

# David Millard

The Christian Connexion  
to Joseph Bates



Printed by  
Talking Rock Sabbath Chapel  
1250 W. Price Creek Rd.  
Talking Rock, Georgia 30175  
706.692.8954  
[www.TRSC.today](http://www.TRSC.today)

**David Millard** (1794-1873) was the first Christian Connexion preacher ordained in the state of New York. Millard was also once pastor of Adventist pioneer Joseph Bates. After moving to Jackson, Michigan on April 7, 1868 at age 74 to live near his three children, the two were once again neighbors. Bates was then residing in Monterey, Michigan about 100 miles west of Jackson, each being approximately 50 miles on either side of Battle Creek.

In the April 13, 1869 issue of the *Review and Herald*, Joseph Bates mentioned, “I spent the evening very pleasantly with my former pastor, Elder David Millard, of the Christian connection, very recently removed from York State. I told him I had taken the liberty to use his name in my Autobiography, showing how highly he regarded the Advent movement, by his public letters, and associating his name with fifteen others in a call for the first Second Advent Conference ever convened.”

Millard’s book, *The New Messiah*, originally published in 1823, contained an interesting commentary on the spread of Unitarian (non-trinitarian) belief in the 1836 edition. He described it as “the divine unity of God and the Sonship of Jesus Christ.” “The Presbyterians in England are, at the present time, nearly all Unitarians. In Ireland, the same denomination have divided within a few years on this point, most of whom are on the Unitarian side. The old General Baptists in England, are mostly Unitarians. ... There is also a considerable body in England, called Unitarian Methodists. In Scotland, the doctrine has spread to a very considerable extent. Within a half a century, the doctrine has spread to a vast extent in Germany and Switzerland. Even at Geneva, where Calvin caused Servetus to be burned to death on the charge of being an Unitarian, the doctrine of the unity of God is the prevailing belief.”

Following is a condensed sampling of his 240 page book.

## Optimism

The recent revolution experienced among Calvinistic sects, together with the spirit of free enquiry now abroad in the land, augur the time near at hand, when the mysterious and contradictory doctrine of the Trinity will be thoroughly exploded: when its remaining advocates will dwindle into sickly minority.

## Plurality of God

The plurality in the expressions (“Let us make man in our image”) does not necessarily imply more than two, and as God made all things by his Son [Heb. i. 2. (and Eph 3:9; Col 1:16)] it appears evident to me, that it was the Son to whom God spoke.

Might we not in some instances expect, that the expression, “**I am** the Lord your God,” which we meet so frequently in scripture, would be changed to **We are** the Lord your God?

The Son of God spoke thus: “And this is life eternal, that they might know **thee**, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom **thou** hast sent.” [emphasis his]

Elohim is a pleural Hebrew word. It is often appealed to as proof that God is a plurality of persons. But Elohim is applied to men as well in scripture. It is applied to Moses in Exodus vii. 1. “See I have made thee a god [Heb. **Elohim**] to Pharaoh.”

Certainly it will not be argued that Moses was a plurality of persons. The children of Heth gave the same title to Abraham.

“Thou are a mighty prince among us.” Genesis xxxiii. 6.

In Hebrew, this passage reads, “a mighty **Elohim** among us.”

It will not be contended that Abraham was three persons.

Elohim is also applied to Aaron’s molten calf, and to Dagon.

Examining the New Testament, I find the doctrine that God is three persons, equally unsupported. Through the whole of the gospel, God, instead of being spoken of as three persons, is plainly represented as one person—“his [God’s] person” [Heb i. 3].

“To us there is but **one God**, the Father,” [1 Cor. Viii. 6.]

“A mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is **ONE**.” [Gal. iii. 20.] He is “The Holy **One**.” “The high and lofty **One**.”

## 1 John 5:7

Millard provides a long list of evidence to support his belief that 1 John 5:7 is an interpolation:

1. It is not contained in any Greek manuscript written earlier than the 5<sup>th</sup> century.
2. Nor in any Latin manuscript earlier than the 9<sup>th</sup> century.
3. It is not found in any of the early versions.
4. It is not cited by any of the Greek ecclesiastical writers (they cite only the words before and after the text)
5. It is not cited by any of the early Latin fathers.
6. It is first cited by Virgilius Tapsensis, a Latin writer in the latter end of the 5<sup>th</sup> century, by whom it is suspected to have been forged.
7. It has been omitted as spurious in many editions of the New Testament since the reformation: in the first two of Erasmus, those of Aldus, Colinacus, Zwingli, and lately of Griesbach; and it was omitted by Luther. In the old English Bibles of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth, it was printed in small type or included in brackets; but the brackets disappeared between 1566 and 1580.
8. Dr. Adam Clark, the Methodist commentator, gives the passage up as spurious.

“113 Greek manuscripts are extant, containing the first epistle of John, and the text in question is wanting in 112. The first time it appears in Greek is the Greek translation of the Acts of the council of Lateran, held in AD 1215. Though it is found in many Latin copies, yet it does not appear that any written previously to the 10<sup>th</sup> century contain it. All the Greek fathers omit the verse though many of them quote both verse 6 and verse 8 and apply them to the Trinity. It is wanting in the German translations of Luther published during his life time.”

## Father and Son are One

It is urged by Trinitarians that John x. 30 “I and my Father are *one*” teach that Christ and his Father are one and the same being. But Paul tells his Corinthian brethren, “He that planteth and he that watereth are *one*,” [1 Cor. iii. 8] while a few verses preceding this, he told them, “I have planted, Apollos watered.” Is this teaching that Paul is Apollos? That Paul and Apollos are the same being? Paul also wrote, “ye are all *one* in Christ Jesus” [Gal. iii.23].

Though all believers in Christ are said to be *one*, yet they are not one person. Jesus prayed to his Father, “that they may be *one*, even as we are one.” If Christ and his Father are but one being, then his disciples must be one being? Either the Trinitarian doctrine is incorrect, or Christ’s prayer can never be answered. These scriptures indicate not a oneness of being, but a oneness of union, of being united in mind.

That a doctrine so important as this is said to be, at the same time so difficult to understand, should be left so undefined as to be made out by inference only, is a difficulty which needs much ingenuity to explain.

