

view Jesus was a demiurge, a kind of lesser God, who had been created out of nothing by God the Father to act as his agent or intermediary for the creation of and interaction with the material world and everything in it.

Peace be on you all. Very strange, I can see strange debates between christians. Whether Jesus is God, son, humen. No one of you knows the conclusion. I am with you you will never reach to a conclusion unless you opened you mind. Very strange, Most of you are from highly developed countries, mine from a third world country. You believe that humen is a God. You believe that water can make a person christian. You believe that a cross or statue or picture can answer your request. You believe just confessing to a humen can do forgivness to you. You believe that god sacrifice himself for humens who he created. You believe that God can be a humen and can be killed. You believe the humen that sacrificed himself gave forgiveness for all humens, whatever they do. You believe God can be a man because he is god and when killed there will be no god because god was dead. God created death, so how can he die. I am the person from the third would believe in 1 god. I believe that each person is resposnible on what he do, and on one else are responsible except myself. Very strange Click to expand Ahmedhelmy, Having read the Koran and previously had a Muslim girlfriend and having several Muslim friends, I have an idea it my be poor, but I have one of what Muslims believe but you apparently have no idea of Christian beliefs. Almost every single statement in your quoted post is incorrect. Arianism espoused by the JWs is an ancient heresy condemned by the Church years ago. I only know of one Islamic sect widely regarded as heretical, the Ahmadiyya.

Chapter 2 : The Trinity Doctrine - Arianism Defeated by the Firstborn

87 CHAPTER 7 ARIUS Jesus Is a Lesser God Historical Background Sudden chaos overtook Alexandria in A riot broke out and people streamed into the street chanting, "There was a time when.

Is Jesus Christ truly God in the flesh? Is the Son of God merely a created being? These are the sorts of questions a 4th century teacher named Arius asked and answered incorrectly. This heresy continues in some form today. As opposed to being divine in and of himself, Arius believed the Son of God to be merely a created being with divine attributes; "there was [a time] when he the Son was not" Arius. See "What are the Attributes of God? See "What is Kenosis? In addition, Arius misunderstood the hypostatic union. What is the hypostatic union? The hypostatic union is: Jesus Christ is fully God and fully man Col 2: Therefore, he has two natures: Jesus Christ continued to exist fully as God when he added a perfect human nature to himself Phil 2: Therefore, there is a union in the one person of Christ of a full human nature and a full divine nature. Moreover, Arius misunderstood the word "firstborn" Rom 8: It refers to the special status of the firstborn as the preeminent son and heir to be held in great honor Gen However, Arian was again anathemised and pronounced a heretic at the Council of Constantinople AD Paul pairs that designation with the concept of "a different spirit" and "a different gospel" 2 Cor All Christological errors are serious. All lead to and are another gospel, which is no gospel at all Gal 1: Amidst all these assaults against God and his church by numerous false religions, the church has grown stronger, not weaker. In many ways, the church should be thankful for the gift of opposition!

Chapter 3 : What is Arianism?

If Christianity had agreed with Arius that Jesus could be a lesser godâ€”if it had failed to defend monotheism, if it had fallen into the trench of professing three unrelated deitiesâ€”it may have dissolved into the religion of Rome and its pantheons of false gods.

