God’s words, because Christ receives them from him. Thus Paul says: “God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.” Heb.1:1,2. And Christ himself and previously testified that his works were the works of Him that sent
him, and that his words were not his own, but such as he had received of the Father. John 14:10,24.

This union between the Father and the Son does not detract from either, but strengthens both. Through it, in connection with the Holy Spirit, we have all of Deity. Through it we are enabled to “see Jesus” in all his fulness and glory; for so it pleased God that in him should “all fulness dwell,” even “the fulness of the Godhead bodily.” Col.1:19; 2:9. And “looking unto Jesus,” we thus behold him, when as yet there was Deity alone in all the universe.

As related to all else, animate and inanimate, all shining worlds that people space, all orders of intelligences, above and below, thrones, dominions, principalities and powers, visible and invisible, he antedated them all, as in uncreated being, derived from God, he took his place, as “the only begotten Son” of the Father.” “In the beginning was the Word.” In point of existence he was thus before them all. And then began creation, of which he was the “beginner.” To all below him he was the Creator. And as to him they owe existence, upon him they lean for constant preservation; for he upholds “all things by the word of his power.” Heb.1:3. On the basis of this relationship, it need not be stated that all worlds and dominions, all ranks and orders of beings, are therefore under his authority and subject to his will. Standing thus at the head of the universe, and all things therein, creator, upholder, and ruler of all, what flight of imagination could span the measure of his glory and power?

Note Page 14 Paragraph 2 through 15 para., 1 is the reason why they so violently attack Smith, he points to Christ as the originator of the Sabbath, in-spite of sunday keepers claim for why they worship on the 1st day of the week.

“You will notice in these few verses the apostle brings to view the three great agencies which are concerned in this work: God, the Father; Christ, His Son; and the Holy Spirit.” (Uriah Smith, March 14, 1891,

“It thus becomes a matter of great interest to investigate the testimony if the scriptures concerning the text to which the LORD designed that the Spirit should MANIFEST ITSELF in the church during the period of human probation.” {Patriarchs and Prophets. Introduction. 2.3}. 

S.N. Haskell
PROPHETIC WAYMARKS CHAPTER V
A GLIMPSE OF HEAVEN
By Stephen N. Haskell
page 495.2-496.0. 500.2.
or SEER OF PATMOS pg. 93.2-94.0. 98.2.

Back in the ages, which finite mind cannot fathom, the Father and Son were alone in the universe. Christ was the first begotten of the Father, and to Him Jehovah made known" First Born. . . .

There was, in the life of Emmanuel, a union of divinity with humanity. Christ was the firstborn in heaven; He was likewise the firstborn of God upon earth, and heir to the Father's throne. Christ, the firstborn, though the Son Of God, was clothed in humanity, and was made perfect through suffering. He took the form of man, and through eternity, He will remain a man. Every firstborn into human families is a type of the offering made by Christ.

James White.

The inexplicable Trinity that makes the Godhead three in one and one in three, is bad enough; but that ultra Unitarianism that makes Christ inferior to the Father is worse. Did God say to an inferior, "Let us make man in our image?" (RH, November 29, 1877) J. W.

Note: James White makes it clear he does not view Christ as inferior to the Father, and the error of religions that teach one God being manifested in three different roles.

Why the First Begotten and Foreordained.

By Uriah Smith

The chief objection to this view is this: If Moses was raised so many years before the resurrection of Christ, how can Christ be called the first-fruits of them that slept, as in 1 Cor. 15:20,23 how can he be said to be the first that should rise from the dead, as in Acts 26:23 or be called the first begotten, and first begotten of the dead, as in Hebrews 1:6 and Rev. 1:5? or the first-born among many brethren, the first-born of every creature, and the first-born from the dead, as in Rom. 8:29 and Colossians 1:15,18? . . . {HereAndHereAfter US 164.3}

In answering these queries, we first call attention to an important fact: Several individuals, of whom we have explicit account, were raised to life before the
resurrection of Christ. The following cases may be cited: (1) the widow’s son (1 Kings 17:22). (2) The son of the Shunammite (2 Kings 4:35); (3) the unknown man raised to life by touching the bones of Elisha (2 Kings 13:21); (1) the son of the widow of Nain (Luke 7:14); (5) the rulers daughter (Luke 8:50,55); and (6) Lazarus. {Here and Hereafter. US 165.1}