### **Sunday-Trinity Connection**

Sunday observance and Trinitarian belief are both claimed to have been accepted and promoted by the apostles and the early Christian church. But it is surprising that there is no evidence of objection to the devoted Sabbatarian and fiercely monotheistic Jews in either the Gospels, the book of Acts, or the Epistles of the New Testament.

Truth never can suffer by scrutiny...but a doctrine that shrinks from investigation, betrays its origin.

Trinitarians say, the doctrine of the Trinity is above reason, and therefore cannot be investigated by it; it is a doctrine of revelation, and we are bound to believe it. Dr. Adam Clark says, “the doctrine which can not stand the test of rational investigation can not be true. Doctrines of pure revelation? I know of no such doctrines in the Bible.”

If it is a mystery, then how can they pass judgment on that of which they are perfectly ignorant? The doctrine of the Trinity teaches that God is three persons, and yet but one being.

How can we define the difference between person and being?

Trinitarians say that the Trinity is three persons in one being, yet this is not all. They also maintain that each person is the whole being and not just a part of the whole. That three parts may exist in one

*whole*, I admit; but that three *wholes* are only one *whole*, is a very different thing.

They illustrate the Trinity as the three letters in the one word "GOD." Yet each letter is not the entire word, but only a part.

[Today they illustrate the Trinity by breaking an egg and observe that it is composed of three parts. But the shell is not the whole egg, neither the yolk, nor the egg white.]

### **Who is the Mediator?**

If the one God is the three persons of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, who is left to be the mediator between this "one God" and men? However many persons there may be in the "one God," it is between this "one God" and us that the mediator is needed.

If the Bible has taught us that God is as much as three persons... has it told us that he is no more than three? Since we read of "the seven spirits of God," to which we add the Trinity, how do we know but that God is ten persons? Why stop there? We might fancy that he is ten thousand persons, or even thirty million like the Hindoo deities. Where shall we find a rational stopping place once the mind has commenced its airy flight into the boundless regions of conjecture?

### **Pre-existence of Christ**

The scriptures represent Christ as being with his Father before the world was. "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee, before the world was." John xvii. 5. *Wisdom* mentioned in the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter of Proverbs alludes to Christ. This appears to be confirmed by the apostle Paul, who informs us, that Christ "is of God made unto us *wisdom*," and says, "we preach Christ, the power of God, and the *wisdom* of God." 1 Cor. i. 24.

We will now begin at the 17<sup>th</sup> verse of the 8<sup>th</sup> chapter of Proverbs; and see whether the words of Wisdom, will not appear to be the words of Christ. "I love them that love me; and those that seek me early shall find me... I lead in the way of righteousness... The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. *I was set up* from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, *I was brought forth*... before the

hills *was I brought forth*...When he prepared the heavens, I was there...when he appointed the foundations of the earth; then I was by him as one brought up with him; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him.”

It not only appears that the Father possessed the Son before time began, but also that the Son was *brought forth* from the Father before the world was. Now compare these expressions with Christ’s words to the Jews. “Jesus said unto them, if God were your Father, ye would love me: for *I proceeded forth and came from God*.” These being admitted, (which I think cannot be denied,) the conclusion follows, that *Wisdom, the Word, or Son,* was brought forth before time began.

It is not so important for me to explain in what *manner* Christ existed with his Father before he was made flesh; it appears that he did—I, therefore, leave the subject where the Bible leaves it.

### **Created or Derived**

Some have stated that they could make no distinction between a *created* and a *derived* existence; but to me the difference is obvious. The original and strict meaning of the word *create* is to bring something into existence from *nonentity*, which could not be said of the Son of God. He did not come into existence from *nothing*, as Arians supposed, but *proceeded forth*, or *was brought forth from God*, and consequently partook of that *nature* from whence he proceeded. It is true we have all, by successive generation, derived our existence from Adam, the father of us all; but he being created, our existence is at best a created one. But **as Christ derived his existence, or was brought forth from the self-existent God, he was not a strictly created being.**

If one does not believe there is a distinction between the Father and Son, he is a Sabellian, and consequently an advocate for a doctrine which was condemned by the church before Arianism was known. My belief is that the Son *proceeded forth* from the Father, “being of his substance as *begotten of him*.” Thus I partly borrow the language to express my views, from the decision of the council of Nice.

Christ is in scripture styled “the Wisdom of God;” “the Power of God,” and “the Word of God...” They are only figurative titles given to the Son of God...and that previous to the commencement of time,



nothing is known but *eternity*, which is here called *everlasting*. From the beginning of creation, or before the earth was, Christ was set up by his Father.

The Word [in John 1:1] alludes to Christ I admit. Twice in this passage the Word is said to be with God, and once the Word is called *God*. As the Word was said to be with God, which implies a distinction, the only difficulty that arises is, if the Word was not the God it was with, why is it said “the Word was God?” To this I reply, the word *God* is variously used in scripture, and is applied in different characters. David says, “worship him all ye *gods*.” Ps. xcvi. 7. What David called *Gods*, Paul calls angels, and says, “let all the angels of God worship him.” Heb. i. 6. Hence angels are called *gods*. Different classes of men have the title of *God* given them. “*God* standeth in the congregation of the mighty; he judgeth among the *gods*.” “I have said, ye are *gods*; and all of you are children of the Most High.” Ps. lxxxii. 1, 6. That men are alluded to here is plain from Christ’s own words. When the Jews accused him of blasphemy, for saying he was the Son of *God*, he answered them, “Is it not written in your law, I said ye are *gods*?” John x. 34. *Judges* or *rulers* are called *gods* in the law given by *God* himself. “Thou shalt not revile the *gods*, nor curse the ruler of thy people.” Exod. Xxii. 28. Moses was a *god* and had a prophet. “The Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a *god* to Pharaoh, and Aaron, thy brother, shall be thy *prophet*.”

It is evident where Christ is called *God* in scripture, that it is as plainly in distinction from his “*God and Father*” as words can express it.

But the question is asked, “why is he called *God* if he is not the very *God*?” I might ask with the same propriety, “why do the other characters which I have noticed, have the title *god* applied to them, if they are not so many persons in the *Godhead*?”

In John i. 1. We are repeatedly told “the Word was with *God*,” that is with his *God and Father*. Is it given to him in Heb. i. 8 by *God* himself? “Thy throne, O *God*, is forever and ever.” The reason is also assigned; because “thou has loved righteousness and hated iniquity: therefore *God*, even thy *God*, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.”