July 14, at Another very interesting post! Please bear with a somewhat detailed response: On that reckoning, Aimee Byrd would be a supporter of patriarchy. CBMW teaches the subordination of women to men in at most two things â€” the family and the church; patriarchy teaches the submission of women to men in all things â€” government, the marketplace, education, etc. No complementarian believes that women in general are subject to men in general; to label CBMW as patriarchal is misleading ad hominem at best, slander at worst. In the age to come, there will be no more marriage, and the giftings and leadership of the Church qua institution will pass away, only faith, hope, and love remaining. Please find me a complementarian who denies this. There are plenty of decent arguments to make for egalitarianism, but this is not one of them. To claim such is the case is incendiary, irresponsible, and â€” most important â€” false. First, Wayne Grudem is a Baptist, and somewhere in the back of his Baptist mind he probably sees himself as standing against the actually un-Nicene view endorsed from time to time in Baptist circles. Sproul and others have taught that the three eternally distinct persons of the Trinity had no relational distinctions from eternity; the Father and the Son only became such or took on such roles with the Incarnation. Martin actually rejected the classic orthodox teaching of the eternal generation of the Son by the Father Nicene as too Arian. Of course, Wayne Grudem, in his desire to ground the relations of generation the Father generates , filiation the Son filiates , and procession the Spirit proceeds in eternity, in fact goes beyond and even against the tradition he seeks to defend. Thus far, Grudem is right: The economic Trinity reflects the ontological or immanent Trinity. But this is not because of any hierarchy or subordination within the Godhead â€” and this is where Grudem is in error. He seems unable to appreciate the distinction between the relations within the Trinity and some sort of hierarchy of authority. That this is his root mistake is clear from his article which Rachel Green Miller so-adroitly rebutted: The Son does not predestine us in the Father. The Son does not create through the Father. The Son does not send his only Father into the world. The Father does not pray to the Son or intercede for his people before the Son. But there is none. To deny these unidirectional relationships between Father and Son is to fail to speak the way the Scripture speaks about the eternal relationship between the Father and the Son. That is a non-sequitur, but this mistake is not remotely the same, or even on the same scale, as suggesting the Jesus is only semi-divine. Instead, they assert multiple wills within the Godhead, predicating will of person rather than of nature. Given that Grudem is hardly alone in screwing up this point of theology, why is everyone going after him, and why now, with the recent revelation of his health issues. I agree that monothelism is false â€” for unless Jesus had a human mind in addition to the mind of the Godhead, there is no way the Father could know the day and the hour without the Son also knowing. Jesus adding on a human mind â€” or rational soul with its own capacity for choice will , to get technical â€” in his incarnation is just the necessary entailment of his being made like his brothers in every way except sin Heb 2: Un-Chalcedonian, sure, but not un-Nicene. And even Chalcedon did not directly condemn monothelism; later councils took up that task, along with introducing false doctrines about icons. The Incarnation reveals the self-giving character of God, even in its humiliation and submission, it does not conceal it. If Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever, perhaps his obedience to the Father in the flesh in some sense reflects their eternal relationship. The Son may eternally submit to the Father without there being any difference in nature, authority, or glory, but simply because it is in the nature shared by of each of the Three Persons to seek the glory and pleasure of the Other Two. But I am sure that all the recent mudslinging is simply unwarranted. CBMW is wrong to appeal to the Trinity to support their views on gender, and enough Complementarians have come out and said just that to make this attack on Complementarians unwarranted.

Chapter 4 : What is Arianism? â€“ James Attebury

8 But unto the Son he (God) saith, Thy throne, O God, (God imparted Godhood upon Jesus) is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. 9 Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God,(even Jesus's God) hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

Next Are Jehovah Witnesses followers of the heresy of Arianism? If it is your belief that you are not Arians then how can you support that you are somehow different than these Christians heretics that were condemned at the Council of Nicaea for all eternity for teaching and believing that Jesus is a created creature and not God. At this Council the Church by the authority of Christ Himself declared that all Arians are in anathema and condemned for all eternity to hell unless they repent of this false belief. How can you claim that you do not fall under this condemnation? Gary, You need to study the history of the Church Constantine his whole life sided with the Arians and not with the Christians. He was baptized as an Arian by two Arian bishops on his deathbed as was a common practice in those days. Constantine was never a Christian. Phooey, The Church teaches no pagan beliefs as you claim. The Bible states that Jesus did indeed give to His Church the authority that you deny. Jesus said to the Church what you bind on earth is bound in heaven. Is that what you are Is that what you are claiming that Jesus had no authority? Is ther not even one JW who can answer this question with evidence that supports the contention that you are not Arians? What do you believe that makes you different and thus not condemned under anathema? In fact, many individuals and groups throughout the centuries have rejected the Trinity based on their examination of the Bible alone, divorced from "Church tradition," which is very telling. The Bible without eisegetical study teaches only Trinitarianism and that truly and surely that Jesus is God. However all teaching of the Church, the Bible, the fathers and history are of one voice which is that God is three persons in one God. The Church is the "pillar and foundation of the truth" and not the Bible alone which is the Sacred Tradition of the Church. Waiting- You are waiting for something you will never experience unless you repent of your sin if not believing in the true nature of God. The Church has spoken and you and others in your sect are condemned to an eternity in hell. You have been forewarned so do not be surprised if at judgment you hear "depart You have been forewarned so do not be surprised if at judgment you hear "depart from me I never knew you".

Chapter 5 : The Sonship of Jesus Christ

The heresy of Arianism, which denied the eternality of Jesus Christ as the Son of God as the Logos (Word), was named after Arius, a presbyter in Alexandria in the 3rd Century A.D. Actually, the "father of Arianism" was Lucian of Antioch.

