

DID JESUS EMANATE FROM GOD THE FATHER?
EKKEHARDT MUELLER, BRI

The Gospel of John mentions repeatedly that Jesus came forth from God the Father (John 8:42; 13:3; 16:27,28,30; 17:8). This formulation may suggest to some readers that Jesus in one way or another emanated from God in eternity past.

Comments by Gary Hullquist, MD

The use of *exerchomai* (*exelthon* “proceeded forth” “came out from”) is important in the context of the eternal Father-Son relationship. How Christ is the divine Son of God has not been specifically revealed. What is certain is that the Father sent His Son, not another transcendental being who was to *become* the Son of God.

This procession or coming forth from God was commonly understood by a great many “readers” throughout history.

Ignatius, c. 100

Disciple of the apostle John, warns the believers in Tralleis about “vain talkers and deceivers, not Christians, but Christ-betrayers, bearing about the name of Christ in deceit.”

“They introduce God as a **Being unknown**; they suppose **Christ to be unbegotten**; and as to the Spirit, they do not admit that He exists. Some of them say that the Son is a mere man, and that **the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are but the same person.**” *The Epistle of Ignatius to the Trallians*, chp. 6

Just as John had warned in his epistles, Ignatius reported the loss of identity that was the result of metaphoric antichrist teachings, denying the Father and the Son (1John 2:22) by making them either one person or one being. In contrast, Ignatius declares the “only true God,” the literal “Father and Begetter” of the real “only-begotten Son ...before time began” just as Paul identified in 1Cor. 8:6.

“our Physician is **the only true God, the unbegotten** and unapproachable, **the Lord of all, the Father and Begetter** of the **only-begotten Son**. We have also as a Physician **the Lord our God, Jesus the Christ, the only-begotten Son and Word, before time began**” *The Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians*, chp. 7

Justin Martyr, c. 110-165

“God **begat before all creatures** a Beginning, [who was] a certain rational power [**proceeding**] **from Himself**, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the Glory of the Lord, now the Son, again Wisdom, again an Angel, then God, and then Lord and Logos; and on another occasion He calls Himself Captain, when He appeared in human form to Joshua the son of Nave (Nun). For He can be called by all those names, since He ministers to the Father's will, and since **He was begotten of the Father** by an act of will” *Dialog with Trypho*, chp. LXI

Rather than denying the existence of the Spirit as Ignatius had observed, Justin identifies one of the names of the begotten Son as “the Holy Spirit”—the Spirit of Christ (1Pet 1:10,11; Rom 8:9), the Spirit of prophecy (Rev 19:10), the Spirit of God's Son (Gal 4:6), the Spirit of Jesus Christ (Phil 1:19).

Tertullian, c. 200

“Thus does He make Him equal to Him: for by **proceeding from Himself He became His first-begotten Son**, because **begotten before all things**; and **His only-begotten** also, because **alone begotten of God**, in a way peculiar to Himself, from the womb of His own heart -- even as the Father Himself testifies: "My heart," says He, "has emitted my most excellent Word." [Ps 45:1] “...the very Word Himself, who is spoken of under the name both of Wisdom and of Reason, and of the entire Divine Soul and Spirit. He became also the Son of God, and was **begotten when He proceeded forth from Him.**” Tertullian, *Against Praxaes*, Chp. 7

“**His coming out from God** is like the ray’s procession from the sun, and the river’s from the fountain, and the tree’s from the seed.” Chp. 22.

“**Praxeas, however, would have it that it was the Father who proceeded forth from Himself**, and had returned to Himself; so that what the devil put into the heart of Judas was the betrayal, not of the Son, but of the Father Himself.” Chp. 23

This was the same argument offered by our Adventist pioneers.

“He styled himself the Son of God. Then **he could not be the Father of which he was the son.**” James White, *Review and Herald*, Sept. 18, 1855

“But to say that Jesus Christ ‘is the very and eternal God,’ **makes him his own son, and his own father**, and that **he came from himself**, and went to himself.” J.H. Waggoner, *Review and Herald*, Sept. 23, 1875

Novatian, c. 250

“Hence all things are placed under His feet, and delivered to Him who is God, and the Son acknowledges that all things are in subjection to Him as **a gift from the Father**; thus He refers back to the Father the entire authority of Godhead. **The Father is shown to be the One God, true and eternal** [John 17:3]; **from Him alone** this power of Divinity **issues**, and though it is **transmitted to the Son** and centered upon Him, it runs its course **back to the Father**, through their community of Substance.” Novatian c. 250, *Treatise of Novatianus on the Trinity*, translated by Herbert More, 1919; *Ante-Nicene Christian Library* vol. 13 edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 1869, p. 297.

This is remarkably similar to Ellen White’s “circuit of beneficence” in *Desire of Ages* p. 21.

“In these words is set forth the great principle which is the law of life for the universe. All things Christ received from God, but He took to give. So in the heavenly courts, in His ministry for all created beings: through the beloved Son, **the Father’s life flows out** to all; through the Son **it returns**, in praise and joyous service, a tide of love, **to the great Source of all.**” Ellen White, *Desire of Ages* p. 21.

Novatian continues with the same thought,

“The Son is shown to be God, since Divinity is manifestly **delivered and granted to Him**; yet none the less, **the Father is proved to be the One God**, while step by step that same Majesty and Divinity, like a billow returning upon itself, **sent forth again from the Son Himself, returns** and finds its way **back to the Father Who gave it**. Thus we see that **the Father is the God of all things** [1Cor 8:6], and also the **source of the being of His Son, Whom He has begotten** as Lord; and **the Son is the God of all else**, since the Father has appointed Him Whom He begat to be over all things.” Novatian c. 250, *Treatise of Novatianus on the Trinity*, translated by Herbert More, 1919, p. 139; *Ante-Nicene Christian Library* vol. 13 edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, 1869, p. 297.

“In dealing with this subject, inasmuch as He is **the only begotten and the first begotten, of Him, Who, as having no origin, is alone the beginning and the fountain-head of all things**, He thereby declared that God is One; Whom He has evinced to be not in subjection to any beginning or source of being, but rather Himself the source of being, and the beginning of all things.” Novatian, in “*The Treatise of Novatian On the Trinity*” translated by Herbert Moore, 1919, p. 137.

Novatian comments on John 8:42 as well, applying the common analogy of the spoken word.

“If Christ is man only, how does He say, ‘**I proceeded forth** and came from God,’ when it is evident that man was made by God, and did not proceed forth from Him? But in the way in which as man He proceeded not from God, thus **the Word of God proceeded**, of whom it is said, ‘My heart hath uttered forth a good Word;’ [Ps xlv. 1] which, **because it is from God, is with reason also with God**. And this, too, since it was not uttered without effect, reasonably makes all things: ‘For all things were made by Him, and without

Him was nothing made.’ But this Word whereby all things were made [is God]. ‘And God,’ says he, ‘was the Word.’ **Therefore God proceeded from God, in that the Word which proceeded is God, who proceeded forth from God.**” *Ante-Nicene Christian Library* vol. 13, p. 331.

Novatian uses the Greek syntax in quoting John 1:1 “And God was the Word” which he associates with the source of the Word—from God.

Hilary of Poitiers, c. 350

“The statement that ‘God sent his Son’ means that **Jesus was already the Son of God when he was sent**; that is, Jesus is **the Son of God in an eternal sense.**” Hilary of Poitiers (c. 300-368), *De Trinitate* 3.3.

R.F. Cottrell made much the same statement:

“If it is declared that the Father sent his son into the world, **I believe he had a son to send.**” *Review and Herald* June 1, 1869.

Hilary likewise addressed John 8:42.

“If He were their Father, they would love Christ because He had gone forth from God. And now I must enquire **the meaning of this going forth from God.** His going forth is **obviously different from His coming**, for the two are mentioned side by side in this passage, I went forth from God and am come. In order to elucidate **the separate meanings of I went forth from God and I am come**, He immediately subjoins, Neither am I come of Myself, but He sent Me. He tells us that **He is not the source of His own existence** in the words, Neither am I come of Myself. In them He tells us that **He has proceeded forth a second time from God**, and has been sent by Him.” *Early Church Fathers – Nicene/Post Nicene* Part 2, volume 9: Hilary of Poitiers, “On the Trinity,” book 6, section 30.

Hilary makes a clear distinction between the two actions—that of “proceeding forth” or “going forth” or “went forth” from the Father and “coming” or “am come” from God. He refers to these as two processions; the first is evidence that God the Father is “the source of His own existence.” He then continues,

“**Went forth carries back our thoughts to the incorporeal birth**, for it is by love of **Christ, Who was born from Him**, that we must gain the right of devoutly claiming God for our Father.” “For the one and only reason which He gives for loving the Son is **His origin from the Father. The Son, therefore, is from the Father, not by His Advent, but by His birth**; and love for the Father is only possible to those who believe that **the Son is from Him.**” *ibid*

He believes that the first phrase, “went forth” or “proceeded forth” from God, refers to Christ’s “incorporeal birth”—His divine spirit birth, “born from Him” from God the Father, not by virtue of the incarnation, but by His birth from the Father.

Athanasius, c. 356

“It has been shewn above, and must be believed as true, that **the Word is from the Father, and the only Offspring proper to Him and natural.** For whence may one conceive the Son to be, who is the Wisdom and the Word, in whom all things came to be, but from God Himself? However, the Scriptures also teach us this, since the Father says by David, ‘**My heart uttered a good Word,**’ [Ps. 45:1] and, ‘From the womb before the morning star I begat Thee;’ [Ps. 110:3] and the Son signifies to the Jews about Himself, ‘If God were your Father, ye would love Me; for **I proceeded forth from the Father.**’ ... Besides, what else does ‘in the bosom’ intimate, but **the Son’s genuine generation from the Father?**” Athanasius, *De Decretis* (“Defense of the Nicene Definition”) Chp. 5, par. 21

Athanasius certainly did not endorse the creed that bears his name formulated nearly 200 years after his death. Rather, he strongly supports a belief in the proper, natural, genuine begotten offspring of the Word from the Father.