When we are told in the passage that “the Word was *God*,” we are not to understand, that he was identically and literally the Supreme

God, but that he was so bright and clear an expression of God's mind, that it was not so much Jesus, as God himself, who appeared and taught mankind. In accordance with this explanation, we find Jesus frequently expressing the sentiment, that it was *not he* but *God* whom the people saw and heard in his miracles and instructions. "He that believeth on me, believeth *not on me*, but on him that sent me; and he that seeth me, seeth him that sent me." Thus the Word was God.

It is not unusual to call one person by the name of another whom he resembles. Thus John the Baptist is called Elias, because he came in the spirit and power of Elias.

### **The Begotten Word**

If we compare the Word mentioned in John i. 1, with what is said of it in the 14<sup>th</sup> verse, we shall find it difficult to acknowledge it to be the very God. "And the Word 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." Here it is said the Word was *begotten*; and also that it was *made flesh*. But would we say the *very God* was begotten? If he was; when? And by whom?

### **The God-Man**

Mr Luckey [a Trinitarian author] intimates that all the apostle meant by saying "the Word was made flesh," was that divinity became veiled in humanity, or that the very God was clothed with human nature. "If so, the Word was not made flesh, but was merely an inhabitant of it," and the apostle John *stands corrected* by the Trinitarian theory.

[Ellen White used expressions such as "The divine Son of God...clothed his divinity with humanity" but it was the Son's divinity that was clothed, not the one true God, the Father.]

According to the Trinitarian theory that "Christ was very God and very man," it is impossible for them to assent to the apostle's testimony as it stands, "the Word was made flesh" as well as "begotten." They confidently assert this Word to be the self-existent God; consequently not *begotten*...and of course was not made flesh, but was merely an inhabitant of it.

Indeed I am bold to assert there is not a man on earth, who can believe that the *very God was made man*. It is a monstrous tax on

human credulity, and the popish doctrine of *transubstantiation* is but a mere shadow to it.

Trinitarians may still urge their doctrine, that *as man*, Christ was born, but *as God*, he was not; that *as man*, he suffered and died, but as God, he did not; and I would ask in what part of scripture their strange doctrine is asserted? They tell us the Bible is full of it, but I challenge them to produce one text that affirms Christ is very God and very man. It is true Christ is called *God* and he is called *man* in scripture. And so are angels as well as the supreme Jehovah himself. The prophet speaks of “the *man* Gabriel; and the angels who appeared to *Lot* and *Abram* are in the account called men; yet it is believed by all that Gabriel, as well as the angels before mentioned, were not mere men.

It is frankly acknowledged that Christ is a superior character; superior to either men or angels; and of course different in his *nature*; yet every thing said of him in scripture, when rightly considered, will appear perfectly consistent with the idea, that he is a *proper Son*. God is declared to be his Father, and the Virgin Mary his mother. Of his descent from his Father, it is said, he “proceeded forth and came from God,” and of his Mother it is said, he was made flesh; that he took not upon him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abram; that the children being partakers of flesh and blood, he also took part of the same; that is he partook of his Father as well as his mother, yet not a whole complete nature from each; but that which proceeded from *both*, constituted one complete Son, composed of a holy, pure nature, which scriptures call *divine*.

John says, “the Word was made flesh,” which I fully believe. That which proceeded forth from God before the foundation of the world, was made flesh in the womb of the Virgin, by the power of the Holy Ghost...As he proceeded from God and from the woman, he is called the Son of God about forty-five times, and the Son of man about fifty times in the scriptures, and hence is a proper mediator between God and men.

### **The Two Nature Scheme**

How plainly then does scripture read, that God “gave his Son,” and that God “sent his Son.” Can we suppose that these expressions mean that God *gave himself*, *sent himself*, or even a part of himself? Or would the Trinitarian resort to his *two nature* scheme to defend

himself, and say it was the *divine nature* that *gave* and *sent* the *human nature*. But hear the words of Christ, “I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.” John vi. 38. As no one would argue that *human nature* came down from heaven, it must be admitted that it was the *divine nature*. But upon the hypothesis that Christ in his divine nature is the supreme God, I would ask who sent him? Is it said his Father sent him? I again ask who is the Father of the Supreme God? But since Trinitarians affirm that Christ and his Father are one and the same being, from their hypothesis, the conclusion must be that God sent himself. Let it be remembered that Christ said, “I came down from heaven *not to do mine own will*, but the will of him that sent me.” There is no way for Trinitarians to conform this passage to their system, without making it contradict itself. “Jesus saith unto them, my meat is to do the will of him that *sent me*, and finish his work.” “I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which has *sent me*.” “My doctrine is not mine, but his that *sent me*.” Surely, my readers are too well acquainted with language to be ignorant of the meaning of these expressions.

### **The Lord’s Anointed**

We read in scripture of “the Lord and *his* Christ.” “The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord and against *his* Christ.” Acts iv. 26. [quoting Psalm 2:1] The meaning of Christ is the anointed of God, or one anointed and sent. “The *Lord* and *his* Christ,” is the same as the Lord and his *anointed messenger*. But to say the anointed messenger was the supreme God himself, who anointed him, would be to render the apostle’s words without meaning. As often as we read of “*the* Christ,” and “*his* Christ,” in scripture, just so often we are reminded that “the Christ” is a being distinct from “*the* Lord” whose Christ he is.

The apostle said to his brethren, “ye are Christ’s; and Christ is God’s.” 1 Cor. lii. 23. What unprejudiced mind is there, but from this passage would draw the conclusion, that the *God* and *Christ* mentioned were two distinct beings?

John says, “Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son.” 1 John ii. 22. While the scriptures represent Jesus to be the *Christ of God*,

what would it be short of denying that he is *the Christ*, to represent him as the very *God*, whose *Christ* the scriptures state him to be? And to represent *Christ* and the *Father*, to be the same being, what is it short of denying the plain scriptural expression of “Father and Son?”

Again says the apostle: “But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.” 1 Cor. xi. 3. From this passage we learn the following things.

1. The man is the head of the woman.
2. Christ is the head of the man, and
3. God is the head of Christ.

Now, is a person to conclude from this passage that the *woman* was the *man*, or that the *man* was *Christ* as much as *Christ* was the *God* spoken of? As clear a distinction of being is represented between Christ and God, as between the *man* and *Christ*, or the *woman* and the *man*. Consequently from this view, Christ must be a distinct being from his Father.

