

WHERE IT CAME FROM ... AND WHERE IT WILL TAKE US . . .

The Error of Original Sin

-*"Who Needs Original Sin?"*-A Sermon given at the Campus Hills Church in Loma Linda, California, on April 22, 1978, by its senior pastor, Dr. Ralph Larson.

"The word of the Lord came again, saying. What mean ye that ye use this proverb ...saying. 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge. ' 'As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel, Behold, all souls are mine. . -the soul that sinneth, it shall die. ' 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the fatter, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son.. "-Ezekiel 18:1-4, 20.

I am sure that you are aware that the Seventh-day Adventist church is presently involved in a dialogue that is assuming the proportions of a debate. Our faith is meeting a new challenge, not from without, but from within. As the pastor of a congregation in an Adventist thought center like Loma Linda, there appears to be no way that I can stand aside from this discussion. The members of my congregation are meeting questions and challenges, and then in turn are asking questions that need to be answered.

I am convinced that the present challenge to our faith presents grave dangers to Christ's flock, and to its individual members. I want to discuss these dangers with you this morning, and to avoid the possibility of being misunderstood, I have taken the precaution of putting my thoughts on the subject in writing.

Our faith is continually being challenged from without the church, and it has on several occasions been challenged from within. Some of these inner challenges have been more serious than others, but the Lord has, by His good providence, brought the church through them all. I believe He will bring the church through this one. My concern is not for the church at large. My concern is for individual members. People have suffered injury to their faith in similar experiences in the past, and this is what I hope to prevent insofar as this is possible.

The present debate is not about minor matters. It involves doctrines that are at the very heart of our theology: the nature of Christ, the nature of man, and the nature of salvation itself. There are some who believe that the present challenge is as important, in the light of its potential results, as the doctrine of pantheism that was advanced by Dr. John Harvey Kellogg at the turn of the century. It may be worth our time to reflect for a moment about that crisis in Seventh-day Adventist history.

Dr. John Harvey Kellogg, you will remember, was one of the greatest leaders this denomination has produced. He built the Battle Creek Sanitarium into an institution of international recognition. He pioneered advanced concepts in medicine and nutrition, and he laid the foundations for the prepared food industries of our time. Need to say, he was greatly loved and respected by the Adventist people.

But in his later years, Dr. Kellogg embraced an ancient error, the doctrine of pantheism. According to this doctrine, God is actually in all living things, including the flowers, the trees, and even ourselves. This appears to be a very beautiful idea, but it leads to serious errors. All nature becomes God. You see, if I am partly God, then it is impossible for me to sin, because God surely does not sin.

Therefore it follows that everything do is all right. There was no need for

Christ's death on Calvary nor for His ministrations in Heaven. There is no need for salvation.

Dr. Kellogg did not discern these dangers, and he made it his goal to persuade the Remnant Church to add the doctrine of pantheism to its theology. He published a book called *The Living Temple* in which the errors of pantheism were interwoven with beautiful and saving truths in such a manner that it was difficult to separate them one from another.

As we view the scene from this distance, we are moved to ask certain questions. How could so brilliant a man as Dr. Kellogg get hooked on pantheism? We have no answer to this question, but we can perhaps learn from it that position, prestige, and even keenness of intellect are not enough to protect a man from error. If this could happen to him, it could happen to anybody.

And why was the error not refuted more promptly? Why was it permitted to go on until many minds were caught up in its confusion? The answer to this is really quite simple. Men were concerned and anxious, but who wanted to be found disagreeing with Dr. Kellogg? Scorn would certainly be heaped upon you. The question, "Who do you think you are to presume to disagree with this great man?" would be heard then, as it is being heard now.

Eventually the error had to be met, and the church did survive, free from pantheism. But there were individuals whose faith was greatly damaged. Might this damage have been prevented if the rejection of error had been more prompt and clear and firm? It would seem so.

I feel that the present challenge to our faith is in many respects similar to the one presented by Dr. Kellogg. Again it seems that an ancient error has been embraced by men of influence and position. Again books are being presented in which the ancient error is interwoven with beautiful and saving truths so intricately that the two can hardly be separated. Again pastors of congregations are experiencing deep concern and anxiety but are hesitating to speak out. And their silence is in danger of being misinterpreted.

A young couple who were baptized while Jeanne and I were in Arizona have dedicated their lives to God's service and are now on the La Sierra campus. They had not been there long before they were introduced to the error of which I speak by some of its militant supporters. It was perplexing to them, but they reasoned that if the teaching were untrue, some one in a position of authority would be speaking out against it. Since no one was speaking out, they were about to accept it as true. This illustrates the danger of pastoral silence.