Jesus Christ is undoubtedly the most significant person of all human history. He stands, not just head and shoulders above all men, but like a cosmic giant that overshadows all others into virtual insignificance. Amazingly, He has had far more than His share of detractors. Today, there are many clergymen, both Catholic and Protestant, who will have Him be no more than a man. The Christadelphians see Him as just a man who had no prior existence. Following the lead of Arius, a presbyter c. Their contention is that, rather than being created, Christ was an emanation from the Father coming into being sometime in the mystic past. Because of their previous background it is probable that the majority of the early leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist Church were decidedly Arian in their teaching about Christ. The emphasis soon moved to Semi-Arianism, and later as the Church matured it moved to acceptance of the full deity of Jesus and acceptance of the Trinity doctrine. Today, there seems to be a resurgence of belief among a minority in the Semi-Arian position. These people seem to suffer from a hangover from the past. As has often been suggested there are really no new heresies, the aberrations that come to the surface today are really old heresies in modern dress. Sometimes they are found scattered here and there but on other occasions they can be found in the short space of a few sentences. Here in magnificent fashion Jesus is shown to be God in the fullest sense. Of course there is much other evidence but our purpose will be to major on this passage. Paul had to combat a Gnostic-type teaching which asserted that there are a number of emanations from God which were only more or less divine and which acted as intermediaries between God and mankind. It seems that false teachers were confusing the Colossians by their insistence that Christ was just a member of this hierarchical structure. Semi-Arianism, it will be noted, is a somewhat similar heresy on the point just made. Please join with me in a consideration of the wonderful things that Paul said about Christ in Colossians 1: Unless otherwise stated all Bible quotations are from the New International Version. However, it certainly could never be said of him that he was the exact counterpart of God. Why ever would Paul make this statement if he only meant that Jesus was the image of God in the same way as all other men? Clearly, this is not what He was saying. As the context is unravelled this will become clearer and clearer. Only the Divine can truly picture the Divine. The image that God reveals is shown forth in the person of Jesus Christ and unless we see Him as God we do not truly see the fullest manifestation of God available to us. However, the term is often used in the Bible for reasons other than to identify one physically born first. The natural firstborn in a family was entitled to certain rights and privileges which gave him the chief position among the offspring in a family, a position of honour and dignity. This figure was often transferred to other people and things to indicate their pre-eminent position. The following are some examples: Evidently, this was the description of a disease considered to be the chief among the fatal maladies of the day. The Revised English Bible provides a clear picture of what Paul intended to convey: Paul was demolishing the Gnostic arguments and, as we are beginning to see, without knowing it was shattering those of all Arians at the same time. Did Jesus merely create in the power received from the Almighty Father? Listen to what Yahweh says at Isaiah Paul says that all things were created by Jesus; Yahweh says that all things were created by Him without assistance from anyone else. Jesus was not some emanation from Yahweh creating on His behalf. If we let Scripture speak for itself we have to acknowledge that Jesus is Yahweh. For another clear example which shows that Jesus is Yahweh the Creator, compare the reference to Jesus found in Hebrews 1: If we want to be faithful to Scripture we never could make such a claim. Jesus created for Himself and not for someone else. Christ does not come from the realm of time; He is from the vast immeasurable ages of eternity. Before everything else Jesus was there. Now we see that because of Jesus the Universe is a Cosmos and not a chaos. If He ceased to be, the whole creation would fall to pieces. Of course not, but Jesus is not a creature; He is the Creator! He is a member of the Trinity. He who created is alone able to sustain. Every heartbeat is a signal that He is there and that He cares for us. He cares for us and loves us so much that He, the Creator and Upholder of the Universe, condescended to come down to this little planet, to His beautiful

creation which we have marred, and suffer and die for us that we might find salvation and forgiveness in Him. He is the Creator of the first chapter of the Old Testament. He is the helpless babe of the first chapter of the New Testament. He who made all things became the man who had nowhere to lay His wonderful head " and all for our sakes. The weeping Jesus " the great King of the universe was nailed to a cross by men such as we, the work of His hands, in rebellion. How sublime is the gospel! God surely loves us! He is the head of the body- the church. Christ is supreme over nature and He is the chief One in the spiritual realm too. This Greek word is also used in relation to Christ in Revelation 3: Arians like to claim that this text too teaches that Christ was the first to be created. But rather, it means that He was the beginner, or the prime source, of creation. Many translations make this fact clear to us: Just as our Lord is the origin of Creation, He is also the origin beginning of spiritual life to the Church. However, His is the primacy in this sphere as well, for all others resurrected before and after Him owed their freedom from death to His triumph over the grave. Truly, He is the pre-eminent One from among the dead. Christ was different from all other men because He is the source of all life; He alone had the power to lay down His life and to take it again John Christ came from among the dead as their representative, that those who have died in Him might be guaranteed deliverance. What a wonderful testimony to the absolute Deity of Christ Paul gave when he wrote to those misguided Christians in Colossae! We see more clearly now that Paul not only demolished the Gnostic arguments but, without knowing it, shattered those of all Arians at the same time. We need not be misled if we study the Word of God, for the answer to all heresies is found therein. We learn of the living Word through a study of the written Word. As we come to know Him we find that He is sufficient for all our needs. But what of you and me? Have we surrendered our lives to Him that He may have the pre-eminence in our lives?