[Paul indicates that “the man” mentioned here is Adam and the woman can only be Eve, for in verse 8 he states, “the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man.” The only woman ever to be “of the man” was Eve, “for she was taken out of man” Genesis 2:23. Paul’s use of the term “head” is not merely rulership, but rather *source*, as in the headwaters of a river, or the heading of a chapter which marks the beginning and start of that section. Adam was the source of Eve, who came forth from him; Christ was the source of Adam, from whose hands Adam was formed; God the Father was the source of His Son, from whose bosom he was brought forth, whose goings forth was from of old, from everlasting.]

### **The Two Witnesses**

Our Savior said to the Jews: It is written in your law, the testimony of *two men* is true. *I am one* that beareth witness of myself, and the *Father* that *sent me*, beareth witness of me.” John viii. 17,18. I would ask, are not *two men*, *two beings*? And would it not be an insult to human understanding, to say that *one being* is two distinct witnesses?

## He Proceeded Forth

“Jesus saith unto them, if God were your Father, ye would love me; for *I proceeded forth and came from God*; neither came I of myself, but he *sent me*.” [John 8:42] If Christ is not here represented as a distinct being from his Father, I am at a loss to know the meaning of language. Can he be the God he *proceeded forth and came from*? It is stated that it was his human nature that proceeded forth from God? But do not Trinitarians state, that the human nature was made of the woman, and was “of the earth earthy?” [Gal. 4:4; 1Cor 15:47]

See the following passages: “For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that *I came out from God*. I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and *go to the Father*.” The disciples said unto him, “by this we believe thou camest forth from God.” John xvi. 27, 29. Again Jesus said to his Father, “for I have given unto them the words which *thou gavest me*; and they have received them, and have known surely that *I came out from thee*, and they have believed that thou didst *send me*.” John xvii. 8. Surely these passages are too plain to need a comment.

The Lord Jesus is frequently spoken of as one who has a God as well as a Father. Paul speaks of “the God of our Lord Jesus Christ,” [Eph 1:17] and several times of “the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” [2 Cor 11:31; Eph 1:3; 4:6; 1 Pet 1:3] In every other case at least, he who has a God and Father, is a being distinct from the supreme God. As surely as this person has a God and Father, so surely he is not the “only true God,” or the same being as his Father, unless the Father also has a God and Father.

## Praying to the Father

Christ is frequently represented as praying to his Father. Trinitarians, however, have a *rare* skill to dispose of this as well as a hundred other things by resorting to their *two nature* scheme. They tell us it was only Christ’s *human nature* that prayed to his *divine nature*...that one part of Christ prayed to another part of himself. But what will a Trinitarian resort to rather than relinquish his *mysterious*, self-contradictory doctrine? Will scripture support the assertion that it was only *human nature* that prayed? I think not. “Now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory I had with thee before the world was.” John xvii. 5. That which

prayed was with the Father before the world was, while *human* nature was not created till after the world was made; therefore it must have been his divine nature that prayed, if it is true that he possessed two whole natures. But if in his *divine nature* he was the supreme God, I ask, Who did he pray to? And what cause had he to pray at all?

The Lord Jesus is said to have been anointed of God. “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power.” Acts x. 38. In what sense can we suppose the supreme God anointed Jesus, if it be a fact that Jesus is the supreme God himself? If the Father is the “true God,” and the Son the “true God,” and the Holy Ghost the “true God,” which shall we say is the “*only* true God” mentioned in scripture? [John 17:3]

We learn from scripture, that God raised Christ from the dead. Peter said, “But ye denied the Holy One...and killed the Prince of Life, whom God raised from the dead.” Acts iii. 14,15. Did one nature of Christ raise the other nature from the dead? Hear his words to Mary after he had risen, “touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend to my Father and your Father; and to my God and your God.” [John 20:17] According to the Trinitarian theory, at this time his two natures were again united. But upon the hypothesis that his divine nature was the very God, to whom did he ascend?

Stephen, filled with the Holy Ghost, saw the heavens open and Christ standing at the right hand of God. [Acts 7:55] Mark says, “So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the *right hand* of God. Mark xvi. 19. Peter says, “This Jesus *hath God raised up*, whereof we are all witnesses. Therefore being by the *right hand of God* exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed for this which ye now see and hear.” Acts ii. 32,33. Paul says of Christ, he “is set down *on the right hand* of the throne of God.” Heb. xii. 2. How frequently is Christ represented in scripture as sitting at the right hand of God! Does this mean something, or nothing?

### **Human vs. Divine**

Speaking of the day of Judgment, Christ says: “Of that day, and that hour, knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.” Mark xiii. 32. Matthew has it “my

Father only.” Here my opponents resort to the *two nature* scheme again in order to evade the force of this text. They say Christ only spake of himself here, as a man; that is, in his *human nature*, he did not know when that day would be, but that in his *divine nature* he did know. This is indirectly accusing the Son of God with dishonesty. For example, suppose a person is standing before me, and another asks me, do you see that person? I shut one eye, and look at the person with the other eye and answer—No. I only mean, I do not see the person with the eye that is shut, although I see him all the while with the one that is open. Who would not accuse me with dishonesty?

Why have not the apostles given us some specimen of this mode of reasoning, if it is correct? that this alludes to his *divine nature*, and this to his *human nature*? Is it not a monstrous tax on the scriptures, to urge such unqualified assertions on them without their consent? It is suggested that Peter addressed Christ as God when he said, ‘Lord thou knowest all things.’ [John 21:17] But Christ speaking of himself as man said, the Son knoweth not the day or hour of his coming. If we examine with candor the “all things” mentioned, allude to John writing to his brethren, when he addressed them: “But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and *ye know all things*.” 1 John ii. 20. Indeed these words of John might be quoted with equal propriety to prove that John’s brethren knew when that day would be, as to quote the words of Peter, to prove that the Son did know, what Jesus said the Son did not know.

## **Given**

When Christ arose from the dead, he spoke to his disciples saying, “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” Matt. xxviii. 18. If all power was *given* to Christ, there must have been a time when he had not all power; for to say he possessed all power from all eternity, and yet had it given to him, is too gross an absurdity to merit notice. Besides, who gave the very God all power in heaven and earth? Let Jesus answer who it was that gave him all power: “All things are delivered me of my Father.” [Matt 11:27]

Relative to the extent of power *given* to Christ, it is highly probable to me, that it was all power in heaven and earth, relating to his kingdom or church, or as Paul defines it, “God hath given Christ to be head over all things to the church” Ephes, i. 22.