It seems, therefore, that there comes a time when silence is no longer compatible with pastoral integrity. There comes a time when the pastor must choose between the role of the hireling, who puts his own security first when danger approaches, and the role of the true shepherd, who puts the welfare of the flock ahead of his own welfare. That is why some of us are deciding that we can no longer remain silent about the present challenge to our faith. What, then, is the present debate all about?

First, let me make clear what it is NOT about. The present debate is NOT about the doctrine of Righteousness by Faith. To the best of my knowledge and belief, there are no Seventh-day Adventist ministers who do not believe in righteousness by faith. This is not to say that all of us communicate it with equal skill, or even that we all practice it as well as we ought. But we all believe it. The doctrine of righteousness by

faith is not being debated among Seventh-day Adventist ministers, as if some believed in it and some did not.

The present debate is over the doctrine of Original Sin. The doctrine of Original Sin is an ancient error which has historically had no place at all in Seventh day Adventist theology, or in the writing of Ellen White, the inspired messenger to the Remnant Church. -Nevertheless some have embraced this doctrine, and are claiming that it makes the doctrine of Righteousness by Faith more beautiful and appealing.

This is why we as Seventh-day Adventist believers are continually being called to new conferences about "Righteousness by Faith." Church members are being given to understand that they are being offered rich new insights into the doctrine of "righteousness by faith." What they are not frankly and straightforwardly told, is that they are being led to embrace the doctrine of original sin, which has until now been altogether outside the boundaries of Adventist theology. The present debate, then, is between those Seventh-day Adventist ministers who want to preach Righteousness by Faith as they believe the Inspired Writings teach it without any intermingling of the doctrine of Original Sin, and those who want to mingle the doctrine of Original Sin with the message of Righteousness by Faith.

Now it is my belief that if the doctrine of Original Sin were laid before you in all of its unvarnished ugliness, without any disguising wrappings of "righteousness by faith," it would not take you very long to decide whether or not you want it as a part of Adventist theology. Let us therefore consider the doctrine of Original Sin.

Stated briefly and simply, the doctrine of Original Sin includes these points:

1. All men are guilty before God because of the sins of Adam, even if it were possible for them to live without performing a single sinful act in their entire lives.
2. They are judged and condemned by God for this guilt, which they inherit from Adam as fully as for their own sins.
3. This condition which is inherited from Adam is the fountain or source of all their temptations, lusts, and evil desires.
4. It is not possible for man to get rid of this condition while he lives upon this earth, even through the power of Christ.
5. It is therefore utterly impossible for men to ever achieve complete victory over sin while living upon this earth, and It is dangerous for them to try.
6. Since it would be impossible for Christ to be a saviour if the inheritance of Original sin passed to Him from Mary, a variety of theological schemes have been introduced to prevent this from happening. Roman Catholicism teaches that

Jesus had an "immaculate conception" 'born miraculously free from Original Sin, along with Mary His mother, The greater number of Modern Protestant theologians teach essentially the same thing, but they say it this way: Jesus had the unfallen nature of Adam, rather than our fallen nature.

The doctrine of Original Sin was first developed by St. Augustine, one of the most influential Roman Catholic theologians of all time. He lived in the fourth and fifth centuries of our era, and gave to the apostate church of Babylon not only the doctrine of Original Sin, but also the doctrine of Predestination and the doctrine of "Christianity by force" -compelling people by the use of coercion and physical force to accept Christianity.

Augustine was apparently not troubled by the fact that his doctrine of Original Sin, in reality, taught men that God was an unjust judge who would condemn human beings for something for which they were not responsible and about which they could do nothing at all. Of course, Augustine, the Catholic priest who was not troubled by the infamous doctrine of Predestination would perhaps not be expected to be troubled about any questions at all concerning the fairness and justice of God's character. You will remember that the doctrine of Predestination holds that God decides of His own free and sovereign will who will be saved and who will be lost, before they are even born, and that they do not at any time have any choice at all in the matter. And in the same light, this same man who had such a view of God, as did Augustine, would not hesitate to advance the horrible doctrine that it is perfectly all right to use physical force to compel men to accept Christ. As you would quickly recognize, it was this teaching of St. Augustine's that provided the theological rationalization for the atrocities of the Middle Ages, leading ultimately to the Inquisition with its racks and torture chambers, and to the Jesuits with their versatile ways of destroying men.

