

[Marcos C. Thaler](#)

[11 April 2013](#) · [Wausau, WI, United States](#)

The Peril of Misunderstanding Ellen White's DA 530 Statement Concerning Christ's "original, unborrowed, underived" Life:

[Edited version, for clarity, and various typos that effected the theology in some expressions in the previous version]

This writeup is written in response to the issue [James Gale](#) brought up in regard to M. L. Andreason's change of position from a non-Trinitarian to a Trinitarian one. I would invite [Jon-Philippe Ruhumuliza](#), [Fredy Torres](#), [Dean Bowen](#), [Brendan Paul Knudson](#), [Andrew Darkes](#), and any others that may have missed, to please read the following prayerfully, and carefully, with an open heart:

Let's quote the EGW statement:

"In Christ is life, original, unborrowed, underived. 'He that hath the Son hath life.' 1Jn 5:12 The divinity of Christ is the believer's assurance of eternal life." DA (1898) p. 530.

M. L. Andreason, as Godly man as he was, was simply confused what Ellen White meant by this statement because of the Trinitarian mould that had been placed upon the statement as time progressed. He had been told about the existence of this statement, and it likely that it had been presented to him in a Trinitarian mould do to a number of new-timers that were coming on the scene. But this was contrary to his previous thinking, and contrary to the thinking of most Adventist old-late-timer pioneer leaders in his day, that believed, in harmony with the original and earlier pioneers, that Christ was TRULY begotten of the Father - literally born of the Father, yet ETERNALLY EXISTENT as being in the bosom of His father BEFORE He was begotten! Longacre, and many men like him, were not confused on this matter, however. They did not misunderstand Ellen White's statement in DA 530. They understood where she was coming from, and what she was saying.

"None but the Son of God could accomplish our redemption; for only He who was in the bosom of the Father could declare Him." {SC 14.2}

Now let us raise the question: What was this "mould" that these new-timers were accepting and promoting, and instilling in the minds of Adventists in their day, which may have likely reached the young 24-year old mind of Andreason?

In order to infuse a Trinitarian mould on Ellen White's writings, they began to believe...

1. That Ellen White was in this statement changing her former, well-established position concerning the Sonship of Christ in DA 530, that He was truly begotten of the Father.
2. They ignore the context of the statement, and assume that Christ is saying that He is really not the Son of God.
3. And that He never received life from the Father.
4. They misinterpret the statement to mean that He never was and never is the Son of God.
5. They have been taught that the statement means that He is not related to the Father.
6. They have been taught that is another God who has life in Himself but that He did not receive from the Father.

But none of these interpretations are inherent in her passage in DA 530. You cannot make her statement contradict John 5:26, or her many other statements where she clearly states that He is begotten of the Father.

It seems that when Andreason read this statement in DA 530, he was confused because of the new Trinitarian mould that was coming into Adventism, into changing from a non-Trinitarian to a Trinitarian position.

However, this was not true of many faithful Adventist pioneers of a later age, such as, Elder Irwin H. Evans (who wrote Ministry of Angels in 1915, and was quite a prominent leader in Adventism), Charles Longacre (who gave the 3-part sermon I pasted above), Judson Washburn, and many others. I could list many more.

The short answer is simple. Christ was GIVEN (by divine inheritance) the original, unborrowed, underived life of His Father, and this is plainly and unequivocally stated in John 5:26---which states: "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself" (John 5:26).

The expression in DA 530 was not original with Ellen White, it was borrowed and derived from John Cumming, D.D., F.R.S.E. of London in his Sabbath Evening Readings on the New Testament - St. John published by the John P. Jewett Co., Cleveland, OH in 1856. On page 5 Cumming writes:

"In him was life,-that is, original, unborrowed, underived. In us there is a streamlet from the Fountain of Life; in him was the Fountain of Life. Our life is something we receive, something that the Giver takes back again to himself, -over which we have no control, and for which we must give God the account and the praise. But in Jesus was life underived, unborrowed;"

A Bibliography of Ellen G. White's Private and Office Libraries - compiled by Warren H. Jones, Tim Poirier, and Ron Graybill lists Cumming's Sabbath Evening Readings on the New Testament as one of Mrs. White's Office library books and from which she would have had opportunity to read. However, it is of interest that Cumming does not mention a triune Godhead. He only asserts the Deity of Christ.