Chapter 6 : Fr. Hardon Archives - Arianism

Jesus, like the Angel of Fire, like Moses (who by the way was god to Pharaoh and Aaron) is a deified person who was given authority (like Joseph by Pharaoh) to be god, or given the authority of God. The difference here is that the son Word earned the highest authority, because he did what no one on earth, or in Heaven could do: "Open the book.

This is the first of a series of articles that will discuss specific heresies. In his motivation to understand the nature of God Arius began with the Gnostic assumptions common to his time and place. One of the common assumptions of Gnosticism is that God, Who is spirit, is utterly holy but the material creation is utterly unholy. Gnostics held that these two could not come into direct contact. This Gnostic assumption logically required that Jesus could not be fully God. He must therefore be a created god. Arianism was one reaction to the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. Another heresy in the theological stew of that time was the Sabellian, or modalist, view of the Three in One nature of God. The Trinity is a mystery and therefore generates attempts to solve the mystery. This is a denial of the Unity of God in favor of the Oneness of God. The Arians were at the other end by denying the Oneness of God in favor of the three. The Son and Holy Spirit were held by many Arians to be lesser deities, and hence, ceased to be monotheistic. The Trinity was the view of God held by the vast majority of believers since the time of the Apostles. Various heresies came along to challenge orthodoxy but did not have the staying power of truth itself. When Arianism came on the scene it was quite successful in capturing the belief of many people. This set the stage for some great theological debates between Arius and Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria. At different times Arius was in the ascendancy and had the favor of Constantine who sent Athanasius into exile. At another time it was the reverse. This creed rejected Arianism and affirmed the Trinitarian orthodoxy. Arianism divided the Church for half a century. After its defeat at the Nicene Council it faded in influence. They hold that Jesus did not pre-exist his earthly life, nor do they affirm the lesser deity of Jesus. Nothing could be more explicit than John 1:

Chapter 7 : Heresy of Arianism | Christian Forums

The mans view under debate was Arius He believed Jesus was divine but believed from CHRI at Houston Baptist University.