“Then cometh the end, when he [Christ] shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.” “And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.” 1 Cor. xv. 24-28. From this passage we learn that Christ will again deliver up his power, or kingdom, to God his Father, and become subject to him. But if Christ be the very God, who will he *deliver* up the kingdom to? Who will *put* all things under him? Who will he become *subject* to?

### **One Mediator**

“For there is *one God* and *one mediator* between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” 1 Tim. ii. 5. If it be a fact, as Trinitarians say, that Christ is the *one God* mentioned in this passage, I would ask who the *mediator* is between this *one God* and men? If Christ be the self-existent God, the true God, and the only wise God, it is between him and men, that a mediator is needed. Who then is the mediator between Jesus Christ and men? Let the apostle answer. “Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.” Gal. iii. 20. That is, a mediator is not one of the parties that he mediates between, but is a middle person, or one that stands *between two*. A mediator and *day’s-man* means the same. Job said, “neither is there any day’s-man betwixt us, that he might lay his hand upon us both.” Job ix. 33. Thus Christ is represented as standing between God and men, that he might lay his hand upon both, and thus make reconciliation. Is God a mediator between himself and men? Does one part of God mediate, or intercede with another part of himself?

In the fifth chapter of Revelations, God is represented as sitting upon a throne, with a book in his right hand, and Christ is represented as taking the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne. Can it be supposed, that he that took the book out of the hand of him that sat upon the throne, was the same being that sat upon the throne, out of whose hand he took the book?

In the 17<sup>th</sup> chapter of John we have a prayer of Christ’s recorded, the longest prayer in the New Testament. Had I forged a prayer for the Son of God, in order to favor the sentiment I vindicate, I could not have invented one more expressive of my views. “And this is

life eternal that they might know thee the *only true God* and Jesus Christ whom thou *hast sent*.” John xvii. 3. Instead of Christ asserting himself to be “the only true God,” he acknowledges his Father to be the only true God. Did the only true God send the only true God? O! when will the eyes of people be open to discern between *truth* and *absurdity*.

### **The Only Wise God**

Jude 25 is often quoted. “To the only wise God our Savior,” to which is added “this is the Lord Jesus Christ.” However, if our Lord Jesus Christ is *the only wise God*, what kind of a God must “the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” be? Could not Jehovah, hundreds of years before he sent his Son to be a Savior, say there was no Savior besides himself; and afterwards send his Son to be a Savior? God may be called our Savior, because he saves by his Son; and Christ is our Savior, because he has redeemed us by his blood. God in giving his Son, is the giver of salvation; and Christ by dying for us, opened the way for our salvation, to bring us home to God.

### **He Forgives Sins**

Mark ii. 10 “The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins.” It is frequently asked, as did the Pharisees, “who can forgive sins but God only?” But Jesus, instead of affirming himself to be the supreme God in this work, calls himself the *Son of man*. And instead of this being the work of God exclusively, it appears that Christ commissioned his apostles to *remit sins*. “Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them” John xx. 23.

### **Power to Lay It Down**

John x. 17,18 “Therefore doeth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.” To say the *immortal* God, laid down his *life* and took it again, would be an assertion too preposterous for credibility.

The word *power* in the passage, imports the same as *authority*, which Christ said he had received of his Father. That is, his Father had *empowered* or *authorized* him, to lay down his life and take it again. The scriptures, however abundantly teach us, that God raised

Christ from the dead. In raising Christ from the dead, the Father restored to the Son that which the Son committed to the Father on the cross, when he said, "Father, into thy hand I commend my spirit."

### **We Will Come**

It appears evident to me that Christ is represented in scripture, as present with his disciples in distinction from his God and Father. John xiv. 23. "Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." Let the passage speak for itself.

### **The Creator of All Things**

The Trinitarian states that Christ is the creator of all things. This I dispute. The passages brought to prove that Christ is the creator of all things include: John i. 3. "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." Colossians i. 16. "For by him [Christ] were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in the earth...all things were created by him, and for him."

It will be noticed that it is not said in either of these passages, that the Son made all things [but rather all things were made by him]; or that he is the maker or creator of all things. It is however, stated that all things were made by him, and that all things were created by him. By comparing these two passages with others we shall ascertain their true meaning. Heb. i. 1,2. "God...hath, in these last days, spoken unto us by his son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he [God] made the worlds." God made the worlds by his Son. How were all things made by Christ? God made all things by him.

For a parallel passage see Ephesians iii. 9. "And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." We must admit that Christ and his Father are distinct beings. To say the passage means that God created all things by himself, would leave it high on the rank of absurdities. All things were created by Christ, because God created all things by him.

The word ‘Son’ cannot signify the *human* nature, for it is impossible for the worlds to have been made by the human *nature* of Jesus, thousands of years before that human nature existed. But if, without any deference to the doctrine of the Trinity, we take the testimony of the apostle just as we find it, the sense of the passage is too plain and easy to be mistaken. It teaches us that God made the worlds through the instrumentality of his Son.

There is also a rule of Greek syntax. The Greek preposition *dia*, which is rendered *by*, does not signify by any one as an original or *first* cause; but it denotes by any one or any thing as an *instrumental* cause. The noun, signifying the original or first cause, is governed by another preposition, *hypo*. This rule may be illustrated by the first passage in the New Testament, in which the prepositions *dia* and *hypo* occur. “Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken (*hypo*) *by* the Lord (*dia*) *through* the prophet.”

Origen commented on John 1:3 “If all things were made *through* (*dia*) the word, they were not made *by* (*hypo*) the word, but by one more powerful and greater than the word.” Eusebius of Caesarea in his annotations on the first of John’s gospel wrote: “‘The world was made by (*hypo*) him;’ he has not said *by* (*hypo*) him, but *through* (*dia*) him; in order that he might raise our conceptions to the underived power of the Father as the original cause of all things.”