Later, in the 1905 Letter 309 (Medical Ministry p. 7) , Mrs White borrowed even more from Cumming:

"In Jesus is our life derived. In Him is life, that is original, unborrowed, underived life. In us there is a streamlet from the fountain of life. In Him is the fountain of life. Our life is something that we receive, something that the Giver takes back again to Himself."

Nor was Cumming the first to use these words. William E. Channing employed them in 1819 during a discourse presented in Baltimore entitled "Unitarian Christianity."

"We earnestly maintain...that our Father in heaven is originally, essentially, and eternally placable, and disposed to forgive; and that his unborrowed, underived, and unchangeable love is the only fountain of what flows to us through his Son." "We understand by it that there is one being, one mind, one person, one intelligent agent, and one only, to whom underived and infinite perfection and dominion belong." The Works of Willam E. Channing, 1882, p. 371

Although in this instance it was love and perfection that was "unborrowed, underived" rather than everlasting life, it is ironic that this expression in DA 530 receives such attention and reverence by those defending a Trinitarian Ellen White when its roots stem from a staunchly anti-Trinitarian source.

Why would Ellen White borrow a statement that came down through history, first from Channing, then by Cumming, that would completely contradict her former statements that were in harmony with Scripture on the Begottenness of Christ? Obviously, as she explains within the context of DA 530 itself, she borrowed the statement under inspiration, not in order to deny the Sonship of Christ and His relationship with the Father as Adventist Modern Trinitarianism would have us believe.

Obviously, she borrowed the statement to emphasize that because as John has says..."And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." (1 John 5:11), we have have complete confidence in Christ's power and willingness to give us eternal life!

This is corroborated with "The divinity of Christ is the believer's assurance of eternal life." DA (1898) p. 530.---that is what she means to say, and no attack on a previously established truth that He IS the Son of God in a TRUE sense.

Notice what she says about His human birth in Bethlehem:

"In His incarnation He gained in a NEW SENSE the title of the Son of God. Said the angel to Mary, "The power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke 1:35). While the Son of a human being, He became the SON OF GOD IN A NEW SENSE. Thus He stood in our world--the Son of God, yet allied by birth to the human race. {1SM 226.2}

It is editorial dishonesty to try and make Ellen White say that which she did not mean at all in DA 530.

Notice her other statement:

"In Jesus is our life derived. In Him is life, that is original, unborrowed, underived life. In us there is a streamlet from the fountain of life. In Him is the fountain of life. Our life is something that we receive, something that the Giver takes back again to Himself. If our life is hid with Christ in God, we shall, when Christ shall appear, also appear with Him in glory. And while in this world we will give to God, in sanctified service, all the capabilities He has given us."--Letter 309, 1905. {MM 7.3}

Notice that these other statements from Ellen White clearly demonstrate the TRUTH of her words, that the life that Christ has, and which He received from the Father, is the same kind of life that is in the Father, which is a life that is the property of God, and original with the Father, underived, and unborrowed--while the life of all created beings is derived, borrowed, and not original. The good news is that we can have it today! Borrowed. Derived. Not original. But conditional on faith and corresponding obedience! But when Jesus comes, it won't be conditional anymore! But it will still be original, unborrowed, underived, if we are faithful.

The life of Christ is innately HIS by nature of His Sonship. But we are created beings, and therefore our life is borrowed from the Father, through Jesus, to us.

Notice...

"...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." Desire of Ages, p. 21

And please remember one more thing. The whole world has wondered after the Beast, including Adventists. Even in the issue of the Trinity. So we have had to pray, study, agonize, in order to be freed from the influence of Rome that has now invaded Adventism. So if you want to be free, from Catholic errors, you will have to do likewise yourself. That is why we are spending time helping you and others to accept nothing but unadulterated truth! And believe me, there are many errors that are yet to be refuted in Adventism! Such as, did Christ really take our fallen sinful flesh with all its liabilities? Or Christ came in the unfallen flesh of Adam before the fall? Where did this come from? Why Rome of course! What about the error of not accepting the complete legal redemption accomplished by the Father through His Son for ALL men? This truth has been, and is being rejected by the General Conference through the Biblical Research Institute.