William Sherlock, 1690

“This Power the Son always had as **begotten of his Father, from all Eternity**, and One God with him... And **therefore now it is given him to have Life in himself**, as the Father hath Life in himself: The Father hath Life in himself, as **the Original Fountain of all Life by whom the Son himself lives**; [John 6:57] **all Life is derived from God**, either by eternal Generation, or Procession, or Creation; and thus Christ hath Life in himself also, in the new Creation he is the Fountain of Life.” William Sherlock, *A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity*, pp. 171, 172, 1690

John Fletcher, 1788

“From this common, equal, and full participation of the highest titles, and most distinguishing perfections of the Supreme Being, it follows, that the Son (with respect to *Deity*) is as perfectly equal to the Father, though **all the Son’s Deity came from his Divine Father**; as Isaac (with respect to *humanity*) was equal to Abraham, though all the humanity of Isaac came from his *human* parent.” John Fletcher, *An Expostulatory Letter to the Rev. Dr. Priestley*, Chp. 3, 1788

Matthew Henry, 1806

“He was the Son of God; I **proceeded forth** from God, *exelthon*; this means his divine excellence, or **origin from the Father**, by the communication of the divine essence” Matthew Henry, *An exposition of all the books of the Old and New Testaments* vol. 4 1806, p. 569

Abner Jones, 1829

“Light proceeded forth and came from the sun, and is essentially of the same nature and united with it. So **Christ proceeded forth from the substance of the Father, and is of the same divine nature with his Father** and essentially united with Him in creation, providence and grace.” *Christian Repository*, volume 1, pub. Church of the United Brethren in Christ (1800-1889) May, 1829 Vol 1. No. 5 “Principles, No. 1” by Abner Jones, p. 131.

Church of England, 1846

“what is meant by styling Christ, God; that is, we declare that he is **God the Son from God the Father**, truly and verily God, as we conceive the Father to be... dean Vincent, quoted in bishop Mant’s “Prayer-book,” p. 338” *The Church of England Magazine*, Vol. 20 1846, p. 126.

Samuel Minton, 1847

“The Apostles are here said to believe two things; 1st, that Jesus “**came out from**” God; and 2ndly, that he was sent by God.” Samuel Minton, *The Pre-Existence of Christ*, Lecture XI, p. 140, 1847.

Henry Solly, 1861

“In the words ‘**proceeded forth**,’ *exelthon*, **something more certainly appears to be implied than that our Lord had merely received a commission from God** in the same way as Moses or John the Baptist received it. If he had intended us to understand **merely that Christ was divinely commissioned**, there were several words quite fit for such a meaning, without taking one that **implies a great deal more**.” *The Doctrine of atonement by the Son of God*, Henry Solly, 1861, pp. 45, 46.

Charles Spurgeon, 1875

“Jesus Christ is the Son of God, by what we are accustomed to call **eternal filiation**, or what the text calls **proceeding from him**; and therefore because of that, **being divine and proceeding from the divine Father in some mysterious sense**, he is himself to be devoutly adored, and if we are the children of God

we must love the Lord Jesus.” Sermon 1257 “Love to Jesus the Great Test” delivered October 3, 1875 based on John 8:42.

Charles Spurgeon, 1883

“**A man is the father of a man; a man is not the father of that which he makes with his own hands,** such as a statue or a painting; but **a man is the father of another who is of the same nature as himself,** and **the Lord Jesus Christ is of the same nature as God in all respects—a true Son.** The Lord Jesus Christ is **equal in nature to the Father,** and therefore he counts it not robbery to be **equal with God,** and he receives the same honor and worship as the Father, as saith the Scripture, “that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father.” Charles Spurgeon, sermon 1727 “The Voice from the Cloud”, June 24, 1883

Our pioneers shared the same conviction.

“Jesus Christ was **begotten of the Father's own substance.** He was **not created out of material** as the angels and other creatures were. **He is truly and emphatically the "Son of God,"** the same as I am the son of my father.” D.M. Canright, *Review and Herald*, June 18, 1867

“ ‘The Impress of His Substance.’ -This is what we find in the margin of the Revised Version, for “the express image of His person,” and it is more true to the original. In a vastly inferior degree we see this illustrated among men. **The son is to a degree the impress of his father's being,** but only to a degree, since nothing on this earth is perfect. **The son inherits not only the goods of his father, but also the disposition and characteristics;** and this is by far the most important inheritance.” E.J. Waggoner, *The Present Truth*, July 15, 1897.

Spurgeon also identified the Father and Son in Genesis 1:26.

“The Lord Jesus was for ever in the bosom of the Father, and he saith, “All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.” **It was with the Son of God that the Father took counsel when he said, “Let us make man in our own image,** after our likeness.” *Ibid*, Sermon 1727

Ellen White said essentially the same thing.

“And I saw that when **God said to his Son,** Let us make man in our image, Satan was jealous of Jesus.” *Spiritual Gifts* vol. 1 p. 17, 1858

“After the earth was created, and the beasts upon it, **the Father and Son** carried out their purpose, which was designed before the fall of Satan, to make man in their own image. They had wrought together in the creation of the earth and every living thing upon it. And now **God says to his Son,** ‘Let us make man in our image.’” *Spiritual Gifts* vol. 3, p. 33, 1864; *Signs of the Times*, Jan. 9, 1897; *The Spirit of Prophecy* vol. 1 p. 24, 1870; *The Story of Redemption* p. 20, 1947; *That I May Know Him* p. 13, 1964; *To Be Like Jesus*, p. 227, 2004.

“But when **God said to His Son,** "Let us make man in our image," Satan was jealous of Jesus.” *Early Writings* p. 145, 1882.

Repeatedly, from 1858 to 1897, Ellen White equated the “us” and “our” of Genesis 1:26 with God the Father and His Son. E.J. Waggoner agreed.

“Said he: ‘I and my Father are one.’ John 10:30. Not a thought does one have that is not the thought of the other. Their unity in creation is shown in the words, "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Gen. 1:26. This union of **the Father and the Son serves to explain why** the Hebrew word which is rendered **‘God’ is in the plural number.**” *Bible Echo and Signs of the Times*, Sept. 15, 1889.

E.J. Waggoner wrote of Christ's birth as the Son of God the year before the famous 1888 General Conference commenting on John 8:42.

"But the plainest statement of all, that men are not by nature the children of God, was given by our Saviour himself. To the wicked Jews who said, "We have one Father, even God," he said: "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." Signs of the Times, Feb. 24, 1887.

Then he said,

"All that Christ has or is to have, we shall have also. **He is the Son of God by birth; the only begotten Son of God.** Angels are the sons of God (Job 38:7) **by creation. Adam was a son of God** in the same way, only a little lower than the angels." *Ibid.*

Waggoner notes that there was a difference between Angels and Adam (who are sons of God by creation), and Christ who is the Son of God by birth.

"It is **the word of God proceeding forth and coming from God**, just as Jesus Christ, the living Word, proceeded forth and came from God." *General Conference Bulletin* Feb 24, 1895 p. 318

The year following the 1888 General Conference Waggoner commented on John 14:28 where Christ states that "My Father is greater than I."

"In arguing the **perfect equality of the Father and the Son**, and the fact that **Christ is in very nature God**, we do not design to be understood as teaching that the Father was not before the Son."

In other words, "we teach that the Father was before the Son."

"Christ is the Son of God. While both are of the same nature, **the Father is first in point of time**. He is also **greater in that he had no beginning**, while **Christ's personality had a beginning**." *Bible Echo and Signs of the Times*, Oct. 1, 1889.

James White expressed the same thought eight years earlier.

"The Father was greater than the Son in that he was first. The Son was equal with the Father in that he had received all things from the Father." *Review and Herald*, Jan. 4, 1881.

Just as Christ's humanity had a beginning when he, the Word, became flesh; so Christ's divine Sonship had a beginning when God's thought was made audible and the Word proceeded forth from the bosom of God. Yet notice it is because of this divine inheritance that "both (Father and Son) are of the same nature."

E.J. Waggoner also featured John 8:42 in his 1888 presentations published two years later in his book *Christ and His Righteousness*.

"**All things proceed ultimately from God, the Father; even Christ Himself proceeded and came forth** from the Father, but it has pleased the Father that in Him should all fullness dwell... We know that Christ '**proceeded forth and came from God**' (John 8:42), but it was so far back in the ages of eternity as to be far beyond the grasp of the mind of man." p. 9; also *The Present Truth*, Jan. 9, 1896.

This proceeding forth—back in the ages of eternity—is not his leaving the side of the Father to come to this earth, but his divine birth, coming out of the Father, out of the Father's bosom.

"There was a time when **Christ proceeded forth and came from God, from the bosom of the Father** (John 8:42; 1:18), but that time was so far back in the days of eternity that to finite comprehension it is practically without beginning." *Christ and His Righteousness*, p. 21; also *The Present Truth*, U.K Jan 9, 1896.

Ellen White fully endorsed Waggoner's message.

“When Brother Waggoner brought out these ideas in Minneapolis, it was **the first clear teaching on this subject** from any human lips I had heard, excepting the conversations between myself and my husband.” Sermon at Rome, NY, Jun 19, 1889 in 5MR p. 219.

“I see the beauty of truth in the presentation of the righteousness of Christ in relation to the law as the doctor has placed it before us...That which has been presented **harmonizes perfectly** with the light which God has been pleased to give me during **all the years** of my experience.” *The 1888 Materials*, p. 164.

“All the years” of her experience harmonized “perfectly” with what Dr. Waggoner brought out in Minneapolis. But we are told today that nine years later she abandoned “the light which God had been pleased to give” *her all those years*. Is that so?