The true meaning of all these passages is literally expressed by St. Paul, who says, “*God created all things by Jesus Christ.*”

### **Worship the Son**

“It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.” From this passage, it is confidently affirmed, if Christ is not the very God, it is idolatry to worship him. I ask, When was it thus written; and when was this command given? Was it not hundreds of years before “the first begotten” was brought into the world? It certainly was. This command was given at a time when God declared there was no Savior besides himself. A new dispensation, brought in a new command. Under the gospel, the Father “when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.” Heb. i. 6. The command given under the law, before the *first begotten* was brought into the world, does not affect his worship as the *begotten Son of*

God under the gospel. [Millard seems here to regard the begotten Sonship as incarnational]

Again it is urged, “that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father which hath *sent him*.” John v. 22, 23. The subject appears to me in this light. To honor the Son as one *sent*, is honoring the Father who *sent him*. To reject Christ, is rejecting the Father who sent him. As Christ said: “He that despiseth *you*, despiseth *me*; and he that *despise*th me, *despise*th him that sent me.”

Isaiah xlii. 8. “I am the Lord: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images.” The argument urged from this scripture is, that if we worship the Son as a distinct being from the Father, we take that glory which is due to God alone, and give it to another. In my opinion this is a mistaken view of the passage. We may honor the Son of God, and at the same time pay supreme worship to God his Father. “And that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the *glory of God the Father*.” Phil. ii. 11. What Father would consider himself dishonored in witnessing due respect paid to his Son?

My opponents charge that I worship two beings—two Gods. But the Bible teaches us that ‘the Lord our God, is *one Lord*.’ My views on this subject are stated too plain to be misunderstood. I worship one God, and one begotten Son, one God, and one Lamb that was slain. How would the Trinitarian relish the statement, should I say that he worships three Gods? And would not my charge be better supported than his? Let the candid reader judge.

When did God command men and angels to worship his Son as any other than “his first begotten,” or as a “*Lamb that was slain*?” Who was God’s first begotten? Was it the supreme God himself? But Mr. Luckey concludes, “Trinity must and shall stand; and if the scriptures will not support it, away with them, they are not fit to be among people.” Instead of making the Bible his rule to determine what idolatry is, makes *Trinitarianism* a rule by which to *judge* the Bible. What if Mr. Luckey, after all his struggle to support the doctrine of the Trinity should, like the amiable Robinson or the pious Dr. Watts, be constrained to give it up?

[Isaac Watts changed his position on the Trinity late in life.]

That I worship the Son of God is a fact; yet I do not worship him as “the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” To say it is

idolatry to worship any being but the supreme God, is to accuse the supreme God himself of instituting idolatry, since he has commanded angels to worship his *first begotten*. Let the truth have due weight, however much it may cross the creeds of men. If I am every so happy as to join the heavenly worshippers, I expect to sing, glory to the *Lord God*, and to the *Lamb that was slain*.

### **The Son is the Father?**

John xiv. 9, 10. "Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father...Believest thou not I am in the Father, and the Father in me?" If this passage proves the supreme Deity of Jesus Christ, it also proves that he is the Father, which destroys the doctrine of the Trinity. If the Son is the Father, then they are not two distinct persons. The Athanasian creed says: "We worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity. Neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance." As the doctrine of the Trinity asserts there are three distinct persons in the Godhead, and that the persons must not be confounded, the text in question proves too much for Trinitarian use. It completely spoils the doctrine.

Again, understanding the Savior to mean literally that they who saw him, saw the invisible Jehovah [1Tim 6:16], is to suppose the most palpable contradiction to other plain scripture testimony. John said, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." John i. 18. Speaking of the invisible God, Paul says: "Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light: whom no man hath seen nor can see." 1 Tim. vi. 16. The Lord said to Moses, "Thou canst not see my face, for there shall no man see me and live." Exodus xxxiii. 20.

Whenever we see the *form, image, or likeness* of a particular person, we always, in a certain sense, see the person; because the person is reflected in his image, or likeness. Thus the disciples saw the prophet Elijah in the person of John the Baptist. It is also certain that our Savior said John was Elijah, who had been predicted should come at the opening of the gospel day. In Malachi iv. 6, we read, "I will send you Elijah the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." This prediction was made several hundred years after the old prophet Elijah had taken his exit from this world. We are then to understand that Elijah must figuratively

come in some other man, who would be a likeness of him. This was John the Baptist, of whom our Savior said, "If ye will receive it, this is Elias which was to come." Matth. xi. 14. Also see Matth. xvii. 10-13. Yet no one supposes that John was literally Elijah the prophet, but that coming in the spirit of Elijah, they who saw him, saw Elijah reflected. Our Savior came in the spirit of his Father, and was the representative of the invisible God to men. [Jesus said, "I have come in my Father's name" John 5:43] He is said to be the "image of the invisible God" Col. i. 15; and also "the express image of his [God's] person" Heb. i. 3. The disciples saw the invisible God reflected in the person of his Son. This is the only rational construction that can be given to this passage, unless we wish to make the Bible contradict itself.

"Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?" This portion of the passage is also clung to, as proof that Christ and his Father are one and the same being. As a parallel passage, see John xvii. 20, 21. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." There is a beauty in the scriptures when they are permitted to explain themselves, but when bent to the shape of a human creed, they are often compelled to speak a language never designed by the pen of inspiration.

### **God Blessed**

Rom. ix. 5. "whose are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever." Paul had been speaking of the Israelites and their peculiar privileges, and then adds, "Whose are the fathers and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all." Here comes in a note of punctuation; and then the apostle adds, "God blessed forever." If Christ was the God spoken of in the passage, to have had it correctly punctuated, it should have stood thus: "Christ came who is over all God;" but it will be observed by the careful reader, that the note of punctuation comes before the word *God*, and that *God* is immediately connected with "blessed forever." As much as if the apostle had said, "Christ came who is over all those of whom I speak, for which may God be blessed forever."

## In the Form of God

Phil. ii. 5,6. "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."

1. No one naturally understands the *form* of a thing, to be the thing that is the *form* of. The expression means the same as the *image* of a thing. Every one knows that a person and the *image* of a person are two different things. If Christ is the *form* or *image* of God, we cannot rationally suppose him to be the very being he is the *form* or *image* of.
2. The word equal always implies two or more. If I should say a thing is equal with itself, would not the reader say I talked nonsense? Trinitarians will first say that Christ is the self-existent God; they will next affirm that he is *equal* with God, which means God is *equal* with *himself*! Such arguments originated at *Babel*, where language was confounded.