Remember, Antichrist walks on two legs:

(Leg 1)

Jesus is NOT truly, literally, the Son of God:

"Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: but he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also." (1 John 2:22, 23)

The Adventist Leadership has accepted this false teaching.

(Leg 2)

The Immaculate Conception which leads to believing that Jesus did not come in fallen flesh.

"And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." ... "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist." (1 John 4:3; 2 John 1:7)

The SDA leadership has also accepted this false doctrine by now accepting the position that Christ came in the flesh of Adam before the fall--the prelapsarian view. They have abandoned the unanimous postlapsarian view by once again, twisting Ellen White statements. Some have tried to patch up the controversy by stating that now it's "both"--it's called "wishy-washy compromise".

And unfortunately, Antichrist is walking on these two legs all over Adventism.

Waggoner, Jones, W.W. Prescott, and Ellen White all preached the good news of the Gospel unaffected by ANY of these two legs!

The expression was first used by EGW in a R&H article in 1896, and the year following in Signs of the Times:

"In Him was life, original, unborrowed, underived. This life is not inherent in man. He can possess it only through Christ. He cannot earn it; it is given him as a free gift if he will believe in Christ as His personal Saviour. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent" (John 17:3). This is the open fountain of life for the world." EGW, 1SM pp.296, 297

In other words, "He [man] can possess it [life, original, unborrowed, underived] only through Christ. He [man] cannot earn it [life, original, unborrowed, underived]; it is given him as a free gift if he [man] will believe in Christ as His personal Saviour."

IN CHRIST is that "life, original, unborrowed, underived". That life has always existed, for it is the very essence of God--eternal life.

"Only He who alone hath immortality, dwelling in light and life, could say, "I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it again." All the human beings in our world take their life from Him. He is the spring, the fountain of life" (MS 131, 1897)

This life was given to Christ by virtue of His divine birth and inheritance (being begotten with that life). We know that Christ is here talking about eternal life (original, unborrowed, underived life). To ascertain this fact all we need to do is ask ourselves the following question: What kind of life does the Father have in Himself? It certainly cannot be mortal life. It can only be immortal life (1 Timothy 1:17) which is described as original, unborrowed, underived.

This is the Son's life by right of inheritance. He inherited that life of his Father by birth (for He is the only-begotten Son). Therefore, Christ is the only one who has this life as the Father. It is His Father's life and Christ inherited it by virtue of being brought forth from Him.

Christ received ALL things (by birth) from the Father. Does that include life as well? Is it true that it is the Father's life which flows through His only begotten Son?

Closing Statement:

While Andreason, at the age of 24, may have been puzzled by Ellen White's statement in DA 530, and unfortunately, was lead into the new Trinitarian leanings creeping into the Church, other Godly stalwart men like Charles Longacre, who was a little bit older than Andreason, and more experienced, certainly was not! For He painted her statements on the Son's "self-existent, unborrowed, underived, unoriginal life" in its TRUE light, in harmony with all her other statements, and in harmony with the understanding of all the Pioneers---who, were not a "step down" from the Protestants in their knowledge and understanding of God, but a "step up", for which Ellen White emphasizes over and over their closer and deeper connection with God than many of the new men that were coming on the scene.

It is my appeal to all here, that they may sincerely, and seriously consider the data and arguments presented thus. We are living in the last days, and there is a shaking going on. We are here to RESTORE, true, unadulterated Christian Adventism at its FINEST! The Gospel will be proclaimed UNDILUTED by the viruses of Rome! We must pray for unity--but more than just pray, we must ACT upon it, and "press together, press together, press together!" (2 SM 374)

This will not only include a complete stripping away from the Roman dunghill of the Immortality of the Soul, Eternal Torment, Sunday Sacredness, but ALSO on the false nature of the Father and the Son, which, in attempt to over-state the Son's Divinity, end up destroying His Sonship, and destroy the beautiful fact that Christ overcame in the fallen flesh of man, subject to all our liabilities!

Once these truths are more firmly established, then God's people can start to more fully unite in the love of God, and proclaim the Three Angel's Messages more fully, and receive the Latter Rain.