“**A line of truth extending from that time to the time when we shall enter the city of God, was made plain to me**, and I gave to others the instruction that the Lord had given me.” 1SM p. 206 1904

“What influence is it would lead men at this stage of our history to work in an underhand, powerful way to tear down **the foundation of our faith**--the foundation **that was laid at the beginning of our work** by prayerful study of the Word and by revelation? Upon this foundation we have been **building for the past fifty years.**” 1SM p. 207 1904

“I appreciate **the truth, every jot of it, just as it has been given to me by the Holy Spirit for the last fifty years.** I desire everyone to know that **I stand on the same platform of truth that we have maintained for more than half a century.** That is the testimony I desire to bear on the day that I am seventy-eight years of age.” Ms 142, 1905

“**The past fifty years have not dimmed one jot or principle of our faith** as we received the great and wonderful evidences that were made certain to us in 1844, after the passing of the time....**Not a word is changed or denied.** That which the Holy Spirit testified to as truth after the passing of the time, in our great disappointment, **is the solid foundation of truth.** Pillars of truth were revealed, and **we accepted the foundation principles that have made us what we are--Seventh-day Adventists,** keeping the commandments of God and having the faith of Jesus.” Youth's Instructor, February 7, 1906

Uriah Smith applied John 8:42.

“His [Christ's] beginning was not like that of any other being in the universe. It is set forth in the mysterious expressions, ‘his [God's] only begotten Son’ (John 3:16; 1John 4:9), ‘the only begotten of the Father’ (John 1:14), and, ‘**I proceeded forth and came from God.**’ John 8:42.” Uriah Smith, *Looking Unto Jesus* p. 10 1898

J. Cynddylan Jones, 1884

“ ‘Ye have believed that I came out from God. I came forth from—out of—the Father, and am come into the world.’ Not only He came from God, but **He came out of God.** John the Baptist came from God: ‘There was a man sent from God, whose name was John.’ But **Jesus Christ came, not from God, but out of God—He emerged from His central essence,** ‘And He came into the world’—not to it, but into it: **out of God into the world,** out of the loftiest heart of Divinity into the deepest heart of humanity” *The Local preacher's treasury*, ed. by John Bate 1884. The Divine Love: Christmas Sermon by J. Cynddylan Jones, p. 542.

W.W. Prescott, 1920

“**The Son is equal to the Father in everything except** that which is conveyed by the terms Father and Son. He is equal to the Father in that he shares to the full the Father's existence from eternity and his infinite power and wisdom and love. But inasmuch as **the Father possesses these divine attributes from**

himself alone, whereas **the Son possesses them as derived from the Father**, in this real sense and in this sense only, the Father is greater than the Son.” W.W. Prescott, *The Doctrine of Christ*, Section II, p. 20, 1920.

Prescott, who was directly involved in assisting in the editing of the *Desire of Ages*, continued to understand the meaning of the “original, unborrowed, underived” life which was in Christ to be “derived from the Father.”

Is this really the case? [that Jesus proceeded forth from within the Father’s essence]

1. The Greek Verb

The Greek verb that is used in these places is *exerchomai*. It is employed more than 200 times in the NT and is typically translated as “to go/come out/forth,” “to proceed.” It can also mean “to go away,” “to leave,” “to depart,” “to escape,” “to be descended,” and “to disappear.” It is used literally and figuratively. While the Samaritans “came out of the city” (John 4:30), Jesus escaped the grasp of the people (John 10:39), Paul departed (Acts 20:1), the faith of the Thessalonians “has gone forth,” that is, it was proclaimed (1Thess 1:8), news of one of Jesus’ miracle spread (Matt 9:26), and for their masters the hope of profit had disappeared as soon as Paul healed the demon-possessed slave-girl (Acts 16:19).

Sometimes the location from where someone came or went out is not stressed. Instead the emphasis is on the direction of the journey. Therefore, a number of translations render *exerchomai* in these cases as “to go” (e.g., John 1:43).¹ “The next day Jesus decided to go to Galilee” (John 1:43). This short review of the usage of *exerchomai* indicates that we have to study the context of each occurrence of the term to determine its precise shade of meaning.

This is undeniably true. The last example of the demon-possessed girl is most closely parallel to the texts under consideration in that both are situations where a being came out from another being.

Luke 11:24 The unclean spirit, when he has **gone out of** the man
ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα ἐξέλιθη

John 8:42 you would love me, for I **came out** and have come from God
ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον

John 16:27 you have loved me, and have believed that I **from** the Father God **came forth**
ὅτι ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς/θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον

John 16:28 I **came out from** the Father and have come into the world
ἐξῆλθον ἐκ / παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς

John 17:8 they...knew for sure that I **came forth from** you
ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον (that from you I came out)

Hebrews 7:5 “they [sons of Levi] **come out** of the loins of Abraham”

Or when healing power goes out of Christ:

Mark 5:30 “virtue had **gone out of him**” when the woman touched the hem of his garment.

In fact, the most frequent appearance of *exerchomai* in the Gospels is the casting *out* of demons, from which we get the word exorcism.

Matt 9:32,33 A dumb man possessed with a devil, and the devil was cast *out*

Matt 12:28 Jesus cast *out* devils

Matt 12:43 the unclean spirit goes *out* of a man
 Matt 17:18 Jesus rebuked the devil; and he departed *out* of him
 Mark 1:26 the unclean spirit came *out* of him
 Mark 5:8 Jesus said, Come *out* of the man thou unclean spirit
 Mark 7:30 the devil was gone *out* of her daughter
 Mark 9:25 Dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come *out* of him
 Luke 4:33 When the devil had thrown him in the midst, he came *out* of him
 Luke 8:2 Mary called Magdalene, *out* of whom went seven devils
 Luke 8:29 He commanded the unclean spirit to come *out* of the man
 Luke 11:14 When the devil was gone *out*, the dumb man spoke
 Luke 11:24 When the unclean spirit is gone *out* of a man...he says, I will return to my house whence I came *out*
 Acts 16:18 Paul said to the spirit, in the name of Jesus Christ come *out* of her

If the *exerchomai/exelthon* of the Son is merely leaving the Father's side, then the *exerchomai/exelthon* of the unclean spirit is also simply leaving the possessed person's side. But the demons came *out* (*exerchomai*) of the demoniacs and *into* (*eiserchomai*) the swine. They dwell within the person they possess which they call their "house."

"A study of semantically related and contextually related terms demonstrates that the issue in demon possession is indeed one of location—**inside versus outside!** The Greek word *ekballein* is used thirty-three times in the New Testament—exclusively in the Synoptic Gospels—to mean 'to cast *out*' a demon, unclean spirit, or Satan...The New Testament also speaks of demons 'going *out*' (*exerchomai*) of a person".
 Russel L. Penney, *Overcoming the World Missions Crisis: Thinking Strategically to Reach the World*, Kregel Academic, 2001, p. 217, 218.

Likewise, the Son came *out* of the Father as the divine Word and *into* human flesh as the Christ. He dwells within the Father's bosom; he is in the Father and the Father in him (John 14:10; 17:21). Further, They send Their spirit which proceeds from the Father (John 15:26) and the Son (John 20:22; Gal 4:6) to dwell in us (John 14:23; Rom 8:9; Eph 3:16,17).

2. The References

Six verses occur in John's Gospel where *exerchomai* is applied to Jesus describing his coming forth from God the Father. They are John 8:42; 13:3; 16:27,28,30; and 17:8. We will take a look at them in order to find out, if they address Jesus' emanation or procession from the Father. Such an understanding would most likely affect our view of the Trinity.

"I prefer to avoid the term 'Trinity,' which does not appear in the Bible, using instead the Scriptural 'Godhead,' which is derived from the Greek *Theotais*, and means literally 'the state of being God,' or 'Divinity.'" James D. Beyer, "How Many Gods in the Godhead?" *Signs of the Times*, January 1, 1970.

If Jesus were an emanation from the Father, he may have been within the Father from eternity but would not have existed as a distinct person from eternity...

Can we profess to understand the mind of God? (1Cor 2:16).

We have already examined the *exerchomai* of unclean spirits from possessed human beings. The evil spirits exist as distinct persons within the human vessel and are not impaired or impoverished or limited by doing so. Paul speaks of Christ as the wisdom of God (1Cor 1:24), a thought first expressed by Solomon in Proverbs 8 and confirmed by Ellen White on multiple occasions. The understanding of Christ as the Word is a most primitive Christian concept. The Wisdom of God is in the mind of God; The Word of God originates in the mind of God.

"those things which *proceed out* of the mouth come forth from the heart" (mind) Matt 15:18

From the earliest post-apostolic times the Son was described as the mind or thought of God residing in the heart of God and then was uttered as the Word of God.

“the Word, that always exists, **residing within the heart of God**. For before anything came into being He had Him as a counselor, being **His own mind and thought**. But when God wished to make all that He determined on, **He begot this word, uttered, the first-born** of all creation” *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*: vol. 2, Theophilus (7th bishop of Antioch c. 169-183) to Autolytus (an idolater and scorner of Christians), p. 103, Chapter XXII

Ellen White, in agreement with many others during the early Christian centuries,^a understood Christ’s preexistence in two phases: first, as the thought and then, second, as the word of God.

“He was the Word of God,—God’s thought made audible.” *Desire of Ages* p. 19.

Grudem and Purswell note that in the 1Cor. 14:36 use of *exerchomai*,

“Paul’s statement is very simple and just says, ‘Did **the word of God come forth** [aorist of *exerchomai*, ‘come out’] from you?’ The KJV literally translates, ‘What? Came the word of God **out** from you?’ Wayne A. Grudem, Jeff Purswell, *Bible Doctrine: Essential Teachings of the Christian Faith*, Zondervan, 1999, p. 412.

Words do not simply come *from* beside us, they come *out* from us as we speak. James 3:10 employs *exerchomai* in the setting of words issuing from one’s mouth.