Dr. Macknight rendered the passage: "Now let this disposition be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; who, though he was in the form of God, did not affect to appear in **divine majesty**, but **divested himself**; taking upon him the form of a servant, being made in likeness of men..." This rendering strips the passage of all difficulty. [not equal to God in identity, but equal in divine majesty of which he divested himself]

## The Fullness of the Godhead

Colossians ii. 9. "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." This text does not say, the Godhead dwells in Christ bodily, but the *fullness* of it. The term GODHEAD, is used to express the *being*, or *person* of God. I see no difference between the meaning of the following two expressions found in scripture: "The fullness of God," and "the fullness of the Godhead." Paul desired that his brethren "know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God." Eph. iii. 19. Not that Paul desired three persons should bodily dwell in each of his brethren, but that they might be filled with the Spirit of God. Christ had the Spirit given to him without measure. "For he whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure to him," John iii. 34. It is therefore plain that "the fullness of God" and "the fullness of the Godhead" mean the same



as the Spirit of God. Where can we have access to the divine Spirit? The answer is given, in Christ; for “in him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.” He is the only medium through which we can have access to God. [“No man cometh to the Father but by me” John 14:6] Through him the Spirit flows to the soul of every believer. But if this text proves that Christ is the supreme and eternal God, then every believer who is filled with the *fullness of God* is the same.

### **Mystery of Godliness**

1Tim. iii. 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.” But the text from Griesbach is rendered thus: “He who was manifest in the flesh, was justified in the spirit, seen of angels...”

[textual variants are divided on the wording.

Stephanus Textus Receptus 1550, Scrivener’s Textus

Receptus 1894, Greek Orthodox Church 1904, Byzantine

Majority text of 2005 have Greek *Theos*;

Tischendorf 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, Westcott and Hort 1881 and Nestle 1904 have ‘Os. ]

If it was the supreme God who is alluded to in this text, who was it that Justified him in the Spirit? And who received him up into glory? Was the throne of God in heaven vacated during the whole period from the birth of Christ to the time of his ascension?

That God was manifest in Christ, or revealed in the person of his Son, I have already stated. Of Christ, the apostle Paul says, “Who being the brightness of his [God’s] glory, and the express image of his [God’s] person” Heb. i. 3. Now an image is the likeness, representation, or manifestation of whatever it resembles. Thus God was manifest in Christ, who was the image or likeness of God.

### **True God and Eternal Life**

1 John v. 20. “And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life.” This passage is generally urged with the

utmost confidence that it affords incontestable proof, that Jesus Christ is the true and self-existent God. Sometimes the sense of a passage is rendered obscure by the repetition of *pronouns*; and it is ever safe to substitute *nouns* for *pronouns*. By the true God, John had reference to the very being, of whom Jesus Christ was a Son.

The whole strength of the Trinitarian argument in this text, consists in referring the pronoun *this* to Christ, the nearest antecedent. But it must be remembered, that pronouns such as this, do not always refer to the nearest antecedent. For example, 2 John 7. “Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh; this is a deceiver and an antichrist.” If we apply the same rule of grammar to this passage, that is insisted on in 1 John v. 20, and we will prove that Jesus Christ is a deceiver and an antichrist.

But the same apostle John declares that the Father is the only true God, in contradistinction to Jesus Christ [whom he has sent. John 17:5]. If Jesus was the only true God, who was the Christ whom the only true God sent?

[The expression “true God and eternal life” is a recapitulation of the first verses of John’s first epistle, “that eternal life which was with the Father” speaking of Christ and God. 1John 5:20 informs us that the true God has a Son and that we are “*in him* that is true.” This accords with 1 Cor 8:6 “one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we are *in him*.”]

### **Trinitarian vs Socinian**

[Socinians deny the pre-existence of Christ who they regard as only a man but adopted by God and given divinity at either his birth, or more commonly, his baptism]

I am unable to discover so great a difference as many pretend to, between the Trinitarian and Socinian systems. Trinitarians and Socinians both believe that only a *man* suffered on the cross. Socinians have one God and a mere man, and Trinitarians have no more than one God and human nature. [both have no more than a human sacrifice.] Instead, I believe in one God, self-existent and infinite, and in the place of human nature, in one holy divine Son of God, far superior to either men or angels. I affirm that this holy Son of God actually died for the sins of the world.

The Trinitarian system of faith in substance is, that God is *three persons*, and yet but *one being*; and that Jesus Christ is *two beings*, and yet but *one person*! We contend for a different system of faith: that God is one person only; that Jesus Christ is properly “God’s own Son,” and that the Holy Ghost is a *divine emanation* from God.

### **Millard on the Christ Connection**

The first leaders in the connection adopted the name of Christians, considering it the most proper name to distinguish the disciples of Christ from the *world*. This name, if properly revived, was calculated to bury all party names, and thus far promote a union in the Christian world, so much to be desired. To this principle, we, as a connection, still adhere. We think unscriptural party names, injurious to the peace of the church, calculated to foster pride, and covet popularity.

We are perfectly free to adopt and address each other by any name or title which Christ has given to his disciples as recorded in the scriptures; whether it be *Christians, friends, brethren, saints, or disciples*. But we reject all unscriptural names. The assertion that we assumed the name of *Christians* because we alone are what this name imports, is an unjust charge. We fellowship all as Christians, whom we can gain an evidence have the *fellowship* of the *Father and Son* [1John 1:3].

Though we are far from being indifferent in respect to what a person believes, yet we do not think that certain controverted points among Christians, ought to be made the *test of fellowship*, but that *religion*, or the love of God in the soul, is what alone can constitute it. We do not set ourselves up as *infallible*, and therefore dare not *judge* a brother for whom Christ has died. We are willing to live and let live, to think and let think. We esteem the right of *private judgment* a privilege too dear to be deprived of; then why should we wish to usurp that from others, which we esteem so precious ourselves? We cannot withhold the hand of fellowship from a Christian brother, whoever he be. We believe where true charity reigns in the heart, that a union of soul may be enjoyed and fostered, even where a great difference of sentiment exists.

How would Mr. Luckey relish the statement should I pronounce him a *papist*? It is certain that all *papists* are Trinitarians. We call ourselves *Christians*, in conformity to scripture, and we wish thus

to be considered, as far as we live like such... We do not assume it as our exclusively. We shall rejoice when all the followers of Christ, shall be willing to lay aside their unscriptural names, and share this in union with us.