These instances cannot be disposed of by making a distinction between a resurrection to mortality and one to, immortality; for where does the Bible make any such distinction in these cases, or in the resurrection per se? Or where does it give even an affirmation of anything of the kind? Christ, in sending word to John of the results of his work, told the disciples to tell him, among other things, that the dead were raised up. And when the wicked are restored to life (which will be to mortal life only), it is called a resurrection, no less so than the restoration of the righteous to eternal life. (See John 5:29; Acts 24:15; Rev. 20:5.) Therefore in the matter of being raised from the dead, the Bible recognizes no distinction in the act itself on account of the different conditions to which the different classes are raised. Hence the cases referred to above, were resurrections from the dead just as really as though they had been raised to immortality; and the distinction which some attempt to make, is thus shown to be wholly gratuitous, and is excluded from the controversy. {HereAndHereAfter US 165.2}

The objection now lies just as much against the cases of those of whose resurrection we have the most explicit account, as against that of Moses. And the question next to be met is, Can those passages which declare that a number of the dead were raised before the resurrection of Christ, and those which speak of Christ as the first to be raised, be shown to be free from contradiction? {HereAndHereAfter US 165.3}

It will be noticed that the objection, so far as the words “first-fruits,” “first-begotten,” and “first-born” are concerned, rests wholly upon the supposition that these words denote exclusively priority in time. It instantly vanishes when the fact is presented that these words are not confined to this meaning. {HereAndHereAfter US 166.1}

Christ is called the first-fruits in 1 Cor. 15:20,23, solely in reference to his being the antitype of the wave-sheaf, and in contrast with the great harvest that will take place at his second coming. This word is used in different senses, as we learn from James 1:18 and Rev. 14:4, where it cannot have reference to antecedence in time. This is all that need be said on this word. {HereAndHereAfter US 166.2}

The word rendered “first-begotten” and “first-born” is greekword (prototokos). This word is defined by Robinson thus Properly the first-born of father or mother. And, as the first-born was entitled to certain prerogatives and privileges over the rest of the family, the word takes another meaning; namely, I first-born, the same as the first, the chief, one highly distinguished and pre-eminent. So of Christ, as
the beloved Son of God. Col. 1:15. Greenfield’s definition is similar. This word is used in the same sense in the Septuagint. In Exodus 1:22 Israel is called the first-born; and in Jeremiah 31:9 Ephraim is called the first-born; but, in point of time, Esau was before Israel, and Manasseh before Ephraim. Their being called the first-born must therefore be owing to the rank, dignity, and station, to which they had attained. {HereAndHereAfter US 166.3}

When Christ left heaven to die for a lost world, he left behind, for the time being, his immortality also. but how could that be laid aside? That it was laid aside is sure, or he could not have died; but he did die, as a whole, as a divine being, as the Son of God, not in body only, while the spirit, the divinity, lived right on; for then the world would have only a human Saviour, a human sacrifice for its sins; but the prophet says that “his soul” was made “an offering for sin.” Isa.53:10. But how this could be done, is a question like a hundred other questions that might be asked concerning this heaven-devised transaction, the answers to which the finite mind could never grasp. The nature, though not the manner, of this marvelous event, Paul partially reveals in 1Tim.3:16: “And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.” “The Word,” says John, “was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.” John 1:14. Again we read: “But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death” (Heb.2:9), that is, that he might suffer death. {LUJ US 23.2}

Luke. 3:38 Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God.

1John 3:1 Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God:

Foreknown, And Predestinated?

LOOKING UNTO JESUS

. . .OR. . .

CHRIST IN TYPE AND
When the plan of salvation had been formed, and Christ had elected to give his life for the redemption of men, he was then, already, in the intent and purpose of that plan, the offered victim, and is spoken of as the “Lamb slain”—“slain from the foundation of the world” (κόσμος), or from the time when the redemptive economy was established. Rev.13:8. It will be noticed that he is not said to have been slain before the foundation of the world, implying that the fall of man and redemption by the death of Christ, were events fixed and foreordained before the world was formed, and man created. This would place too powerful a weapon against the divine government, in the hands of the skeptic.

But the disbeliever asks with an air of expected victory, Did not God foreknow that man would sin? Was it not therefore a settled fact that he would sin? And did not God, therefore, when he made man with that certainty before him, become responsible for the entrance of sin into this world?—So it might look from that point of view, and with that method of reasoning. But as the Scriptures do not so express it, it is not necessary to formulate it to such a conclusion. God made man, as he must make all intelligences who are to serve him, a free moral agent, that such service may not be mechanical and constrained, but voluntary and free. As such, he could obey or disobey; could maintain his rectitude or fall into sin. His course was to be determined by his own choice. God did not force him to sin, nor did he intend that he should sin. On the other hand, he made every possible inducement (short of constraining his free will) to keep him in the path of obedience. Being free, of course God knew that he might sin; but this would be a very different thing from saying that he know that he would sin.