In the early fifth century a monk named Pelagius, reacting against Augustine's theories, went to the other extreme and denied that either guilt or weakness descended from Adam to his family. He held that all men at birth start with the same opportunity that Adam had at his creation. But the church soon ruled against the errors of Pelagius, and the other extreme, the views of Augustine generally prevailed in Catholicism from his time on.

Unfortunately, neither John Calvin nor Martin Luther, both of whom were steeped in the traditions of Augustine, were able to work themselves free from either his doctrine of Predestination or his doctrine of Original Sin. Some, as they consider Calvin's approval of the public burning of Servetus in Geneva in 1553, and Luther's encouragement of the slaughter of the revolting peasants in Germany in 1525, are moved to wonder whether these good men actually were able to get rid of Augustine's concept of religion by force. However that may be, both Luther and Calvin were in agreement with Augustine about Predestination and Original Sin. After Luther's death Melancthon led the Lutheran church away from the doctrine of Predestination, which is the reason that some Lutheran people are not aware that Luther did, in fact, believe in Predestination. If you have questions on that subject, read Luther's Bondage of the Will.

There is an ancient proverb to the effect that the telling of one untruth makes necessary the telling of other untruths. That is the way it worked out with the doctrine of Original Sin. The first error created problems, and the other errors resulted from men's attempt to solve those problems. For example, if all men actually inherit the guilt of Adam, and pass it on to their descendants, and if this brings them under judgment and condemnation of God, what happens when this guilt is passed on from Mary to Christ? It was a difficult problem to solve. The followers of Augustine eventually worked out a solution which was satisfactory to themselves. This was the doctrine of Immaculate Conception, according to which a special miracle prevent Mary from inheriting Original Sin, so that she would not pass it on to Christ. Protestants, of course, had difficulty with this, yet those who have held to the doctrine of Original Sin have realized that some means had to be found to keep its guilt from reaching Christ.

For this reason another miracle of which the Bible says nothing was proposed, by means of which Christ was made able to avoid assuming the human nature of the generation of men into which He was born, but instead assumed "the nature of Adam before the fall" -as they describe it.

The result is a Protestant version of the Catholic teaching of "Immaculate Conception. " Seventh-day Adventists have found this thinking to be unsatisfactory and

for two reasons: (1) They have held that any such interference by any means that made the natural relationship of Mary with Jesus different than it would have been with any other son that might have been born to her, destroyed the trueness of Christ's humanity, which is the hope of our salvation. (2) We find that the Spirit of Prophecy, in at least a dozen different passages, affirms in clear and unmistakable terms that Jesus did actually assume in His Incarnation the nature of fallen man, while remaining wholly without sin.

And there is another major conflict between the doctrine of Original Sin and the writings of the Spirit of Prophecy. We have seen that the doctrine of Original Sin firmly rules out the possibility of a total victory over sin by any human being, with or without the enabling power of Christ. The Spirit of Prophecy totally, disagrees. Within its pages, the goal of character perfection through the power of Jesus Christ is constantly held before the reader. It never recommends a partial solution to the problem of sin. To God is attributed the power to eradicate evil of every kind from the Christian's nature, No exception is ever made for Original Sin with its bondage and life-long chains. As far as I have been able to discover, the term "original sin" occurs only once in the Spirit of Prophecy writings, and is a time context, referring to Adam's sin as the original or first sin upon the earth.

So those who have wanted to harmonize the theology of the Remnant Church with the doctrine of Sin have been faced with a formidable task, and their efforts have been marvelous to behold. In the writings of one Adventist proponent of that doctrine I read that original sin both is and is not guilt, that it both is and is not a condition outside of man's nature, and that it both is and is not an aspect of man's nature. I learn that man both does and does not inherit original sin, and although it is the fountain of evil from which all temptations proceed, Christ had no advantage over us in being free from its influences. I find that original sin both is and is not eradicated by the new birth experience, and that it both does and does not prevent Christians from being totally sanctified. And so on.

Perhaps these confusions should not surprise us. It is my own conviction that the doctrine of Original Sin is so Inherently untrue and illogical that no skill of man can ever set it forth in a logic and non-contradictory statement. Some brilliant minds have tried, and in my own judgment they have signally failed.

One of their major problems has been to find Biblical support for this doctrine. The Scriptures that are set forth as evidence do not bear up well under investigation at all. For example, consider their 'Exhibit A: " Romans 5:12.