All sorts of philosophical ideas were in the air. The meaning of Scripture was being distorted by these. A true understanding of the Person of Jesus was unfortunately affected by a number of speculative ideas. Arianism and Semi-Arianism No doubt one of the most successful of these ideas was what eventually developed into Arianism. This became a 4th century heresy sponsored chiefly by Arius a priest of Alexandria. This teaching intends to take away the absolute Deity of Jesus. First of all it was said that Jesus was created by God but later semi-Arianism promoted the belief that He was born of God. The conclusion of Arianism is that Jesus is not eternal but that He had a beginning. However, their concept differed from that of the Arians in that they believed that this process was continuing and eternal. Jesus, they said, was eternally generated from the Father. This is a very difficult theory to grasp. I have been unable to embrace it as truth as a study of this paper will make clear. Therefore, I will not attempt to further elucidate it now. Scripture has convinced me that Jesus has always existed as a Member of the Trinity along with the Father and the Holy Spirit. The Arians presented Jesus as a kind of lesser god. It is my prayer that they will see the futility of trying to save the concept of Jesus being begotten of the Father and that they will appreciate that He is Eternal Deity full and complete. They will then surely abandon the heresy and again accept the truth of the Biblical Trinity doctrine. Monogenes The history of the interpretation of this word is quite fascinating. Prior to and during New Testament times the word clearly meant something like "unique" or "only. The distortion of the word in the Latin Vulgate and the subsequent perpetuation of the error in the King James Version of A. It might appear that we have all the ingredients for a fictional thriller here but we are not dealing with fiction and the material we need to review is too much of a serious nature to be considered as suitable for a thriller. All that I have said is elaborated on in this paper so please read on. Linguistic studies have shown that genes is not related to the verb gennaō to beget , but rather to the term genos class or kind. So the word means something like "unique" or "only. The fact that monogenes does not mean "only begotten" can be easily seen by reference to Hebrews Isaac was not the only son of Abraham who had also begotten Ishmael. A study of the usage of the word prior to and during New Testament years confirms exactly this understanding of the word. There is no doubt regarding the meaning of the Greek word used here monogenes ; it means "only" and not "only begotten. The following is from an informative Adventist publication: It is translated in the KJV as "darling" Psalm It then states that "In harmony with the last two examples, see the Apocrypha, Tobit 3: Thus we find Plato writing of monogenes ouranos - the only heavens - Timaeus, English translation by R. Bury, The Loeb Classical Library. A reference, one believed to be a contemporary of the apostle John, might be in place in this connection. Clement of Rome describes the legendary bird, the Phoenix, as monogenes. This is the only one of its kind [monogenes]. It should be noted that the Phoenix being a legendary bird, was certainly not born or begotten, but it could be monogenes, the only one of its kind, unique. It is therefore most relevant and conclusive. A definition of a word that precedes New Testament times would naturally be expected to flow into New Testament times. There is not one instance where something like "unique" or "only" is not a suitable translation of the word in the whole of the New Testament. Accordingly, most modern translations render it in all instances in such a way. They deny the absolute Deity of Jesus and make out that He is a sort of lesser god. Some have referred to Him as a demi-god. In the light of the above, their attempt to reduce Jesus from being God absolutely and part of the Trinity, fails miserably. They appeal to the writings of early Christians, some of which do contain reference to Jesus as "only begotten" in the copies available to us. However, the authenticity of these writings is questionable in some instances and the evidence is that they may have been tampered with. Take for example Ignatius: Ignatius wrote in the early years of the second century of the Christian era. But that is not all! Of the seven Epistles which are acknowledged by Eusebius Hist. The shorter of the two is accepted as the authentic version. There are references to Jesus as being "only begotten" in the longer version, but it is considered to be spurious. The shorter version contains none of the "only begotten" references. The

question is, "How and why did the disputed words appear in the longer version? The writings of some other early Christians as we have them today also speak of Jesus as "only begotten. It was distorted to mean, "only begotten" and this was apparently filtered back into the writings of Ignatius and probably into those of others also. It seems clear to me that these writings were fiddled with. Somewhere around the year AD Origen promulgated the "eternal generation" of Jesus concept. This eventually became the common belief in the Church of the time and it has remained with us until recent years. We can only guess. We must also be aware of the fact that Greek philosophy and Gnosticism were being embraced by some Christians, at least to some degree, in those developing years of early Christianity. These were instrumental in corrupting many Christian truths in the minds and teachings of some Christians. There were a lot of theories related to the Person of Christ being promoted and being considered. Uncertainty was in the air. This contradicts the falsified long document which presents itself as a writing of Ignatius. Surely it is clear that a change was made and that it was widespread. What a sad state of affairs. It should be noted that there is not one New Testament reference, where the word is used, that requires that it be translated other than something like "unique" or "only. We must not be deceived by it. Wayne Grudem has suggested that "it is not impossible that the Nicene fathers in A. As charitable as we might try to be I still cannot escape the conclusion that, at least early on, there had been a fiddle. Later Christians may not have been aware of this and may have been fooled by it. We should not be. Conclusion Bethe forms of Arianism are a definite distortion of truth and have been rightly labeled as heresy. Arianism was dealt a decisive blow by the Council of Nicea in A. It is amazing the amount of dust modern day Semi-Arians have been able to throw up in their endeavors to depreciate the value of the Council Despite the fact that it supported the idea of "only begotten". The later Athanasian Creed offers a very good statement explaining the Trinity doctrine except for its comment that Jesus was begotten see my book Understanding the Trinity, pages 13, In addition to the above there is a massive amount of true Scriptural evidence for the full Deity of Jesus and my book contains an abundance of this. Scriptural facts show that Jesus is no depreciated god but is a Member of the Almighty Trinity. Any belief that has two gods must be branded a heresy on this point alone! Forms of Arianism, like all heresies, have enjoyed a resurgence now and again, but they can only thrive where ignorance prevails. It is the hope and prayer of the writer of this paper that its contents will inform those who are sincere but have been caught up in the distortion of truth. The Bible warns that there will be many false teachers peddling their wares in the last days. Every wind of doctrine is blowing today and there seems to be a tendency on the part of some to run off with every new heresy. The Trinity doctrine is a wonderful truth. Jesus has always existed and He is coming back soon to rescue those who are faithful to Him. May you and I dear reader be found among that company. Let us praise God for His unbelievable patience with us.