And is not this as far as it is necessary to go? To God’s omniscience, every possible course that Adam might take as a free spirit, with a free choice, and every possible contingency that might arise from his uncoerced action, was open and plain. So, also, every step necessary to meet that contingency would be provided for should it occur. But, it will be asked, does not Peter (1Pet.1:20) say that Christ was foreordained to his work before the foundation of the world?—No;
not “foreordained,” as in the common version, but *foreknown* (προεγνωσμένου). Christ could be foreknown, in God’s plan, as a redeemer, to meet a possible contingency of that nature that might arise, without being foreordained to meet a known necessity already in existence. Man chose to sin; then that One foreknown in the counsels of eternity, to meet such a contingency should it arise, entered upon his work, and in the fulness of time was, as Peter says, manifested to the world.

This view of the subject does not restrict the attribute of God’s foreknowledge, but greatly enhances it; it leaves man a free moral agent, as he was; and it leaves the skeptic without a case. Christ could, therefore, properly be spoken of only as slain *from* the foundation of the world, just as the Scriptures do speak of him; for it would be as manifestly inconsistent to speak of him as slain *before* the foundation of the world, before the course of man called for such a sacrifice, as it would have been to introduce a type of Christ in the garden of Eden, previous to the fall of man, before a redeemer had become a necessity.

1 Sam. 2:3 Talk no more so exceeding proudly; let [not] arrogancy come out of your mouth: for the LORD is a God of knowledge, and *by him actions are weighed*.

In the councils of heaven before the creation of the world, when it was planned that man should people the earth, there arose the question, *What if man should sin*, as Satan has sinned? Christ answered this question. The infinite Son of God pledged Himself that *if man should sin*, He would give Himself, His life, as a ransom for the fallen race, taking upon Himself the transgression of humanity. The Innocent would bear the sins of the guilty, and stand before God to make intercession in behalf of the transgressor. {2SAT 229.4}

In the *councils of heaven*, before the world was created, the *Father and the Son covenanted together* that *if man proved disloyal* to God, Christ, one with the Father, would take the place of the transgressor, and suffer the penalty of justice that must fall upon him (MS 145, 1897). {6BC 1070.4}

His followers were seeking him, and he aroused himself and, assuming a look of defiance, informed them of his plans to wrest from God the noble Adam and his companion Eve. *If he* could in any way beguile them to disobedience, God would make some provision whereby they might be pardoned, and then himself and all the fallen angels would be in a fair way to share with them of God's mercy. If this should fail, *they could* unite with Adam and Eve, for when once they should
transgress the law of God they would be subjects of God's wrath, like themselves. Their transgression would place them, also, in a state of rebellion, and they could unite with Adam and Eve, take possession of Eden, and hold it as their home. And if they (Satan and his angels) could gain access to the tree of life in the midst of the garden, their strength would, they thought, be equal to that of the holy angels, and even God Himself could not expel them. {SR 27.3}

Never can the cost of our redemption be realized until the redeemed shall stand with the Redeemer before the throne of God. Then as the glories of the eternal home burst upon our enraptured senses we shall remember that Jesus left all this for us, that He not only became an exile from the heavenly courts, but for us took the risk of failure and eternal loss. Then we shall cast our crowns at His feet, and raise the song, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing." Rev. 5:12. {DA 131.3}

To those who point out the mistakes (real or supposed) of the Pioneers.

Every channel that God has used through which to communicate truth is to be respected. God has appointed human agents whom He has made channels through which the waters of life have flowed down through the ages of the past to our times. God has made them the depositories of sacred truth, and they have been collaborators with Jesus Christ diffusing the light and truth that has made the church what it is today.

Let God alone specify the mistakes that they have made; but let us be silent concerning what we may think is a defect. We have enough to do to learn the lessons He would have us learn. Increased light has come to us from God as we have searched the living oracles. We have discovered gems that were more precious than gold and silver, and many of these rich treasures have been pointed out to us by men who are now laid away in the grave. Let us not depreciate one of God's workmen. If God in His great mercy has traced the imperfection of any of His workmen, it is for the purpose of leading the church to shun his defects, and to imitate his virtues. {6MR 206.1}

Let us cherish the truth which has been spoken to us and the counsel that has been given to us by men through whom God has manifested His will in a marked manner. Let us be grateful that there were men who appropriated the grace of
Christ, and bore the burden in the heat of the day, whose lips are now silent. The Lord Jesus bade John to write of them, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them." We should be careful how we handle the names of the precious and blessed ones who sleep in Jesus. {6MR 206.2}