=====

I will provide Charles Longacre's sermon in 1947, one more time, for all to see. He preached this sermon when the Trinity was already making major thrusts into Adventism, but it had not yet fully absorbed it and taken over, so he therefore, due to his respected status, could speak clearly on the true original Adventist position which he saw no disunity whatsoever in any of Ellen White's "so-called Trinitarian" statements:

The 1947 Longacre Paper:

Charles Longacre was born in 1871. He was intimately acquainted with Ellen White, Uriah Smith and other Adventist pioneers. He was one of six pall bearers selected at Ellen White's funeral. He also attended the 1919 Bible Conference and was a member of the Bible Research Fellowship which was organized in 1940 by the North American Bible Teachers. Under the chairmanship of L.L.Caviness in 1944. He was offered the opportunity of presenting a paper at Pacific Union College on "The Deity of Christ." in January 1947. A sermon on the same subject was presented shortly thereafter at the Takoma Park Church in Washington, D.C.

Longacre began his discourse by presenting the various views of Christ's Godhood. After discussing the two extremes of both an only human Christ and a God the Father Christ, he continued,

Quoting Longacre's Sermon:

"We now come to the third group which hold that Christ was the only begotten Son of God, the Father, and that He was such from the days of eternity and was the only one who proceeded directly from God, being begotten by the Father before all creation, before anything was created in an empty universe. This group hold that the Son of God is equal to the Father, is the express image of the Father, possesses the same substance as the Father, the same life as the Father, the same power and authority as the Father, but that all these attributes were given to the Son of God by the Father, when He was begotten by the Father."

"This group believe that the Son of God existed "in the bosom of the Father" from all eternity, just as Levi existed in the "loins of Abraham," as the apostle Paul said; "And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him." Heb. 7:9, 10." (Charles S. Longacre, The Deity of Christ, paper for the Bible Research Fellowship Angwin, California January 1947, page 3)

End Quote of Longacre

He read, "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last" Rev 1:11, then commented.

Continuing Quote of Longacre:

"Not everything has a beginning nor does everything have an ending. God Himself never had a beginning and He will not have an ending. He is the self-existent One, who never had a beginning. Eternity itself never had a beginning and never will have an ending. Space has no beginning and no ending. Everything else had a beginning, but not all things that have a beginning are going to have an end." Ibid, page 4.

"Christ always existed in the bosom of the Father, even before He was Begotten as the Son of God, and God and His prophets counted 'things which are not,' as though they were even before they were manifested. Thus we read that Christ was 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,' and that 'Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot... was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifested in these last times.' So Christ existed in the bosom of the Father from all eternity but was manifested when He was begotten by the Father as His Son, as the apostle Paul says, 'before all creation.' " Ibid, page 19.

"But Christ, the only Begotten of the Father, made in the "express image" of the Father in person. God not only appointed [Him] to be the Saviour of men, but He appointed Him "heir of all things," "being made so much better than the angels, as He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said He (God) at any time, Thou art My son, This day have I begotten thee?" Heb. 1:2-5."

"Here we are told that the expression "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten thee," refers only to Christ and not to any of the angels. Then there must have been a time, a day, when the Son of God was begotten by the Father. On that day, the Father saith unto His only Begotten Son: "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever ... therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. And Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands." Heb. 1:8-10." Ibid, page 8.

"The Spirit of Prophecy says that there was and still is a difference in rank between God - the Father, and God's Son." We read in Vol. 1 of the old Spirit of Prophecy [p.17] thus: "Satan in Heaven, before his rebellion, was a high and exalted angel, next in honor to God's dear Son." The implication is that God stands first in honor, His only begotten Son comes next, and Lucifer was next to the Son of God. If God and His Son were co-eternal, co-equal, and co-existent so that there was no difference between them then we should not say Lucifer was next to the Son of God but next to God as well." Ibid, page 9

"Of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, it is said in the Scriptures, "He is the only Begotten of the Father." The Son of God was not created like other creatures are brought into existence. He is not a created but a Begotten Being, enjoying all the attributes of His Father. Christ Himself explains His own relationship to the Father as follows: "As the Father had life in Himself," unborrowed, underived, original, independent, and immortal, "so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself. John 5:26" Ibid page 4.