What! Has it come to this, that Christians are to be suspected the most, who conform the nearest to scriptures! And must we abandon the scriptures to escape the censure of those who profess Christianity! O shame, where is thy blush!

We are accused of being “destitute of any established system of faith, but make it a virtue, if not a principal part of our religious duty, to decry them [creeds] with clamorous vehemence.” Is the Bible not an established system of faith? Are we destitute of the Bible? What rule can we have superior to the scriptures? If it is said we reject all systems of faith but the Bible, and make it our only written rule of faith and practice, then the truth would be told. The plain truth is, we content that a *Christian union* does not spring from a strict agreement in *belief* in every point, but from holiness of heart, which constitutes a union with God, and ought to constitute a union with one another. But a clamor is raised because we reject human creeds, platforms, articles, and confessions of faith, as useless inventions of men, believing [rather that] the scriptures to be a sufficient rule for faith and practice.

It is not strictly necessary to compel people to subscribe men-made articles, in order for them to bind their consciences; as they may operate to that effect after they have conscientiously subscribed them. Even if they have done this, their bounds are now set as soon as they have set their names to the men-made code. It is virtually said, “*thus far shall thou go and no farther.*” Who then does not see, that their belief is restricted to what is expressed in the articles to which they have subscribed? If their minds should change, to what they might conscientiously consider a more perfect knowledge of the truth, they are liable to be dealt with for heresy, and excluded from church communion, and thus exposed to denunciations and disgrace. And there is no doubt in my mind, but that many through *fear*, have thus *strained* their minds to constantly consent to what they would gladly have had otherwise.

There have been a number of instances, to my knowledge, among different denominations, in which conscientious Christians have had to expose themselves to be dealt with for heresy, and have an

excommunication put upon them, or groan under a restriction of privilege, on the very subject of debate in this work. Some have boldly preferred the former, while some have timidly submitted to the latter.

Instances have been, where a vote has been taken in Methodist classes, that all who believed that Jesus Christ is the very God, would manifest it by rising up. A part and sometimes the greatest part kept their seats; in consequence of which their names were dashed from the *class paper*, by the preacher present. Frequently the most pious and spiritual have been among the number thus thrust out. They were then denounced as heretics, by those with whom they had stood in fellowship; and why? Because they were *honest people*, and would not deny what they conscientiously believed.

Christ has not left his church without a law to govern it, but has given one which James calls "*the perfect law of liberty.*" Whatever is *perfect*, needs no addition to render it so; consequently *the perfect law of liberty*, needs nothing added to it, to be a sure guide, and to make us wise unto salvation, through faith in Christ Jesus.

The *popish* assertion, that the Bible cannot be understood by common people, but should be explained by the learned, is a mere deception. The essential rule of faith and practice, is sufficiently plain in the scriptures, that he who runs may read [Hab 2:2], and "wayfaring men, though fools, need not err therein." [Isa 35:8] One important cause, in my opinion, for so much division in sentiment, is the want of strict adherence to scripture. Instead of taking the scriptures for their "*only rule, and sufficient rule* of faith and practice," many have submitted to men's explanations of scripture for their rule. Thus they have forsaken the fountain of living waters, and hewn out to themselves cisterns, broken cisterns that can hold no water. [Jer. 2:13]

What point is there of either *faith* or *practice*, contained in the scriptures, which needs to be enlarged on? What difficulty can arise in the church, but what the scriptures afford us a rule to settle it by? Until I am convinced that the scriptures are *imperfect*, and that men-made articles of faith are not worse than useless, I shall continue to exhort the disciples to "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not again entangled with the *yoke of bondage.*" Gal. v. i.

## Conclusion

We are assured of the following:

That God has a son

That God gave his Son

That God raised his Son from the dead

That God gave his Son all power in heaven and in earth

That God has exalted his Son at his own right hand

That God will judge the world by his Son

We are also assured

That Jesus Christ has a Father

That he is the Son of God

That he was with God before the foundation of the world

That he proceeded forth and came from God

That he was begotten of God

That he came to do the will of God

That he prayed to God

That he ascended to God

That he sits at the right hand of God

That he is a mediator between God and men

That he will deliver up the kingdom to God

And become subject to God

Not only Joseph Bates, but James White was an ordained Christian Connection minister who frequently quoted William Kinkade, a prominent Christian Connection author in the Review and Herald. Other Christian Connection authors included John Loughborough who quoted Connection minister Nicholas Summerbell in the Nov 5, 1861 RH, John Marsh who joined the Adventists, and Joshua V. Himes who introduced William Miller to many Christian Connection churches, the large majority of which joined the Adventists (over 100 churches in Vermont alone). By 1844 there were 1500 Connection churches with more than half a million adherents.

David Millard ended his book with these words:

As a conscientious Christian, I am constrained to believe, and assert the *unity of God*, and the proper Sonship of Jesus Christ. If there be any doctrine, the belief of which is essential to salvation, it is this, that Jesus is the Son of God. John asks: “who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?” [1John 5:5] He also affirms that “whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God.” [1John 4:15] John the Baptist “saw and bare record that he is the Son of God.” [John 1:34] And the same John further says: “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life...” [John 3:36] And the Son testified of himself, saying, “I am the Son of God.” [John 10:36] When I seriously attend to such passages, I cannot but shudder in view of the contempt which certain persons have shown to the idea that Christ is properly God’s own Son. This is the very doctrine for which the Jews accused the Savior of men with blasphemy, and adjudged him worthy of death. They told Pilate, “he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.” [John 19:7] When the high priest adjured him by the *living God*, to tell whether he was the Christ, the *Son of God*, his answer was “*I am.*” To those who have felt disposed to destroy my character, because I have taught that Jesus is properly the Son of God, I wish them to remember that One infinitely more worthy than I am, has been condemned as deserving death for affirming the same doctrine.

The honors of this world I do not covet, and its censures I fear but little. TRUTH is what I am to vindicate. I humbly pray that I may be enabled in meekness and humility to imitate the example of the first person who suffered for teaching that JESUS CHRIST IS THE SON OF GOD.

# David Millard

The Christian Connexion  
between the one true God  
and His true and proper Son  
to Joseph Bates  
and  
James White  
Barton Stone  
Noah Worcester  
Abner Jones  
Elias Smith  
William Channing  
Henry Grew  
Joshua V. Himes  
William Miller