Chapter 8 : Early Christian History - Creeds

Today the Jehovah's Witnesses are the chief proponents of the Arian view that Jesus is a created, or lesser, god. The Way International is marginally Arian, but go further than either Arius or the Watchtower Society.

Arianism is the belief that Jesus is not God. Instead, it argues that the Son is the first created being made by God through whom he created the world. This heresy is named after Arius who served as a pastor in Alexandria before being condemned at the Council of Nicaea in 325 AD. Arianism also errs by denying that Jesus is God John 1: As with every system of belief, to understand Arianism as it was historically understood, we must go back to the original sources and read Arius in his own words to understand his theology. He sets forth his beliefs concerning who Jesus is in his letter to Alexander of Alexandria: For the Father, having given to him the inheritance of all, did not deprive himself of those things which he has in himself without generation, for he is the source of all. Thus there are three hypostases. God being the cause of all is without beginning, most alone; but the Son, begotten by the Father, created and founded before the ages, was not before he was begotten. Rather, the Son begotten timelessly before everything, alone was caused to subsist by the Father. For he is not everlasting or co-everlasting or unbegotten with the Father. Nor does he have being with the Father, as certain individuals mention things relatively and bring into the discussion two unbegotten causes. But God is thus before all as a monad and cause. Therefore, he is also before the Son, as we have learned from you when you preached throughout the midst of the church. Therefore, insofar as he has from God being, glories, and life, and all things have been handed over to him, thus God is his cause. For he, as his God and being before him, rules him. But the Arians had a way of getting around this condemnation of their beliefs. For Arius, it was timeless and creative, but not eternally ongoing. Following Origen, Alexander believed that the Son is eternally generated by the Father and derives his divine nature from him. Arius later composed the *Thalia* to express his doctrine in poetic form: Equal or like Himself He alone has none, or one in glory. And Ingenerate we call Him, because of Him who is generate by nature. We praise Him as without beginning because of Him who has a beginning. And adore Him as everlasting, because of Him who in time has come to be. The Unbegun made the Son a beginning of things originated; and advanced Him as a Son to Himself by adoption. He has nothing proper to God in proper subsistence. For He is not equal, no, nor one in essence with Him. Wise is God, for He is the teacher of Wisdom. There is full proof that God is invisible to all beings; both to things which are through the Son, and to the Son He is invisible. I will say it expressly, how by the Son is seen the Invisible; by that power by which God sees, and in His own measure, the Son endures to see the Father, as is lawful. Thus there is a Triad, not in equal glories. Not intermingling with each other are their subsistences. One more glorious than the other in their glories unto immensity. Foreign from the Son in essence is the Father, for He is without beginning. Understand that the Monad was; but the Dyad was not, before it was in existence. It follows at once that, though the Son was not, the Father was God. Hence the Son, not being for He existed at the will of the Father, is God Only-begotten, and He is alien from either. Wisdom existed as Wisdom by the will of the Wise God. Hence He is conceived in numberless conceptions: Understand that He is conceived to be Radiance and Light. One equal to the Son, the Superior is able to beget; but one more excellent, or superior, or greater, He is not able. And when and since He was, from that time He has subsisted from God. He, being a strong God, praises in His degree the Superior. To speak in brief, God is ineffable to His Son. For He is to Himself what He is, that is, unspeakable. So that nothing which is called comprehensible does the Son know to speak about; for it is impossible for Him to investigate the Father, who is by Himself. For the Son does not know His own essence. For, being Son, He really existed, at the will of the Father. What argument then allows, that He who is from the Father should know His own parent by comprehension? For it is plain that for that which hath a beginning to conceive how the Unbegun is, or to grasp the idea, is not possible. But they have brought forth their own document, which they have written for you, in which they explain their faith, confessing it with these very words: But your letter surely misrepresents them as saying that the son is the same as the other created things. They are not saying this! I would be astonished if someone were able to speak differently. For if there is only one who exists [eternally], it is clear