“James’ interesting shift to mouth here, along with his use of the verb *exerchomai* (‘come out’), strongly suggests that his words are dependent on Jesus’ teaching regarding the defiling power of speech (cf. Mt. 15:11, 18-19).” Douglas J. Moo, *The letter of James: an introduction and commentary*, Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1985, pp. 128, 129.

Carson compares the use of *exerchomai* with the procession of the Spirit from the Father in John 14:26.

“Otherwise put, the Spirit of truth is the one *who goes out from the Father*: the verb (*ekporeuomai*) is somewhat unexpected, but probably means little more than an alternative, *exerchomai*, repeatedly applied to the Son (8:42; 13:3; 16:27, 28, 30; 17:8).” D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1991, p. 528. (emphasis in original)

Why is *ekporeuomai* unexpected? Because it enforces the concept of “coming out,” and in this case the Spirit of truth this creates an unanticipated cognitive dissonance (for those who preconceive the Comforter to be a separate, independent being) when confronted with the idea of coming “out” from the Father.

The word *ekporeuomai* is defined as 1. To go out (6 times), go forth (1); 2. a. to proceed (10), to come forth (4), to issue, as of feelings, affections, sayings; b. to flow forth as a river; c. to project from the mouth; d. to spread abroad. It is the word used in Matt 4:4 “every word that *proceeds* from the mouth of God.” Word, breath, spirit are used synonymously in scripture as in Psalm 33:6 “By the *word* of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the *breath* of His mouth” and John 6:63 “the *words* that I speak...are *spirit* and they are life.”

...because at some point he would have flowed out, emanated from the Father.

The use of the expression “some point” in the context of eternity indicates not a reference to eternity, but rather sempiternity. Sempiternity describes existence within the domain of time which extends infinitely into the future or the past. Most entertain such a view when saying that something will last forever, time without end. However, the correct description of such an arrangement is properly described as sempiternity where time and age is uncountable, infinite. On the other hand, eternity exists outside the boundaries of time and is as such not amenable to concepts such as a “point in time” or an event, sequence, or age. This is the meaning of the Hebrew word *olam*: out of sight, over the horizon, unreachable. Jude 25 demonstrates this Hebrew concept: “To the only God our Savior, through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, majesty, dominion and authority, **before all time** and now and forever.” NASB, ESV. “...before all ages” NIV, Weymouth.

Typically the idea is that the procession of the second transcendental being from the first indicates that

the second is inferior to the first.

Why? Is there Scriptural support for such an assertion?

Divine equality—not inferiority—is defined in John’s gospel by the Father-Son relationship.
“God was his Father, making himself equal with God” John 5:18.

Jesus recognized his relationship with his Father was one of submission to his Father’s will.

“The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him.” John 13:16.
“I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I.” John 14:28.

In these two statements of Christ the acknowledgement of his Father’s authority is made plain and consistent. In obedience to the Father’s commission to be sent and in his going back to the One who sent him, Christ says that his Father is greater—a recognition of his Father’s authority. This does not make the Son inferior, but rather glorifies the Son because he honors his Father. The submission of the Son assures the authority of the Father. God’s authority and the security of His government rests completely in the service and obedience of the Son.

The Son inherits the very same nature of the Father and is in no way inferior to the fullness of his Father’s divinity. But it is the Father who gives the life which is in Himself to His Son (John 5:26); it is the Father who gives all things into the hands of His Son (Matt 11:27; 28:18; John 3:35; 13:3; 1Cor 15:26); it is the Father who gives the commandment (the authority) to His Son to take up his immortality after laying it down as he receives it once again from his Father (John 10:18).

We must also remember that Jesus repeatedly said that he and the Father are one (John 10:30); that the Father works and he does the same works (John 5:17). These verses are compatible with a true Son the has the same nature as his Father, does the same works, knows the Father as no one else knows him (John 10:15). He is not inferior to the Father; though they have “complete unity,” the Son is not absolutely “identical” to the Father.

“From eternity there was a complete unity between the Father and the Son. They were two, yet little short of being identical; two in individuality, yet one in spirit, and heart, and character.”
Youth’s Instructor, Dec. 16, 1897

The source is more important than the emanation.²

Kurt Galling (1900-1987) a proponent of Old Testament Higher Criticism, explained the serpent in Genesis 3 as a fertility symbol, that the Exodus myth was preceded by the Abrahamic myth.

“Those who seek wisdom in the study of the world’s authors, are not drinking from the pure fountain flowing from the throne of God.” Ellen White, *The Bible Echo*, June 15, 1893

The Source is more important than that which comes out of the Source. Jesus taught this great truth.

“The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him” John 13:16.

The Father is “the great Source of all things” DA p. 21. But the Son is the only way to the Father (John 14:6). Thus he is *given* preeminence (Col 1:18), and is *exalted* above all that is in heaven and earth (Phil 2:9,10).

Yet, the Son knows that the Father is his head (1Cor 11:3) even as “the man is head of the woman.”

The Son is the Son *of* God, even as “the woman is *of* the man” (1Cor 11:8, 12), “because she was taken out of man” (Gen 2:23).

And as Eve was not inferior to Adam, so the Son of God is not inferior to God his Father.

Eve was just as human as Adam. In fact, she had the same nature as Adam more so than any other human.

Does the Gospel of John suggest Jesus to be an emanation from the Father? We will take a look at the passages.

Yes, it does suggest that Jesus was the only begotten Son of the Father, that his Source is the Father. The suggestion is not subtle. The question we should consider is this: is this suggestion valid or not? Is the term Father, consistently and profusely employed by Christ, and the term Son, twice audibly spoken by God Himself, true and accurate or an unfortunate, misleading choice of words on the part of Deity?

John 8:42. This text is part of a longer debate between Jesus and the Jews which deals with the rejection of Jesus' message. The passage focuses strongly on "father." However, the term "father" relates to three persons, the heavenly Father (8:16, 18, 19, 19, 19, 27, 28, 38, 41, 42, 49, 54—twelve times), Abraham (8:39, 53, 56—three times), and the devil (8:38, 41, 44, 44, 44—five times). Jesus is sent by God the Father, but he is not accepted because the Jews do not belong to God. While claiming to have Abraham as their father, they do not exhibit Abraham's attitude but in reality have Satan as their father, the liar and murderer. In this connection Jesus mentions that he has come forth from God. What does this mean? (1) The context refers to Jesus' incarnation—John 8:14. "Jesus' origin and his destination are the same, whether viewed as a Place or as a Person.

Jesus continues in verses 16-18 to identify two witnesses to his credentials as the divine Son of God. He is one, and his Father is the other. They are the two immutable things by which God cannot lie (Heb 6:18). The Son promised to make himself of no reputation, to humble himself, to be found in the fashion of man, to become obedient unto death, that he might secure the redemption of our lost race. The Father placed His seal, His oath upon the eternal covenant in the councils of heaven, when "the counsel of peace was between them both" Zech 6:13.

He has come 'from above' (3:31) or 'from heaven' (3:13, 31; 6:33, 38, 51, 58), and he will return there (3:13; 6:62), or, to put it another way, God the Father is both 'the One who sent him' (see 4:34; 5:24, 30, 37; 6:38, 39-40, 57; 7:16, 28-29), and the One to whom he will return (7:33)."³

The longer debate includes the dispute over Christ's Sonship which begins in chapter 5.

"in calling God 'His own Father' [Christ] had declared Himself equal with God. John 5:18, R. V. The whole nation of the Jews called God their Father, therefore they would not have been so enraged if Christ had represented Himself as standing in the same relation to God. But they accused Him of blasphemy, showing that they understood Him as making this claim **in the highest sense.**"
DA p. 207, 1898

What claim? That God was 'His own Father' "in the highest sense."

This was not in just a metaphoric sense as was the case for the Jews who also called God their Father. The lowest sense of invoking fatherhood is to do so merely as a figure of speech, a symbolic, spiritual father. They spoke of Abraham as their father, not immediately in a literal sense, but at least ancestrally. Yet the highest sense in which Christ spoke was that God was literally his Father, his actual Father. Three years later, Ellen White was even more emphatic:

The whole nation called God their Father, and if Jesus had done this in the same sense in which they did, the Pharisees would not have been so enraged. But they accused Jesus of blasphemy, showing that they understood that Christ claimed God as His Father **in the very highest sense.**" RH, March 5, 1901

Perhaps one could be satisfied with the overshadowing of Mary by the power of the Most High as sufficient to explain how God was the Father of Christ in his humanity. But in the very highest sense? Jesus was claiming divinity as his right by inheritance. To delay God's Fatherhood until the incarnation robs Christ of his eternal Sonship—leaving him only the Son of man in the very highest sense while the Son of God in but a limited, figurative, metaphoric sense. Did God give His Son after the Word was made flesh? (John 3:16; Rom 8:32) or did He give the Son of His love (Col 1:13) as Ellen White depicts in the councils of heaven before even the creation of the angelic host.

(2) The context also repeatedly refers to Jesus as having been sent by the Father (8:16, 18, 26, 29, 42). He is on the Father's mission.

Did He send His only begotten Son into the world? (1John 4:9,14), as “the first begotten” (Heb 1:6) or did the first transcendental being only send the second transcendental being who would become the Son? The measure of the Father’s love is dependent on the reality of His genuine fatherhood.

(3) John 8:42 continues with these concepts. Obviously Jesus is not talking about his origin in eternity past but about his relationship to the Father. He has been sent by God. He is “God’s messenger.”⁴

Obviously Jesus *is* appealing to “his relationship to the Father”—an intimate, inherent relationship that is based on lineage, inheritance, possession. Yes, he was sent by God; so were the prophets and apostles. “There was a man sent from God, whose name was John” John 1:6. John the baptist was also God’s messenger. “I will send my messenger and he shall prepare the way before me” Malachi 3:1, a voice crying in the wilderness, “Prepare ye the way of the Lord!” Isaiah 40:3. “But last of all He sent unto them His Son” Matt 21:37. First, however, he was His Son.