"God "only hath immortality." He alone is the only self-existent God. But He gave His Son when He was Begotten the same life he had in Himself, therefore when Christ offered His life as a ransom for the sins of the world, He and He only could make an atonement for all the sins of all the world, because he made an "infinite sacrifice," and it required an Infinite sacrifice" to atone for all the sins of mankind and angels who had sinned, in order to satisfy the demands of the law of God and infinite justice."

"Christ had unconditional immortality bestowed upon Him when He was Begotten of the Father. Angels had conditional immortality bestowed upon them when they were created by Christ in the beginning. Angels are immortal but their immortality is conditional. Therefore angels do not die but live on after they sin just as Satan or Lucifer lives on in sin. But since Lucifer and the fallen angels only enjoy conditional immortality, God ultimately will destroy them and take from them the gift of immortality which Christ bestowed on them when He created them. Whatever God bestows he can take away whenever He sees fit." Ibid, page 7.

"What kind of life did the Father have in Himself? In God "is life original, unborrowed, underived," "immortal," "independent." "He is the source of life." Christ says, "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given" - the same life, original, unborrowed, underived life to the Son. It was "given" to Him by His Father. Christ was made the source of life just as the Father was the source of life. Christ had the same life the Father had in Himself in His own right. He did not have to derive or borrow it, it was now original with Christ just as it was with the Father. Christ's life was independent of the Father, hence not dependent, derived, or borrowed. He could bestow and give life and create just as the Father could, but the Father gave this life to His Son." Ibid, page 10.

"When this same life the Father had in Himself was given by the Father to His Son so He too had it "in Himself," we are not told. Nor does it make any difference how long it was before anything was created, the fact remains that the Son of God proceeded from the Father, that He was in the bosom of the Father, that His life, "underived, unborrowed" was "given" to Him by the Father, that the Father "ordained" His Son "should be equal with Himself;" that the Father "invested" His Son "with authority," and that the Son does "nothing of Himself alone." Ibid pages 10-11

"If it were impossible for the Son of God to make a mistake or commit a sin, then His coming into this world and subjecting Himself to temptations were all a farce and mere mockery. If it were possible for Him to yield to temptation and fall into sin, then He must have risked heaven and His very existence, and even all eternity. That is exactly what the Scriptures and the Spirit of Prophecy say Christ, the Son of God did do when He came to work out for us a plan of salvation from the curse of sin." Ibid page 13.

End Quote of Longacre

It was this last point that Longacre, like Washburn, saw as the critical factor under attack by the Trinity.

Continuing Quote of Longacre:

"Our life is finite - His is infinite. Ours is mortal - His is immortal. Our spirit is finite, His is infinite. We cannot take up our life after we lay it down. He could, so long as He did not commit sin. But if he had yielded to temptation and become guilty of sin, - and this was possible - His very existence, his eternal existence and heaven itself was possible of being forfeited. If it was not, then He never took a risk; and we are told He "risked all," even heaven itself, as "an eternal loss." This being so, then His corporeal body was not only put in jeopardy but His Deity. Because, if He could exist as a separate Deity, independent of His corporeal body, after He yielded up His life on Calvary, then He did not risk heaven nor would He have suffered "all" as "an eternal loss."

"Since His spirit did not go to heaven, but the Father committed Christ's spirit to the tomb and it slept with His body in the tomb, and "all that comprised the life and the intelligence of Jesus remained with His body in the sepulchre," we must conclude that if Christ had sinned all that ever belonged to Christ would have forever remained in the tomb and Christ would have suffered the "loss" of His eternal existence. Then God would have taken back to Himself what He gave to His son, namely, the same life He gave His only Begotten Son when He proceeded from the bosom of the Father in the beginning when He became "the First-born before all creation," as Paul puts it." Ibid, page 15.

End Quote of Longacre

Longacre was the last proponent of the original Adventist understanding and belief in the begotten Son of God. With his death, the way was made clear to proceed with advancing the orthodox Trinitarian doctrine of one God composed of three separate but equal, co-eternal persons, unbegotten, unproceeding, and unbiblical.