that everything which exists has come into being from him, whatever indeed exists after him. If it were not he alone who exists eternally, but the son also exists eternally, how indeed could one who exists beget another who already exists? It would have to follow that there would actually be two who exist eternally. Morey in his book *The Trinity: Evidence and Issues* outlines the four key tenets of Arianism: In the classic Platonic sense, God is the eternal, immutable, and indivisible Monas. He is not the Father from all eternity because there was a time when He did not have a son. Jesus Christ is called the Duas who was created by the Monas. This is why He is the demiurge-like creator and the mediator between Mind God and matter the world. He was created by the Monas and thus there was a time when he was not. Since the Monas is indivisible, the Son and the Spirit cannot partake of his nature or attributes. Thus, the Trinity cannot be true by definition. The Holy Spirit was created by the Duas and is not God. This was later abandoned by most Arians and today they reduce the Spirit to a non-personal force. One of the main arguments of the Arians is that God alone is unbegotten. Since the Son is begotten, he cannot be God. Only the Father is unbegotten or eternal. If Jesus is eternal and God by nature equal with the Father, then there would be two unbegottens and thus two Gods. In addition, there would be no way to distinguish between the Son and the Father. They would exist as twins or brothers rather than as Father and Son. But the Arians had to accommodate this belief with the biblical passages which teach that Jesus is God. Their solution to this problem was to make the Son a lesser God than the Father so that the divine essence is not divided. The solution to the Arian argument about God alone being unbegotten is not to deny that the Son is unbegotten Ignatius to the Ephesians 7: The one who is unbegotten is three. The Arians argued on the basis of the created order that the Son must be subordinate to the Father because human sons are subordinate to their fathers. Just as human fathers exist before their sons, the Father must have existed before the Son. Because God is immortal and cannot die, Jesus could not have been God since he died for our sins. There is no concept of the two natures of Christ in Arianism. Those passages in Scripture which teach that Jesus is truly human are used against his deity because there is an a priori denial that God could become man in the incarnation. While many cultists argue against the doctrine of the Trinity by claiming that it comes from Greek philosophy rather than the Bible, the Arians and other heretics in the early church were just as influenced by Greek philosophy as the orthodox were. Arguments based on the influence of Greek philosophy are a double-edged sword because of the variegated nature of philosophy and its universal influence. God in Arianism is an indivisible monad and therefore by definition God cannot share his divine nature among more than one person. For God to be simple and not made up of parts, they argued that God must be unitarian in person. If God exists as more than one person, then he could not be simple or indivisible. Arianism reminds us of the danger of allowing fallen human reasoning to distinguish truth from error rather than relying solely on the revelation of God in Scripture. Arguing from the created order back to God makes creation definitional for what is true of God rather than trusting in the words of the creator.

For example, Robert M. Bowman in his Jehovah's Witnesses, Jesus Christ, and the Gospel of John states that at 1 Jn Jesus is called 'the true God and eternal life' "indisputably identifying Christ as the Almighty God of the Old Testament." - p.