Not a Son by appointment or adoption (like Eliezer), nor a Son by creation (like Ishmael), but a real Son (like Isaac). This was the lesson for Abraham: Eliezer “shall not be thine heir; but he that shall *come forth out of* thine own body” Gen 15:4. The coming forth of the Son must be first, then the sending of the Son is second.

He came forth *and* was sent.

“I proceeded forth *and* came from God” John 8:42

“I came forth from the Father, *and* am come into the world” John 16:28

“I came out from thee, *and* they have believed that thou didst send me” John 17:8

Proceeded forth, came forth from, came out from the Father is proof of Christ’s divine credentials;
Came from God, come into the world because the Father did send him is the fulfillment of his mission.

(4) In verse 42 Jesus states literally, “From God I have come forth (*exēlthon*) and have come/am here (*hēkō*).” Brown comments on this statement by observing “. . . the aorist tense indicates that the reference is rather to the mission of the Son, i.e., the Incarnation. ‘I came forth and am here’ is all one idea.”⁵ So the issue is not the life in or of the Godhead. *Hēkō* describes *exēlthon*.

⁵**Father Raymond E. Brown**, American Roman Catholic priest, member of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, denied John’s authorship of the Gospel of John speculating instead that it was the work of a hypothetical ‘Johannine community.’ Influential in moving Vatican II to support higher criticism, denied the inerrancy of Scripture, and questioned the historical validity of Christ’s virgin birth.

We have already addressed the two verbs, the two actions. Because Brown wishes to defend only an Incarnational Sonship he is obligated to make them but one and the same at the sacrifice of Christ’s Eternal Sonship surprisingly in denial of his own church’s Nicene Creed. Why not quote an Adventist author?

“It is no accident that Jesus is called the only begotten Son of God. **What God begets is God**—just as surely as what man begets is man, or what beast begets is beast.” “In God’s case the begetting itself is eternal and is thus different from any earthly begetting. Smith’s son may rise to far greater fame than his sire ever knew, yet, as a true son, he will ever respect and honour his senior, and may still even obey him.” James D. Beyer, “How Many Gods in the Godhead?” *Signs of the Times*, January 1, 1970.

(5) One needs to be careful not to read too much into the preposition *ex* which is used as a prefix in *exerchomai* but is also found by itself. According to 8:42 Jesus has come from God (*ek tou theou*). The unbelieving Jews are “of the father the devil” (*ek tou patros tou diabolou*; 8:44). They are not “of God” (*ek tou theou*; 8:47). On the other hand, believers are “born of God” (*ek theou egennēthēsan*; 1:13). One can be from below (*ex tōn katō*) or from above (*ex tōn anōn*; 8:23), from this world (*ex toutou tou kosmou*) or not from this world (*ouk ex tou kosmou toutou*; 8:23). In these cases, the preposition *ex* does not describe an emanation. Therefore in this sense, it cannot be applied to Jesus either. Schnackenburg sees that Jesus “argues from a sense of complete union with God.”⁶

In isolation, *ex/ek* indicates source and derivation. The source of the Jew's murderous intent is their father the devil; the source of the believer's new birth is the Spirit of their Father; the source of earthly beings is the earth below; the source of heavenly beings is heaven above.

But we are studying the usage of *exerchomai* and in the case of John 8:42 the preposition *ek* serves to provide explicit emphasis and intensification to the *ex-* prefix. In such a usage the concept of "out" is undeniable. John 19:34 is another example that clearly illustrates the transition from inside to outside: "one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith *came there out* blood and water."

The significance of the *ex-* prefix should not be ignored or minimized as Silzer and Finley point out.

"Many Greek words are formed from a single root by adding derivational prefixes or suffixes. This is especially true for verbs, which often receive a prefix that has the same form as a preposition. The verb *erchomai* ("to come"), for example, serves as the basis for *exerchomai* ("to come out of"), *aperchomai* ("to go away"), and *proserchomai* ("to come to, approach"). The preposition *ek* (*ex* before a vowel) means "out of," *apo* means "away from," and *pros* means "to" or "toward." " Peter James Silzer, Thomas John Finley, *How Biblical Languages Work: A Student's Guide to Learning Hebrew and Greek*, Kregel Academic, 2004, p. 227.

But why quote from Schnackenburg? He is another catholic exegete that should uphold the traditional belief that the Son proceeds from the Father even as the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. Or does he?

But he makes it also very clear that the verse deals "with Jesus' coming into the world, and not with his eternal going forth from the Father . . ."⁷

Are we being asked to accept the authority of a Catholic scholar who believes that God burns His creatures forever in the fires of hell, who believes that Sunday is the true day of worship, who believes that man has a naturally immortal soul, who believes that priests have the power to grant forgiveness of sins, who believes that the pope is Christ's vicar on earth? Why should we take the word of such men over the Word of God, the Spirit of Prophecy, and our own Adventist pioneers? Is this the mission of the Biblical Research Institute? To direct us to the position of Rome?

Consider, then another authority, John MacArthur.

"It is now my conviction that the begetting spoken of in Psalm 2 and Hebrews 1 is not an event that takes place in time. Even though at first glance Scripture seems to employ terminology with **temporal overtones** ("*this day* have I begotten thee"), the context of Psalm 2:7 seems clearly to be a reference to the eternal decree of God. It is reasonable to conclude that the begetting spoken of there is also something that pertains to eternity rather than a point in time. **The temporal language** should therefore be understood as **figurative**, not literal." John MacArthur, *The Sonship of Christ*, 1991.

Rather than the "birth language" being understood as figurative—the norm within SDA theological circles—MacArthur became convinced that it was the *temporal language*, "this day," that should be metaphoric. The "begotten Son" was therefore literal, real, actual; the timing of his begetting is figurative, symbolic, *olam*.

John 13:3. This verse is taken from the passage that deals with Jesus washing the feet of his disciples and instituting the ordinance of the footwashing which in some way is related to his death. According to verse 3 Jesus "had come forth from God and was going back to God." The second part of this statement helps to understand the first part. The issue is again Jesus' coming from and returning to the Father, not his eternal origin. The marvelous fact is that the incarnate Lord, the divine Christ serves his disciples in washing their feet, while at the same time having all things in his hands, i.e., maintaining universal dominion.⁸

The occurrence of *exelthon* in this verse is accompanied by the explicit prepositions *apo* (away from) and *pros* (toward) to make clear the nature of the movement relative to God. This simply verifies the second verbal phrase of John 8:42. It does not invalidate the first.

John 16:27,28,30. These verses come at the end of Jesus' farewell speeches. While verses 27 and 28 contain words of Jesus, verse 30 is a response of the disciples. In all three verses the term *exerchomai* is applied to Jesus. Twice Jesus states that he came forth from the Father/from God (*para theou/para tou patros*), while the disciples confess that they believe in Jesus having come forth from God (*apo theou*). In verse 5 Jesus had mentioned that he would return to the One who has sent him. According to verse 7 Jesus would go away. The disciples would no longer see him (16: 16), and the Holy Spirit would take his place as a friend and advocate.

The context of leaving and returning, sending and being sent is of particular interest when considering the parallel actions of the Son and the Comforter-Advocate. The discussion on this topic encompasses John 15:26 to 16:15.

Summarized, Jesus states that:

- He will send the Comforter from the Father (v. 26)
- The Comforter-Spirit of truth proceeds from the Father
- Jesus is going to Him that sent him (v. 5)
- It is expedient for the disciples that Jesus goes away (v. 7)
- The Comforter will not come if Jesus does not go away

Why?

Was not the Spirit of God already present in the world? Yes.

- Zecharias was filled with the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:67)
- His son John was filled with the Holy Spirit even from his mother's womb (Luke 1:15)
- His wife Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:41)
- The Holy Spirit came upon Mary (Luke 1:35)
- The Holy Spirit was upon Simeon (Luke 2:25)
- God gave the Spirit without measure to Jesus (John 1:34)
- God anointed Jesus with the Holy Spirit (Acts 10:38)

Then why was it not possible for the Comforter to come if Jesus did not return to his Father?

“for the Holy Spirit was not yet; because Jesus was not yet glorified” (John 7:39)

- But if Jesus departs, he will send the Comforter (v. 7)
- The Comforter will convict the world of righteousness because Jesus goes to his Father (v. 10)

The Spirit of Christ was in the prophets speaking to them, testifying beforehand (1Pet 1:11).

Jesus Christ the righteous (1John 2:1) “who of God is made unto us righteousness” (1Cor 1:30)

Came to reveal the righteousness of God (Rom 1:17) to the world.

The Comforter was promised by the Father to be given to Jesus (Acts 2:33).

“And having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, Jesus shed this forth.”

“God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts” (Gal 4:6).

But Jesus pointed also to his union with the Father (16:32).⁹

⁹**Oscar Cullmann**, (1902-1999) Lutheran responsible for ecumenical dialog between Lutherans and Catholics; his tombstone bears the inscription “adviser to three popes.”

This context underlines that Jesus is talking about his incarnation. This is supported by verse 28 which helps to understand verses 27 and 30: Jesus came from the Father into the world and would soon leave the world and return to the Father. Brown commenting on v. 28 writes: “The first tense *‘I came’—aorist] acknowledges that the incarnation took place at a particular moment in time; the second *‘I have come’—

perfect] acknowledges its enduring effect."¹⁰ We also notice that different prepositions are used in connection with *exerchomai*. In John 8:42 it is *ek*, in 16:27 *para*, in 16:28 *para* or *ek* depending on the manuscript, and in 16:30 *apo*. Obviously they are used with the same meaning "of"/"from," and there is no real difference between them when John uses them in conjunction with *exerchomai*.¹¹

But this also tells us that *exerchomai ek* should be handled carefully and not taken too far. "Ek cannot be interpreted theologically in reference to the intra-Trinitarian relationship of Father and Son ('came out of the Father'), for this line refers to the incarnation, not to what later theology would call the procession of the Son."¹²

¹²Father Raymond E. Brown is again referenced in what is becoming an increasing reliance on a dubious source. Brown suggests that incarnational sonship predates a "later" processional theology. This has already been demonstrated to be an invalid assertion by the earliest post-apostolic sources.