"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men . . .

Let us pause and notice that we here have a statement of fact, with no explanation offered. The explanation comes in the next line: -

". . . for that all have sinned."

For that" means "because. " Notice that the verse does not say because all have inherited guilt from Adam. It says "because all have sinned. " They therefore have guilt of their own, and have no need to borrow guilt from Adam. Paul's statement is not in contradiction with our opening Scripture:

"The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son. "

That is why the well-known contemporary theologian Emil Brunner says that the doctrine of Original Sin is not really stated in the Bible, but is rather read into it.

Another such Scripture is I Corinthians 15:22: "For as in Adam all die, in Christ shall all be made alive."

Proponents (those favoring) the doctrine of Original Sin are required to break up the natural parallelism in the expressions in Adam and in Christ, and give these phrases two altogether different meanings. In Adam is taken to mean a relationship of nature, an organic relationship, which man has of necessity and about which he has no choice at all. But the phrase in Christ, instead of being ascribed the same meaning as natural parallelism would require, is given an altogether different meaning. But, of course, we all know that we are not "in Christ" through a natural or organic relationship without any choice or decision of our own. We are in Christ because we have deliberately chosen to follow Him and make him our life Leader, Model, and Guide. This is the only thing that "in Christ" can mean.

Surely it is an unwarranted wresting of Scripture that takes two phrases that are set up by a writer in a parallel construction and gives them altogether different meanings. The purpose and intent of the writer is best preserved when both phrases are read alike.

"In Christ " means to follow and imitate Christ "In Adam" means to follow and imitate Adam. It is as simple as that. There is no reason to say 'In Adam " means natural, unchosen relationship but "in Christ" means exactly the opposite.

The third major Scriptural evidence set forth by the supporters of the doctrine of Original Sin is Psalm 51:5:

"Behold I was shapen in Iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me."

This is enlarged on in theological studies, such as this one:

"God respected (Adam and Eve's) free will and choice, and withdrew from the human race . . . Thus all Adam's offspring came into the world without God . Every child is born with an impossible self-centeredness. As concerning all other men [except Christ] they air born without God. –Edward Heppenstell, The Man Who is God, page 107 and onward.

This is certainly a depressing picture of parenthood and childbirth. It might cause people to conclude that it would be best not to have any children. But the evidence does not require such a dismal conclusion. Let us observe that the words, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me," can be understood three ways: First, there is Augustine's understanding, that the very act of procreating a child is sinful. But this contradicts such Scriptures as Hebrews 13:4:

"Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled. "

So we must set that interpretation aside, as invalid. Second, there are those who say it proves the doctrine of Original Sin. But that would contradict Psalm 17:5 and 6:

"For Thou art my hope, O Lord God, Thou art my trust from my youth. By Thee have I been holden up from the womb: Thou art He that took me out of my mother's bowels."

And then there is Psalm 22:9:

"For Thou art He that took me out of the womb. Thou didst make me hope when I was upon my mother's breasts. I was cast upon Thee from the womb, Thou, art my God from my mother's belly. '

And it also contradicts the crystal clear testimony of The Desire of Ages, on page 512:

"Even the babe in its mother's arms may dwell as under the shadow of the Almighty through the faith of the praying mother. John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Spirit from his birth. If we will live in communion with God, we too may expect the divine Spirit to mold our little ones, even from their earliest moments."

So the idea that God withdrew from the human race, leaving every child to be born without God, must be laid aside too. It does not bear up under investigation. That leaves only one possible meaning of the words: "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, in sin did my mother conceive me."

If we see this verse as simply a more poetic way of expressing the same truth that Paul expressed in Romans 3:23: "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," then we shall have no problem of contradictions with other Scriptures or with the Spirit of Prophecy. This would therefore be the best understanding of Psalm 51:5. David was simply saying in poetic language that he was a sinner and his mother was a sinner too. There is no need to read into this verse the horrible doctrine of Original Sin.

This leads our minds to consider one of the greatest problems of the doctrine of Original Sin. There seems to be no way that it can be harmonized with the special counsels that have come to the Remnant Church through God's specially appointed messenger, Ellen White. It is true that attempts are being made to bring the counsels of Ellen White and the doctrine of Original Sin together. But the arguments being advanced are desperately labored, highly artificial, and depart far from the plain and obvious meaning of her words. It would seem, for example, that if what Ellen White wrote about the Nature of Christ can be re-interpreted to mean that Christ in His incarnation assumed the nature of Adam before his fall, then many other re-interpretations of her writings are possible. By using the some methods, we should be able to demonstrate successfully that Ellen White believed that Sunday was the true sabbath of the Lord, that pork and beef are the best foods for human consumption and alcoholic beverages are the best drinks, and that there is actually never going to be a second coming of Christ to this earth.