It has been at very great cost that the truth has been brought before the people. The third angel's message was established through very great difficulties; for every conceivable obstruction was in the way of its proclamation at first. Those who have seen the truth at a later date, who have had no experimental knowledge as to what it cost to become a Seventh-day Adventist when all the believers could be numbered within a small compass, should be guarded in their expressions in regard to the men through whom the Lord wrought as pioneers in His work. These men gave not only themselves, but all that they possessed to advance the precious truth. It cost them more than it costs many today who take it upon themselves to speak so freely of the mistakes the servants of God made in their youth and inexperience. The Lord loved them and valued them; for they had fervor and honesty of soul, and He took them by the hand and led them in safe paths, planting their inexperienced feet upon the Rock of Ages. {6MR 206.3}

Now let every one who loves God, love and respect those whom God has loved and honoured. "Them that honor Me, I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." 1 Samuel 2:30. {6MR 207.1}

These are the words of the Lord, and they point out the fact that we should not lightly esteem those who honor God.--Letter 39, 1894. (To A. T. Jones, June 7, 189.)

EG White on Smith’s book

The interest in Daniel and the Revelation is to continue as long as probationary time shall last. God used the author of this book as a channel through which to communicate light to direct minds to the truth. Shall we not appreciate this light, which points us to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, our King? MR 63.1

See, General Conference Daily Bulletin, Volume 4, pages 146, 147)

What Do Arians Believe about Christ.
Was Smith and Other SDA Pioneers Arians? NO!

Note “As to the humanity of Christ, Arius ascribe only a human body with an animal soul, and not a rational soul.”
Arianism, Doctrine of.—Arianism, one of the most powerful and tenacious heresies in the history of the church, so called from Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, who first reduced the doctrine to a clear expression, and made it the subject of public agitation in church and state. It involves the question of the divinity of Christ and his relation to the Father, and indirectly the whole dogma of the Trinity. It led to a series of violent controversies which, during the fourth century, shook the Roman Empire, especially in the East, to its very base. [p. 155]...

The Father alone is God; he alone is unbegotten, eternal, wise, good, unchangeable. He is separated by an infinite chasm from man, and there is no real mediation between them. God cannot create the world directly, but only through an agent, the Logos, who is himself created for the purpose of creating the world. The Son of God is pre-existent before time and the world (πρὸ χρόνων καὶ αἰώνων [πρὸ χρόνον καὶ αἰόνον]), and before all creatures (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως[prototokos pases ktisowos]), a middle being between God and the world, the perfect image of the Father, the executor of his thoughts, yea, even the creator of the world of matter, and of the spirit. In a secondary or metaphorical sense he may be called God, Logos, and Wisdom (θεός, λόγος, σοφία ). But, on the other hand, Christ is himself a creature (κτίσμα, ποίημα [ktisma, poieima]), the first creature of God, through whom the Father called other creatures into existence; he is made, not of the essence of the Father (ἐκ τῆς ὁσιας [ἐκ τες ουσιας]), but out of nothing (ἐξ οὐκ δύνατον [ex ouk onton] ...) or of the will of the Father before all conceivable time, yet in time; he is therefore not eternal, and there was a time when he was not (ὅτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, ἀρχὴν ἔχει, οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῇ, ἦτοι κτισθῇ [ἐν ροτε οτε ουκ ἐν, archen echei, ouk en prin gennethe, etoi ktisthe]); neither is he unchangeable, but subject to the vicissitudes of a created being (τρεπτὸς φύσιν ὡς τὰ κτίσματα [treptos phusion os ta ktismata]). In the last point Arius changed, having first asserted the unchangeableness of the Son (ἀναλοικατος, ἀπρεπτος ὁ νικός [analoikotos, apreptos o uios]), unless we save his consistency by a distinction between moral and physical unchangeableness: the Son, it may be said, is changeable in his nature (φύσει [phusei]), but remains morally good (καλὸς [kalos]) by an act of his will. With the limitation of Christ’s duration is necessarily connected a limitation of his power, wisdom, and knowledge. It was expressly asserted by the Arians that the Son does not perfectly know the Father, and therefore cannot perfectly reveal him. He is essentially different from the Father (ἐτεροούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ [eterousios to Patri]) in opposition to the orthodox formula ὁμοούσιος [homousios], and the semi-Arian ὁμοούσιος [homoioussios] (hence also the name Heterousiasts), and—as Aetius and Eunomius afterward more strongly expressed it—unlike the Father (ἀνομοῖος καὶ ὄσιαν [anomoioussos kat oisian]). As to the humanity of Christ, Arius ascribed to him only a human body with an animal soul (ψυχὴ ἄλογος [psyche alogenos]), not a rational soul (νοῦς, πνεῦμα [nous, pneuma]); and on this point he anticipated Apollinarius, who substituted the divine Logos for the human reason, but from the opposite motive of saving the unity of the divine personality of Christ.—“A Dictionary of Christian Biography,” Smith and Wace, Vol. I, art. “Arianism,” pp. 155, 156. London: John Murray, 1877.