"In Jn. 8:42, Jesus uses *exerchomai* to tell the Jews that he came from God." "John highlights this unique relationship between the Father and the Son throughout his gospel, demonstrating both Jesus' divine nature and his mission; therefore, anyone who embraces Jesus as Savior must first recognize his sovereign position as one who has proceeded from the Father." William D. Mounce, *Mounces Complete Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words*, Zondervan, 2009.

" 'When He had come to the other side, to the country of the Gergesenes, there met Him two demon-possessed men, coming [*exerchomai*] out of the tombs' (Matt. 8:28). Here, the word 'coming' has a very different meaning...this is a different word that is never used in the context of the Second Coming." H. L. Nigro, *Before God's Wrath: Revised and Expanded Edition*, Strong Tower Publishing, 2004.

Nigro observes that *exerchomai* is never used in connection with the Second Coming where Christ is clearly coming from heaven to earth. This is surprising only if the normal usage of this verb is to express simply the departure from one location to another.

John 17:8. The last reference is found in Jesus' high priestly prayer (John 17). Jesus confesses that he has come from the Father and that his disciples believe that he was sent by him. The context points to his preexistence (17:5) and to the fact that he will return to the Father (17:11,13). As Jesus is not from the world (*ouk eimi ek tou kosmou*) so his disciples are neither (*ouk eisin ek tou kosmou*; 17:14,16). There is also a strong emphasis on Jesus being sent (17:3,8,18,21,23,25). In other words, we have the same situation as with the other references discussed above. The phrase "to come forth from God/the Father" has to be understood in the context of Jesus' incarnation and earthly mission. This is also evident when one looks carefully at the end of verse 8. The two phrases there seem to be parallel: "They truly understood that I came forth from you, and they believed that you sent me."

This would be an additional affirmation that the issue under discussion is Jesus' incarnation and mission. In this case, coming from God may be the same as being sent by him.¹³ Commenting on John 7:29 "I know Him, because I am from him, and he sent me" Schnackenburg correctly states: "Jesus' coming forth from God (cf. 8:42; 17:8) always means, in John, his mission in historic time. . . . The sentence also expresses his abiding unity with the Father . . ."¹⁴

The only true God (John 17:3) is also the only true Father; and the only true Son, the "Son of his love" (Col 1:13), is the vital eternal reality after whom Adam and Eve were created in Their image.

"In the design of God, each creature begets offspring "after his kind" (Gen. 1:11-12; 21-25). The offspring bear the exact likeness of the parent. The fact that a son is generated by the father **guarantees** that the son shares the same essence as the father. I believe this is the sense Scripture aims to convey when it speaks of the begetting of Christ by the Father. **Christ is not a created being** (John 1:1-3). He had no beginning but is as timeless as God Himself." John MacArthur, *ibid*.

As a result of the 1950s evangelical conferences between Martin, Froom, et al, the Seventh-day Adventist Church accepted the Incarnational Sonship position of Walter Martin.

“Many heresies have seized upon the confusion created by the illogical "eternal Sonship" or "eternal generation" theory of Roman Catholic theology, unfortunately carried over to some aspects of Protestant theology. Finally, there cannot be any such thing as eternal Sonship.” Walter Martin, *The Kingdom of the Cults*(1985), pg. 117.

Ironically, today the only remaining major denomination to embrace the incarnational sonship position is the current Seventh-day Adventist Church. Even the CRI, which was founded by Walter Martin, eventually rejected his non-creedal version of the Trinity.

“Now that Walter Martin is gone, the eternal Sonship of Christ is the official position of the CRI.” (Letter from Hank Hanegraaff CRI, Nov. 21, 1995).

“Wherefore, it is a transgression of the Doctrine of Christ to say that Jesus **Christ derived the title Son of God solely from the fact of the incarnation**, or because of His relation to the economy of redemption. Therefore, to deny that **the Father is a real and eternal Father**, and that **the Son is a real and eternal Son**, is the denial of the distinction and relationship in the Being of God; a denial of the Father and the Son; and a displacement of the truth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. (2 John 9; John 1: 1, 2, 14, 18, 29, 49; 1 John 2:22, 23; 4:1-5; Heb. 12:2)” WalterMartin.com website.

“He is the Son of God from all eternity. This is favored by the context (John 1:1,18) and by such passages as 3:16,18, which prove that **the Son was *already* the only begotten before his incarnation...**the sonship here indicated was present *from eternity*.” (William Hendriksen, *New Testament Commentary--Exposition of the Gospel According to John*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1953, p. 87 emphasis his).

“His return to the Father was in the reverse order of procedure to that of His coming. He came from Heaven to the world; He returned from the world to Heaven. He speaks of the One from Whom He came as ‘the Father,’ not in the sense that He came out from One Who subsequently became the Father at His birth, but from One Who was the Father when He came out.” (W. E. Vine, *The Divine Sonship of Christ*, pp. 54-55, Klock and Klock Christian Publishers, Minneapolis, 1984).

Vine observed that the Word that was in the beginning with God in John 1:1 is also “that eternal life which was with the Father” in the beginning of 1John 1:2. The “one from Whom He came” was not simply “the first transcendental being”, but he was already the Father when the Son came out. He concluded that therefore the Father must have been there in the beginning; if so then the Son was with the Father in the beginning: the eternal Father with the eternal Son.

“He who always was and continues to be the Son of God was manifested to men first as the Son of David, and then, after His resurrection, as also the exalted Lord. He always was in the essence of His being the Son of God; this Son of God became of the seed of David and was installed as—what He always was—the Son of God, though now in His proper power, by the resurrection of the dead.” Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, *The Person and Work of Christ* (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1970), p. 81.

By holding to the doctrine of incarnational Sonship it is not surprising that we deal with a nameless Trinity prior to the incarnation, using non-relational designations such as “first person,” “first transcendental being” and “second person.” This requires proponents of the incarnational Sonship to confront the proposition that God chose not to reveal Himself as He truly is (actually a form of deception), but only as He would become. Thus, even when the terms Father and Son are employed, they are disavowed as being real, but rather only prophetic, anticipatory.

“He did not become God’s Son by being given: he was given as God’s Son. He was sent out from God’s presence as his Son (Gal. 4:4)...He became an atoning sacrifice as God’s Son (1 Jn. 2:2)” Donald Macleod. *The Person of Christ* (Contours of Christian Theology). Downers Grove, IL: Inter Varsity Press, 1998.

3. The Larger Context

A biblical doctrine cannot be based on one Greek or Hebrew word or phrase only. Therefore, it is important to take a look at what Scripture teaches in other places. For now, we will remain in the Gospel of John and just list a few statements about Jesus without commenting much on them.

The Gospel of John teaches that Jesus is God (1:1; 20:28).

“The Word was *with* God” identifies the separate and distinct personalities of the Word and God. “*God* was the Word”, a change in the Greek syntax, indicates a sense of nature rather than identity. Ellen White recognizes these two aspects of usage in the following statement:

“The Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of the Father, is truly God in infinity, but not in personality.” Manuscript 116, Dec. 19, 1905; *The Upward Look* p. 367 (1982).

Here she expresses two ways in which someone can be God: in infinity (nature) or in personality (identity). God the Father, she states, is the “only true God” in personality; His Son is not truly God in personality. But both the Father *and* His Son are truly God in infinity: both possess infinite love from an infinite divine nature.

This statement is also fully compatible with the original Adventist belief in the literal divine Son of God. Why? Because a literal Son inherits the very same nature of his literal Father.

However, the statement is problematic for the current triune theory of God. In essence it says, The Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of the Father is not truly God in personality. This directly contradicts the modern “God in three persons” position.

John 20:28. Because the Son has been given to have unborrowed, underived, immortal life in himself, he has power to give life to those whom he has created—both angels and men. This is why Christ could remind Satan that he even as a fallen angel should “worship the Lord thy God”. Christ created Lucifer; and the Son of God (the identity whom Satan questioned) was the Devil’s Lord, the Deceiver’s God. He is also our Lord and our God.

Yet Scripture recognizes that the Son of God also has a God, his Father.

“Blessed by my Rock; and blessed be **the God of the Rock** of my salvation” 2Sam 22:47.

“I ascend to my Father...and to **my God**” John 20:17.

“I will write on him the name **of my God**, and the name of the city **of my God** which is coming down out of heaven **from my God.**” Rev 3:12.

“therefore God, [even] **thy God**, hath anointed thee” Heb 1:9; Psalm 45:6,7.

“**the God and Father** of our Lord Jesus Christ” 1Pet 1:3; Eph 1:3; Rom 15:6; 2Cor 1:3; 11:31.

“**the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father** of glory” Eph 1:17

It accepts multiple persons in the Godhead.

God is the head of Christ, His Son (1Cor 11:3). God and His Son are two persons.

The Son is the express image of his Father’s person (Heb 1:3).

Our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son (1John 1:3).

Jesus is the creator (1:3).

He is life (1:4; 14:6) which is unpacked later:

Jesus has life in himself (5:26)

Because his Father “has *given* that the Son should have life in himself.”

Jesus is the Creator because “God, who created all things through Jesus Christ” (Eph 3:9) is his Father.

“God the Father, of whom are all things” is “the great Source of all” *Desire of Ages* p. 19.

He has given this power to His Son “by whom He created the worlds” Heb 1:2.

The “Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things” 1Cor 8:6.

and is able to lay down his life and take it again (10:17);

Because “this commandment [he] *received* from [his] Father” (John 10:18).

he is the bread of life (6:35)

which came down from heaven to do the will of Him that *sent* him (John 6:38).

and the resurrection and life (11:25).