Search This Blog JW. ORG and Watchtower Library in one search box: Who is the "True God"? There can be no doubt what "truth" means here. It can be properly contrasted here with "falsity. There are only two choices here. This is confirmed by John Obviously, if we "know" God and Christ falsely, we cannot worship them in truth. We must know them accurately! If something is true, does that mean all other things in that same category are necessarily false? Some trinitarians insist that this is so when the term "the true God" is used in Scripture. And, therefore, Jesus cannot be called "a god" in scripture as JWs have translated. Well, alethinos "is unquestionably used sometimes in the Gospel and First Epistle [of John] to signify that a thing truly corresponds to the idea of the name given to it" - p. And respected NT Greek expert W. Vine tells us that alethinos "denotes true in the sense of real, ideal, genuine; it is used a of God, John 7: In either case this certainly does not have to mean that all other prophets must be false! Even if it was said that this one was the "only true Prophet," we would probably consider him the only prophet in the highest sense of the word, but that still would not make all other prophets of God false prophets! Or, since the Proverb quoted at 2 Peter 2: Here again, although the heavenly "tabernacle" is the "true tabernacle," that does not mean that the earthly tabernacle was a false tabernacle. Vine puts it when discussing Heb. Therefore, the heavenly tabernacle was the only true Tabernacle. There could be other, earthly, tabernacles which were still not false tabernacles. No, just because the heavenly tabernacle is the true one, does not make holy tabernacles on earth false tabernacles. They were merely tabernacles in a lesser sense of the word - "in the image of" the only true Tabernacle in heaven! As far as Christians are concerned there is only one "true Christ," our Savior, Jesus! We know that the Bible has also warned us about "false christs. This included the high priests, prophets, and righteous kings of Israel. Why, even the foreign king, Cyrus, was called the christ christw of God Is. So, even though we would say that Jesus is the only true Christ and that there have been many false Christs who have arisen, it still would not be proper to insist that any person other than Jesus who is called "christ" or "a christ" must be a false christ! We would then be saying that King David, Moses, and innumerable others chosen by God to do his will were false christs! And all others called "christ" are either false christs or faithful servants of God in a lesser sense of the word as compared to Jesus himself! These are called "gods" in the sense of faithful servants of God, representing the true God. Also remember that capital letters were not used to distinguish things in the original manuscripts of the Bible as they are in modern English Bibles: God, and without a teaching priest, and without law: This passage is not in the Septuagint. And the only person to be identified as Jehovah in the entire OT is the Father alone! And, in fact, it is also clearly shown that the Messiah is not Jehovah! But what about the New Testament? Is "the true [real] God" ever clearly identified here in contradiction to the OT as the Son? As the Holy Spirit? As a "multiple-person" God? Well, here again the true God is clearly the Father alone as context demands and who has been identified as Jehovah alone above. So what about the only two remaining references in the NT: The only hope for the trinitarian argument that the "true God is Jesus" is found at 1 John 5: This [outos] is the true [alethinos] God, and eternal life. Some trinitarians actually insist that the word "this" outos here refers to Jesus. In other words, "[Jesus Christ] is the true God and eternal life. I understand why some trinitarians are so desperate in their search for non-existent scriptural "evidence" that they have to make it up, but this is incredibly poor! It is obvious that grammatically the word "this" outos could be referring to either the Father or Jesus in this particular scripture see the footnote for 1 John 5: But the fact that the true God or "the true One" has just been identified as the Father of Jesus 1 Jn 5: The highly trinitarian NT scholar Murray J. Harris sums up his page analysis of this scripture as follows: Notice how this trinitarian scholar actually admits that the probability is that the Father not Jesus is being called the true God here. He even tells us and cites examples in his footnotes that New Testament grammarians and commentators most of them trinitarian, of course agree! So this single "proof" that the "true God" is a title for anyone other

than the Father alone is not proof at all. The grammar alone merely makes it a possibility. The immediate context makes it highly improbable since as in all other uses of the term the true God or the true one was just identified as the Father "We are in the one who is true as we are in his Son, Jesus Christ. He is the true God and this is eternal life. We live in union with the true God - in union with his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and this is eternal life. And now we live in fellowship with the true God because we live in fellowship with his Son, Jesus Christ. He is the only true God, and he is eternal life. So the immediate context alone makes it probable that the true God is the Father in this scripture also. Here the Father alone is not only very clearly identified as the only true [alethinos] God, but Jesus Christ is again pointedly and specifically excluded from that identification "AND Jesus Christ whom you [the only true God] have sent"! Notice how this popular trinitarian Bible has rendered John This is eternal life: So, the title "the true God" does not have to mean that there are no others who may be called "gods" or "a god" in a subordinate but righteous sense. And clearly it refers exclusively to the Father! No one else is the God or the True God! Those who use it have not examined it with anything that could be called proper scholarship. They are either terribly misinformed the fault of their spiritual "guides" or, in the case of the trinitarian authors, lecturers, and ministers who are aware of methods of proper research, Bible language grammar, etc. How does this fit with the command that we must worship God in truth aletheia - Jn 4: Or the warning that when the knowingly blind false religious leaders lead the blind the ones following those leaders with blind faith both will fall into the pit? Some of the many trinitarian sources which admit that the Bible actually describes men who represent God judges, Israelite kings, etc. New Bible Dictionary, p. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, 4. The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, p. New American Bible, St. Robertson, Word Pictures, Vol. Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, Vol. Harris, Jesus As God, p. The Fourfold Gospel Note for John The Amplified Bible, Ps. Augustine also had this understanding for "a god. For example, Ernst Haenchen tells us in his commentary on the Gospel of John: In that passage Paul depicts just such a divine being, who later became man in Jesus Christ". Just these three scriptures alone show who the "only true God" and "most high God" is and that other persons may be called "a god" and "son of God" or "son of the most high" in a subordinate but still proper not "false" sense. Commentators who Professor Harris says support Jesus not being called "true God": Authors of general studies who Dr. Harris says support Jesus not being called "true God": Findlay, Harnack, Dupont, W. Winer, Buttman, Schmiedel, A. For illustration of this we need only recall John Dodd, Moffatt New Testament Commentary. Knowing the true God; The Greek of 5: Christ is his Son. In the final sentence this one most naturally refers still to God, not to Christ, as some have suggested. This is the true God, and eternal life.