Data found here:

<http://www.hullquist.com/Bible/bib-onegod-12c.htm#Longacre>

Further materials:

(1) Adventist History - Part 1: Belief in the Begotten: Part 1: The Pioneers:

<http://www.hullquist.com/Bible/bib-onegod-12.htm>

(2) Adventist History - Part 2: The Seventh-Day Adventist Doctrine of God: Part 2: The Alpha:

<http://www.hullquist.com/Bible/bib-onegod-12b.htm>

(3) Adventist History - Part 3: The Seventh-Day Adventist Doctrine of God: Part 3: The Omega:

<http://www.hullquist.com/Bible/bib-onegod-12c.htm>

<http://www.hullquist.com/Bible/bib-trio.htm>

[Like](#) ·

"In Christ is life, original, unborrowed, underived." Desire of Ages, p 530.

What this is telling us is that Christ has life that is "original" – it did not originate from any other being or source, but is original in Him. .Since Christ did not obtain, borrow, or derive His life from any other bring or source, but His life is original in Him, then this proves that God did not literally give birth to Christ in heaven, or the life in Christ would not have been original, unborrowed, and underived, but would have been obtained from the Father!"

My response: (from Maranatha Media)

Is the Son's life borrowed from the Father? No, because it's not on loan.

Is the Son's life original? Yes, he has inherited it directly from his Father. It is inherent in the Son.

“For as the Father has life in Himself; so has He given to the Son to have life in himself” John 5:26.

This text is noticeably missing from most trinitarian discourses. Is it not part of the total evidence? the complete picture of God and His Son? Perhaps it would be included in that large collection which is attributed to the incarnation, an easy and convenient solution for such problem texts.

But to relegate John 5:26 to the incarnation would result in the unacceptable consequence that the Son did not have life in himself before his incarnation. When did the Father give the Son to have life in himself? Did He give the Son life or did He not give the Son life? These are Christ's own words.

Notice the context.

Verse 24 “He that hears my words and believes on Him that sent me, has everlasting life...”

Verse 25 “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.”

This is all about resurrection life.

The Greek for “everlasting life” in verse 24 is *zōēn aiōnion*. And the living that shall take place in those that hear the Son's voice

at the resurrection is zēsousin. This version of the word “life” is used in Greek to convey divine immortality. The other words for life available in Greek—bios and psuchen—are not employed here. They denote physical life and the spiritual soul or mind of man. But zoe is divine eternal life.

And now verse 26 in the literal Greek syntax: “as for the Father has zōēn in Himself, so also to the Son He gave zōēn to have in himself.” Because the Son has received this divine eternal life from the Father he is able to impart it to us. The “divinity of Christ” is truly our “assurance of eternal life.” This is a glorious truth, a vital fact: “our salvation depends” on it. In this all agree with rejoicing!

Our life is not our own. We live on borrowed time, we live with borrowed life. “The spirit of God is in my nostrils” Job 27:3. It’s not our life; it’s His spirit in us that keeps us alive. And when we die, “the spirit shall return unto God who gave it” Ecc 12:7. The spirit doesn’t even belong to us; it’s on loan for a time, and then it goes back to the Owner “in whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind” Job 12:10. We do not have life in ourselves; it is not “our own”; it is borrowed.

But the zōēn divine eternal life that the Father gave to His Son is his very own; he inherited it naturally, intrinsically, innately, inherently.

What kind of life is this? The kind of life that the Father has in Himself: eternal, immortal life. The context in verse 25 is the Son of God raising the dead. It is resurrection life. The Son has the Father’s life automatically, naturally, because he is the Son. The Son receives the Father’s life from the original Source of all life.

“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.” DA p. 21.

Thus the Son’s life is original because he receives it directly from his Father. We receive our life from the Son, and from the Father indirectly. “Through the Son, the Father’s life flows out to all.” Thus we cannot claim to have original life.

This phrase—which by the way, was not original with Ellen White—was never used by her in the context of the throne room in heaven before the creation of all things such as the first chapter of Patriarchs and Prophets. It always appears in association with humanity receiving this kind of life, the resurrection life that is within Jesus.

Again:

Is the Son’s life borrowed from the Father? No, because it’s not on loan.

Is the Son’s life original? Yes, he has inherited it directly from his Father. It is inherent in the Son.

“For as the Father has life in Himself; so has He given to the Son to have life in himself” John 5:26.