The Source of his resurrection and life-giving power is his Father.

“The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live. **For** as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself” John 5:25,26.

“But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.” Rom 8:11.

He is the light (1:9)

As the framers of the Nicene confession recognized, the Son is “Light from Light”
Because his Father is “the Father of lights” James 1:17, for “God is light” 1John 1:5.

and the owner of the world (1:11).

In his incarnation he became a human being (1:14)

and the revealer of the character of God the Father (1:18).

“In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His only begotten Son into the world”
1John 4:9

He is the Son of God (1:34),

“the Son of the Father, in truth” 2John 3

but also the I AM,

“Christ is the wisdom of God. He is the great ‘I AM’ **to the world.**” *Signs of the Times*, Dec 12, 1895; July 3, 1907

“Jehovah is the name **given** to Christ” *Signs of the Times*, May 3, 1899.

“God also has...**given** him a name which is above every name” Phil 2:9

“He has **by inheritance obtained** a more excellent name” Heb 1:4

the eternal God (8:58)

“Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.” John 8:58.

one with the Father (10:30)

“that they may be one even as we are one” John 17:22.

to whom people may pray (14:14).

Unquestionably we may pray to the Son, for he is to be worshiped (Heb 1:6); he is our Creator, the head of his Church, our Father, our God, our Lord even as the one true God is his Father and his God (John 20:17). However, the modern trend of praying to and giving praise to the Holy Spirit is alien to Scripture. While we are instructed to “pray in the Spirit” (Jude 20; Eph 6:18) and “walk in the Spirit” (Micah 2:11; Gal 5:16, 25) and “be in the Spirit” (Rom 8:9) and “be fervent in the Spirit” (Acts 18:25), “live in the Spirit” (Gal 5:25; 1Pet 4:6), and even “worship God in the Spirit” (Phil 3:3), but there is no example or precedent for praying to the Spirit.

He has come to save the world (12:47),
and those people are saved that believe in him (3:16,36; 5:24).

Some of these statements clearly militate against the idea of Jesus having emanated from God. This is especially true for those describing him as life.

Why do any of these, even “those describing him as life”, militate against the idea that Jesus, the Son of the living God came out from God as he said? When we listen to all that Jesus said about the life that he was *given* (John 5:26), the power that he was *given* (Matt 28:18), the authority that he was *given* (John 10:18), the name that he was *given* (Phil 2:9), the glory that he was *given* (John 17:5)—we clearly understand the intimate relationship between the Father and His eternal, immortal, divine Son who is before all things, Creator of all things, exalted above all things.

Schreiner states: “The subordination of the Son in John’s theology . . . does not mean that Jesus is not divine or is a lesser deity. John does not work out for readers how the Son can be dependent upon the Father and be sent by the Father while at the same time sharing deity with the Father.”¹⁵

Schreiner apparently is unaware of John’s theology.
The Son is equal with God because God is his Father (John 7:17).
The Son is one with his Father because he knows the Father
even as the Father knows him (John 10:15).

Jesus is just as divine as his Father; both he and his Father have the same divine nature—the Son is of the same substance, for he proceeded and came out from the Father. This truth is illustrated by several divine themes.

The Branch

Christ is called “the Branch of righteousness” (Jer 33:15), “my servant the BRANCH” (Zech 3:8), “the BRANCH” who “shall build the temple of the LORD” (Zech 6:12).

The Stone

Christ is “the chief cornerstone” the “living stone . . . chosen of God, precious” (1Pet 2:4)

His divine birth guarantees that he inherit every divine attribute that his Father possesses—except that the Father is unbegotten, underived.

The simple monotheism of the one true God, the Father avoids the confusion of identity imposed by the demand of multiple divine Persons *within* a divine single Being. Nor does it detract from the majesty of preeminence of Christ who is to be honored as the Son “even as they honour the Father” John 5:23. Acceptance of the divinely begotten Son leads naturally to the adoration of his deity, exaltation of his name, and worship of his divinity.

In attempting to deal with 1Cor 11:3 Schreiner notes, “in Ephesians 5:22ff. Paul says that “the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church” (verse 23). In what meaningful sense can one say that a husband is the source of his wife? Wives do not exist by virtue of their husband’s existence. Wives do not derive their life from their husbands.” But Eve did. Schreiner dismisses this because in Ephesians Paul is addressing husbands and wives in general. Yet 1Cor 11:3-9 only makes sense when applied to the prototypical husband-wife: Adam and Eve.

The Son voluntarily submits to the Father’s authority because he assumes a different role, yet the same essence. The Son submits to the Father’s authority because he received his life from the Father, inheriting the same nature. Why not quote our own Adventist authors?

“**The true God** is understood to be **the Father**. “God, ‘who only hath immortality,’ possesses inherent eternal life.” (Jerry Lein, *Signs of the Times*, Jan. 31, 1950).

“[Daniel 7:9] Here Daniel calls **God the Father** the Ancient of Days. This would seem to indicate priority, in point of time, over any other being in the universe. He is the source of all life, light, and power. He

enjoys absolute, unconditional immortality. He has life **unborrowed and underived.**” (Dallas Youngs, *Signs of the Times*, Feb. 15, 1949).

The infinity divine nature of the Son is not inferior in any way from that of his infinitely divine Father. Why? Because the Son inherited all things from his Father (Heb. 1:4; Matt 11:27; John 3:35; 13:3).

“Before any other creature was given life, **God brought forth** His Son, His only-begotten Son, **made of His own divine substance** and in His express image. Christ was “first-born.” The Son was **given** self-existent life. He was **made** immortal; that is, He was **given** perpetual life within Himself.” (Dallas Youngs, *Signs of the Times*, Jan. 1, 1945).

“The Father has given this eternal life to Jesus.” (Jerry Lein, *ibid* John 5:26 quoted).

“In other words, Jesus had the power of an **inherent life**. He said: ‘As the Father hath life in Himself [underived, inherent]; so hath He **given** to the Son to have life in Himself.’ John 5:26.” (J.L. Shuler, *Review & Herald*, Nov. 2, 1939).

Conclusion

An exegetical investigation of relevant terms in the Gospel of John as well as theological considerations raised by the same Gospel affirm that the term *exerchomai* as applied to Jesus should not be understood in the sense of Jesus’ being an emanation from God. Already Ellen G. White has pointed out that in the Son is life unborrowed (Ev 616). Let us not forget to honor the Son as we honor the Father. “He who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father who sent Him” (John 5:23).

“As the Father has life in Himself, so has He **given** that the Son should have life in himself” (John 5:26).

“All men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father” (John 5:23)

“He said, And let all the angels of God worship him” “the first begotten” (Heb 1:6)

“He is antichrist that denies the Father and the Son.

Whosoever denies the Son, the same has not the Father.” (1 John 2:22,23).

¹ They include ESV, NIV, NRSV, and others.

² See Kurt Gallang, *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, volume 2, third edition (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957), 449-450.

³ J. Ramsey Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010), 480.

⁴ Michaels, 516.

⁵ Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John 1-12*, The Anchor Bible 29 (New York: Doubleday, 1966), 357. See also Barclay M. Newman and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator’s Handbook on the Gospel of John* (London: United Bible Societies, 1980), 285, who confirm this observation.

⁶ Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John. Volume 2* (New York: Crossroad, 1980), 212.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Cf. Gerald L. Borchert, *John 12-21*, The New American Commentary (Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 2002), 79.

⁹ Cf. Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1963), 301.

¹⁰ Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John 13-21*, The Anchor Bible 29A (New York: Doubleday, 1970), 725.

¹¹ Cf. *Ibid.*, 726: “. . . the change of preposition is meaningless.”

¹² *Ibid.* 725.

¹³ George R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, Word Biblical Commentary 36 (Waco: Word Books, Publisher, 1987), 298, talks about “faith-knowledge.” Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992), 725, suggests that the two phrases are very similar and yet not identical. However, Johannes Schneider, *Das Evangelium nach*

Johannes, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament Sonderband (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1978), 286, would disagree with Morris and see the two phrases as parallel, suggesting that perceiving and believing describe the same process.

¹⁴ Schnackenburg, 2:147.

¹⁵ Thomas R. Schreiner, *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 242.

^a Justin Martyr *First Apology* chp. 63, c. 150 a.d. “the Father of the universe has a Son; who also, being the first-begotten Word of God, is even God.” *Dialog with Trypho* chp. 61 “God begat before all creatures a Beginning, [who was] a certain rational power [proceeding] from Himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the Glory of the Lord, now the Son, again Wisdom, again an Angel, then God, and then Lord and Logos” “He was begotten of the Father by an act of will; just as we see happening among ourselves: for when we give out some word, we beget the word” chp. 62 “this Offspring, which was truly brought forth from the Father, was with the Father before all the creatures, and the Father communed with Him”

“The truest, the most exalted, knowledge is found in the Word of God. In its simplicity there is eloquence. There are those who will grasp **the words of the supposed great men of the world**, and love to dwell upon their phraseology as something they need to esteem and value. You will hear **men exalting human beings**, extolling those who are called great by this world. In doing this, they lose sight of Christ in the Word.” *Sons and Daughters of God* (1955) p. 70

Kurt Galling (1900-1987) a proponent of Old Testament Higher Criticism, explained the serpent in Genesis 3 as a fertility symbol, that the Exodus myth was preceded by the Abrahamic myth.

J. Ramsey Michaels graduate of Princeton University, B.D. Grace Theological Seminary, Th.M. Westminster Theological College, Th. D. Harvard University

Father Raymond E. Brown, American Roman Catholic priest, member of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, denied John’s authorship of the Gospel of John speculating instead that it was the work of a hypothetical ‘Johannine community.’ Influential in moving Vatican II to support higher criticism, denied the inerrancy of Scripture, and questioned the historical validity of Christ’s virgin birth.