As I have examined some of these elaborate explanations of her simple and clear statements, by which it is proposed that she actually did not mean what she wrote, but meant something very different, the thought has occurred to me I would hate to buy a used car from a man who reasons like that writer reasons.

I believe that it is my duty to caution you in advance about the methods that are used to advance the doctrine of Original Sin. They are devious verbal devices that do not inspire confidence, and seem to reveal a lack of genuine evidence. These devices include but are not limited to:

1. Confusion of Categories. A question is raised, and an entirely different question is answered. The outstanding example is the important question, "Can man, through the power of Christ achieve character perfection in this life?" The answer invariably given -is that "man cannot have a self-view of character perfection in this life." Now these are two entirely separate and distinct questions and the answer to the second has no relevance to the first at all. When we consider the difficulties involved in man's estimating his own humility, for example, we recognize the futility of trying to answer the first question with evidence about the second. This could also be called, "Confusion by Irrelevancy." The reply given avoids the issue: "Should' man obey the Law of God?"

2. Transmission of Terms. The same word is given different definitions in a way that can only spread confusion and misunderstanding. This concept is given an astounding variety of definitions, all mingled together with no apparent regard for accuracy or clarity.

3. Violation of Context. Passages are lifted from the writings of Ellen White and used to prove a certain point, when an examination of the context reveals that her intention was precisely the opposite.

4. Internal Self-contradiction. This pattern of tortured thinking is woven through the entire structure of the doctrine of Original Sin (as mentioned a few moments ago). Mutually exclusive propositions are advanced one after another, creating great uncertainty as to what is really believed.

5. The "Pig-in-the-Poke" Technique. The doctrine of Original Sin is seldom set forth under its clear and proper label, but is disguised as a new and beautiful insight about Righteousness by Faith, which at certainly is not.

6. The "True-believer" Technique. The impression is often given that those who do not wish to accept the doctrine of Original Sin are bad people -legalists and those who do not believe in 'righteousness by faith.'

7. The "Straw-man" Technique. . Illustrations are set up purporting to show what opponents to the doctrine of Original Sin believe, but these straw men are products of the writer's imagination, and little or no resemblance to the actual beliefs of those who oppose the doctrine of Original Sin. A reader who tried to arrive at an understanding of our beliefs by studying these straw men would arrive at grotesquely wrong conclusions.

8. Misrepresentations of Other Views. The misstating of the other side. The outstanding example of this problem is the use of the term "sinful nature" to describe the views of those who believe, as Ellen White did, that Christ in His incarnation assumed the fallen nature of man. "Fallen nature" is the term that she uses many times, and in rare passages in which she does use the term "sinful nature" as assumed by Christ she states in the very same sentence that His own nature was sinless. Thus she was avoiding the very thing that the Original Sin folk are saying, and saying continuously, that the opponents of the doctrine of Original Sin believe that Christ had a sinful nature. The emotion-arousing effect of this blasphemous statement can well be imagined.

9. The "Snowjob" Technique. In oral discussions, simple questions are answered with a blizzard of five, ten, or even fifteen separate points or questions all thrown at the questioner at once and with great speed, giving him no time or opportunity to evaluate any of them. And if in an attempt to turn the snow job into a lucid discussion, he responds to any one of the many points that were thrown at him, he is immediately snowed under with a new blizzard consisting of any number of other points or questions. It is apparent that this is not done to clarify discussion, but rather to cause the questioner to feel that there is no use to try to shovel his way through all of that snow, so he might as well give up. This of course, is a well-known debater's trick, but is it appropriate to discussions of spiritual truths? I think not.

10. Theological Double-talk. Making synonyms oppose themselves. If mother asks Johnny why he ate the cookies, he will not adequately defend himself by arguing that he did not eat them, but only "devoured them." And if under pressure he retreats from this position and advances the thinking that he actually neither ate them nor devoured than, but only consumed them, his condition will not be noticeably improved.