Barclay M. Newman, In 2006 the National Liberty Museum (Philadelphia) in conjunction with the Satell Foundation and the Interfaith Institute named him the International Interfaith Person of the Year.

Eugene A. Nida, developed dynamic (functional) equivalence bible translation theory, became increasingly ecumenical and New Evangelical in his approach.

Rudolf Schnackenburg “probably the most prominent Catholic exegete writing in German during the second half of the twentieth century” *Jesus of Nazareth* by Joseph Ratzinger/Pope Benedict XVI, 2007, p. 318

Gerald L. Borchert, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Carson Newman College

Oscar Cullmann, (1902-1999) Lutheran responsible for ecumenical dialog between Lutherans and Catholics; his tombstone bears the inscription “adviser to three popes.”

George R. Beasley-Murray, Baptist New Testament theologian.

Leon Morris (1914-2006) Australian Anglican theologian.

Johannes Schneider, German Baptist theologian who translated the last segment of John 1:1 in his *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1978) "and godlike was the Logos" confirming the qualitative nature of the anarthrous predicate noun *theos*.

Thomas R. Schreiner, “Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity” chp. 5 in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 1991.

Ellen White's use of the word *emanate*

The most common occurrence is the emanation of light:

“...the **rays of light which emanate from the throne of God** shall be reflected by the children of light.”
In Heavenly Places p. 70; Review & Herald, January 9, 1900

“...the **rays of light that emanate from the throne of God...**” Review & Herald, April 12, 1870

“The truth sent out from the press was like **rays of light emanating from the sun** in all directions.” Life Sketches p. 244

“**Beams of light seemed to emanate** from those dear hands and to fall upon the watching, waiting ones.”
3SP p. 253; Bible Echo and Signs of the Times, August 1, 1887

“**Light will emanate from them** [those who are Christ's followers], dispelling the darkness around them, refining and elevating all who come within the sphere of their influence...” 2T p. 694; Review & Herald, July 13, 1897

“Shall we seek for scientific measurement of how much **light shall emanate from us to the world?** God help us to live under the direct rays of the Sun of Righteousness, that we may be channels of light to the world.” Review & Herald, January 31, 1893

“They would bind the members of their churches by certain rules and regulations that forbid them to go to other places of worship, or listen to messengers outside of a certain class of teachers. In this way men and women are led to give up the liberty that God has ordained for them, and they fail to improve the mind and gather up **the divine rays of light which emanate from sources outside their own church.**” Signs of the Times, August 27, 1894

“As they neared the heavenly crown, the **light emanating from it** shone upon them and around them...”
Christian Experience and Teachings of Ellen G. White p. 163; Spiritual Gifts vol. 4b p. 108; 1T p. 349

“When you possess the internal transformation **a light will emanate from you** to others...” Brother Aldrich 1869 Pamphlet p. 15

“We shall find it perfectly easy, and thus we may find an open door to heaven, and **light will emanate** and shine upon our pathway.” 3MR p. 72

“...no other **light ever has shone** or ever will shine so clearly upon fallen man as that which **emanated from the teaching and example of Jesus.**” Desire of Ages p. 220; Spirit of Prophecy vol. 2 p. 84

“No other **light ever has shone** or ever will shine upon fallen man save that which **emanates from Christ. Jesus, the Saviour...**” Thoughts from the Mount of Blessing p. 40

“...the **divine light that emanated from his countenance**, thrilled the people with a power they had never experienced before, as Jesus stood before them...” Spirit of Prophecy vol. 2 p. 111

“The **divine rays of light emanating from Jesus** are not with them...” Historical Sketches of the Foreign Missions of Seventh-day Adventists (1886) p. 145; 5BC p. 1118; Spirit of Prophecy vol. 2 p. 37,38

“The Father was enshrouded with a body of light and glory, so that His person could not be seen; yet I knew that it was the Father and that **from His person emanated this light and glory.**” Early Writings p. 92; Review & Herald, April 14, 1853

“**From Christ emanates all its light.** . . . The Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the light thereof.” Faith I Live By p. 280; God's Amazing Grace p. 95

“...face the **light that emanates from the Sun of righteousness.**” Letter 322, 1906 in Mind, Character, and Personality vol. 2 p. 492; This Day with God p. 305

“The **pure light and glory emanating from Christ** will awaken remorse, shame, and terror.” Confrontation p. 87

“by the **light which emanates from Christ**, shining as His representatives and through them shedding the light of truth in the beauty of holiness to the world.” 12MR p. 129

“...the precious **light that emanates from Jesus** will be reflected upon his life and character.” Sermons and Talks vol. 1 p. 43

“All the contradictions and inconsistencies I had before found in **the Word** were gone; and, although there were many portions of which I was not satisfied that I had a full understanding, yet so much **light had emanated from it** to the illumination of my before darkened mind, that I felt a delight in studying the Scriptures which I had not before supposed could be derived from its teachings.” The words of William Millar quoted in Great Controversy p. 329

“Know that everything that is called **light and truth in the Word of God** is light and truth, **an emanation from divine wisdom**, not an imitation of Satan's subtle arts.” Letter 45, 1899; Selected Messages vol. 2 p. 17

Less frequent is mentioned the emanation of power, influence, glory, good, gospel:

Power

“**A power** attended them that could only **emanate from the divine.**” Life Sketches (1880) p. 193; Signs of the Times, April 20, 1876

“It is not the **power that emanates from men** that makes the work successful...” Review & Herald, November 14, 1893

Influence

“**A holy influence** seemed to **emanate** from the Saviour...” The Spirit of Prophecy vol. 3 p. 116

“...the **holy influence that emanated** from Him.” The Spirit of Prophecy vol. 2 p. 145

“She [woman of Samaria] accepted his assertion, feeling perfect confidence in his words, and not questioning the **holy influence that emanated** from him.” Spirit of Prophecy vol. 2 p. 145

“There is **an atmosphere** that surrounds every soul, **an influence**, either conscious or unconscious, **that emanates from every person** for good or evil...” Signs of the Times, May 20, 1889

“It is His purpose that **the highest influence in the universe, emanating from the Source of all power**, shall be theirs.” Gospel Workers p. 39; Desire of Ages p. 679; God's Amazing Grace p. 255; Lift Him Up p. 290

“...sweet and abiding will be **the influence emanating from Him** who sees in secret...” Faith I Live By p. 225; Our Father Cares p. 136; 2T p. 190; Prayer (2002) p. 284; Steps to Christ p. 98

Glory

“...the **divine rays from glory, that emanate from the throne of God** and shine from the face of Jesus Christ...” 2T p. 619; Review & Herald, May 30, 1871; Sermons and Talks vol. 2 p. 5

“An indescribable **glory emanated from a personage** on the throne...” Review & Herald, Oct 16, 1888; 4BC p. 1139; Reflecting Christ (1985) p. 338

“The **glory** of the cloud **emanated from Jesus Christ**, who from the midst of the glory talked with Moses...” MS 126, 1901 in 1BC p. 1103

“...the pure, exalted, transporting **glory that emanates from God and the Lamb...**” Counsels for the Church p. 186; Maranatha p. 46

Good, Blessing

“...the **good which emanated from God**, the rich **blessing which He has given**, have come to be regarded by some as fanaticism.” 1SM p. 142; Review & Herald, February 6, 1894

Pity, Compassion, Love

“All the **pity, compassion, and love** which have been manifested in the earth have **emanated from the throne of God...**” Signs of the Times, March 5, 1896

“The **divine love emanating from Christ** never destroys human love, but includes it.” Adventist Home p. 99; Counsels for the Church p. 125; Faith I Live By p. 255; In Heavenly Places p. 202

Faith

“...a **faith that emanates from God.**” Our Father Cares p. 131; That I May Know Him p. 226

“We must move every day under the guidance of **God's mighty power**. Every day we need to feel the deep working of **the Spirit of God**. We must have a **faith that emanates from God.**” Signs of the Times, October 11, 1899

Gospel

“God is light and life and love; and it is **from him that the gospel of truth emanates.**” Medical Missionary, August 1, 1892

“**Every principle of the law emanates** from the Infinite God...” Signs of the Times, February 26, 1894

“The **law of God is an emanation** of infinite love.” Review & Herald, Oct 1, 1895

“The **law of God is an emanation** from the divine mind...” Signs of the Times, October 22, 1894

Religion

“...the **religion that emanates from God.**” Signs of the Times, November 22, 1899

Peace of Christ

“**The peace of Christ** is not a boisterous, untamable element made manifest in loud voices and bodily exercises. **The peace of Christ** is an **intelligent peace**, and it does not make those who possess it bear the marks of fanaticism and extravagance. It is not a rambling impulse but an **emanation from God.**” Signs of the Times, May 19, 1890; Faith and Works p. 88

Bodily

“There is nothing impure in clean sand and dry earth; it is the **emanations from the body** that defile, requiring the clothing to be changed and the body washed.” Child Guidance p. 107 (1954); Christian Temperance and Bible Hygiene (1890) p. 141

“Those who have degraded themselves by wrong habits, when they assemble for the worship of God, give forth such **emanations from their diseased bodies** as to be disgusting to those around them.” Review & Herald, September 8, 1874

“The occupants give evidence by the breath and **emanations from the body** that the system is filled with the poison of liquor and tobacco.” Healthful Living (1897) p. 111; 3T p. 562

“The **emanations from damp, moldy rooms and clothing** are poisonous to the system.” Healthful Living p. 143; Health Reformer, February 1, 1874

“**Emanations from the bodies and exhalations from the lungs** have poisoned the air...” 11MR p. 57

In conclusion, it is clear that Ellen White never applied the term emanation to the birth, origin, or appearance of a person, but always to inanimate abstractions such as light, power, glory, influence, blessing, love, faith, peace.

Therefore we reject the application of the term “emanation” as a translation of *exerchomai* in the statements of Christ.