This "synonym switching" is clearly present when an attempt is made to escape the obvious meaning of a term by arguing that man does not 'inherit' Original Sin, but is only "born into it." For all practical purposes these terms are synonymous. And when it is argued that the state man is born into, is not guilt, but a condition that affects him precisely the same way that guilt would affect him, we recognize the problem of Theological Double-talk again. For you see, to change labels -without changing quality

or substance -is to play meaningless games with words. The result is doctrinal victory based on semantic confusion.

Now, what have Adventists believed about Original Sin? We have stood upon the testimony of the Scriptures:

"The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son. "

Here is the truth of Scripture: Man inherits weakness and Infirmities from his ancestors, but not guilt. Guilt is not transferable. This truth is beautiful in its simplicity, and does not require an elaborate system of explanations like the doctrine of Original Sin does.

And here is the conclusion of the matter. The Remnant Church does not need a doctrine of Original Sin, and for at least eight reasons:

1. If we had needed a doctrine of Original Sin, God would not have waited until 1978 to make that known to us.

2. The doctrine of Original Sin impugns the character of God by making Him an unjust and tyrannical judge.

3. The doctrine of Original Sin requires a doctrine of Immaculate Conception, which destroys the humanity of Christ.

4. The doctrine of Original Sin pictures Christ as having enormous advantages over us in meeting temptation, so that it could not be true that He was in all points tempted as we are, as the Bible says He was.

5. The doctrine of Original Sin firmly rules out any possibility of complete victory over sin in this life.

6. The doctrine of Original Sin cancels out the idea that man can obey the Law that God commands him to obey. Trying to do it is a waste of time, for it cannot be done.

7. The doctrine of Original Sin is not truly Biblical

8. The doctrine of Original Sin is in violent conflict with the inspired counsels to the Remnant Church that we call the Spirit of Prophecy.

So who needs the doctrine of Original Sin? The devil does; the Remnant Church does not.

Now, let us fasten our minds on some promises, in closing:

We must realize that through belief in Him it is our privilege to be partakes of the divine nature, and so escape the corruption that is in the world through lust. Then we are cleansed from all sin, all defects of character. We need not retain one sinful propensity.'- 7 Bible Commentary, page 943.

"By His perfect obedience, He has made it possible for every human being to obey God's commandments. When we submit ourselves to Christ, the heart is united with His heart, the will is merged in His will, the mind becomes one with His mind, the thoughts are brought into captivity with Him; we live His life. This is what it means to be clothed with the garment of His Righteousness."-Christ's Object Lessons, page 312.

"And if we consent. He will so identify Himself with our thoughts and aims, so blend our hearts and minds into conformity to His will, that while obeying Him we shall be but carrying out our own impulses. The will, refined and sanctified, will find Its highest delight In doing His service.--Desire of Ages, page 666.

"Everyone who by faith obeys God's commandments will reach the condition of sinlessness in which Adam lived before his transgression. When we submit ourselves to Christ we live His life. This is what it means to be clothed with His Righteousness." - Signs, July 29, 1902.

"Those who are registered as holy in the books of heaven are not aware of the fact, and are the less to boast of their own goodness." - Faith I Live By, page 140.

"When Christ reigns in the soul, there is purity, freedom from sin. The glory, the fullness, the completeness of the gospel plan is fulfilled in the life. The acceptance of the Saviour brings a flow of perfect peace, perfect love, perfect assurance. The beauty and fragrance of the character of Christ revealed in the life testifies that God has indeed sent His Son into the world to be its Saviour." - Christ's Object Lessons, page 420.

"When a soul receives Christ, he receives power to live the life of Christ." - Christ's Object Lessons, page 314.

"As the sinner, drawn by the power of Christ, approaches the uplifted cross, and prostrates himself before it, there is a new creation. A new heart is given him. He becomes a new creature in Christ Jesus. Holiness finds that it has nothing more to require." - Christ's Object Lessons, page 162.

"The experimental knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ whom He has sent, transforms man into the image of God." - Christ's Object Lessons, page 114.

"The leaven of truth works a change in the whole man." - Christ's Object Lessons, page 102.

"Christ will live in us. His character will be reproduced in our nature." - Christ's Object Lessons, page 60.

"The life of Christ has shown what humanity can do by being partaker of the divine nature. All that Christ received from God, -we, too, may have." - Christ's Object Lessons, page 149.

A large number of quotations from Inspiration dealing with the topic of the enabling power of God in our lives, will be found in our tract. "You Can Overcome." (IC-11).

Harvestime Books Resource Library
<http://www.remnant-prophecy.com>
<http://www.Harvestimebooks.com>
<http://www.bible-sabbath.com>