

TRINITY STUDIES 3

A REVIEW OF

ARIANISM

Is Christ a Created Sub God?

AND

OTHER RELATED CONCEPTS

With

**Eusebius on the Deity and Preexistence
of
Jesus Christ**

By

R. E. Pound

**Gravenhurst, Ontario, Canada
2004.**

Introduction

Most theological concepts did not develop instantly nor did one person produce them. They evolved over time with several contributing persons. No one person is responsible for any theological concept; rather persons here and there contribute thoughts and points. Certain writers have named theological concepts after a man or men leaving the impression that such a man or men are responsible for that concept. This is not true, but is the case with Arianism.

The editors of the Nicene Fathers, in their introduction to Eusebius' **Church History** comment in the following manner:

5. THE OUTBREAK OF THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY. THE ATTITUDE OF EUSEBIUS.

About the year 318, while Alexander was bishop of Alexandria, the Arian controversy broke out in that city, and the whole Eastern Church was soon involved in the strife. We cannot enter here into a discussion of Arius' views; but in order to understand the rapidity with which the Arian party grew, and the strong hold which it possessed from the very start in Syria and Asia Minor, we must remember that Arius was not himself the author of that system which we know as Arianism, but that he learned the essentials of it from his instructor Lucian. The latter was one of the most learned men of his age in the Oriental Church, and rounded an (p. 26) exegetico-theological school in Antioch, which for a number of years stood outside of the communion of the orthodox Church in that city, but shortly before the martyrdom of Lucian himself (which took place in 311 or 312) made its peace with the Church, and was recognized by it. He was held in the highest reverence by his disciples, and exerted a great influence over them even after his death. Among them were such men as Arius, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Asterius, and others who were afterward known as staunch Arianists. According to Harnack the chief points in the system of Lucian and his disciples were the creation of the Son, the denial of his co-eternity with the Father, and his immutability acquired by persistent progress and steadfastness. His doctrine, which differed from that of Paul of Samosata chiefly in the fact that it was not a man but a created heavenly being who became "Lord," was evidently the result of a combination of the teaching of Paul and of Origen. It will be seen that we have here, at least in germ, all the essential elements of Arianism proper: the creation of the Son out of nothing, and consequently the conclusion that there was a time when he was not; the distinction of his essence from that of the Father, but at the same time the emphasis upon the fact that he "was not created as the other creatures," and is therefore to be sharply distinguished from them. There was little for Arius to do but to combine the elements given by Lucian in a more complete and well-ordered system, and then to bring that system forward clearly and publicly, and endeavor to make it the faith of the Church at large. His christology was essentially opposed to the Alexandrian, and it was natural that he should soon come into conflict with that church, of which he was a presbyter (upon Lucian's teaching and its relation to Arianism, see Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte*, II. p. 183 sq.).

Arius

Arius was born about A.D. 250 and died about 336. He was a presbyter in Alexandria, Egypt and a part of the Alexandrian School of Theology. He was a disciple of Lucian of Antioch, having studied in that school with Eusebius. As the Alexandrians and others studied and discussed the Divine Nature of Christ and His relationship to His Father, and the Father's to Him, certain older concepts began to form into newer theological points. One was Eternal Generation. This concept meant that God the Father did generate or separate out from within Himself, Jesus Christ, in His deity, as His only Begotten Son. Arius and others rightly opposed such a teaching.

The Old and New Theology

The established Bishops and the Heretics, as they were called, began to discuss older theological differences that were then beginning to surface. Soon these would be processed into theological doctrines. Most of these involved the unscriptural doctrine of eternal generation and the problems of One God in Three Beings. Some sought to develop these doctrines while preserving the essential Divine nature of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Others did not. Soon this major difference became evident: Only the Father was Divine. The heretics said yes, the Bishops said no. The Bishops placed the Divine Nature within Christ by claiming the Father generated to Him the Father's own Divine Nature. Later, the Holy Spirit would become the topic of many heated debates. From these would come the unscriptural doctrine of the Holy Spirit's Eternal Procession. Even as Christ came out of the Father by eternal generation, so would also the Holy Spirit come out of the Father and through Christ. Some later argued that Christ created the Holy Spirit. The Arian controversy arose as a compromise position between the Sabellians or Patripassionists, and the growing Nicene Trinity, the Zeus concept as the Father of all Gods and men.

The Divine Christ of the Arians

In seeking to maintain Christ's deity, at first the Arians did not deny that Christ was Divine. However, they placed Him lower than His Father and argued that Christ was a Divine Creation. By this they meant He was of a Divine Nature, because created by the Father, but not the same as the Father's Divine Nature. Christ was created as a sub-god. He was in between the Father and the regular creation. As concepts became debated and gave way to newer and differing ones, soon the Arians taught that Christ was the link *between* Creation and the Father. The Father created Christ out of nothing. After this the Father created all other things out of Christ. By this distinction Christ is different from all other created beings. Therefore, upon close examination, one can see Pantheism and a denial of the equality self sufficiency and self-existence of Christ's Deity with His Father's Deity.

Tertullian and Praxeas

Before Lucian and Arius and their theology, Tertullian had already contended with Praxeas about the Trinity. Praxeus seemed to hold to a growing form of Patripassionism or Sabellianism. He believed the Father came to this earth, was born of the Virgin, and

died on the Cross. In dissenting from this growing Patripassionism, Tertullian seemed to combine the theology of both the Greeks and the Romans or Latins. He held both to Monarchianism and a Trinity of Deity. He sometime called these Beings persons, other times, by different terms. Here is a summary of Monarchianism and some of its principal defenders.

Monarchianism

In its most general sense monarchianism (also called patripassionism or Sabellianism) refers to the primarily Western attempts in the third century to defend monotheism against suspected tritheism by denying the personal distinctiveness of a divine Son and Holy Spirit in contrast to God the Father. The term is first used by Tertullian to describe those who desired to protect the monarchy (of the one God) from improper thoughts about the economy (of the three: the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit). There were two forms of monarchianism which were not only distinctly independent but even opposed to each other. Dynamic, or adoptionistic, monarchianism proposed a monotheism of God the Father in relation to which Jesus was viewed as a mere man who was endowed with the Holy Spirit. This view was first put forward in Rome about 190 by Theodotus of Byzantium and continued by his successor, Artemon (also called Theodotus), who tried to argue that this teaching was the heir of the apostolic tradition. Artemon was refuted by Hippolytus, who condemned the teaching as an innovative attempt to rationalize the Scripture according to the systems of hellenic logic (most likely that taught by the physician and philosopher Galen).

Although there has been some disagreement on exactly how to classify him, it seems most likely that Paul of Samosata held to a more advanced form of this dynamic monarchianism. He depersonalized the Logos as simply the inherent rationality of God, which led him to formulate a doctrine of the homoousia of the Logos and the Father which necessarily denied the personal subsistence of the preincarnate Word. It was for this reason that both his teaching as a whole and the use of the word homoousia were condemned by the Synod of Antioch in 268. Also in working out the consistency of the dynamic monarchian position, Paul taught that the Holy Spirit was not a distant personal entity but simply a manifestation of the grace of the Father.

Although in basic agreement with dynamic monarchianism on the foundational issue of limiting the term theos to the person of the Father alone, modalistic monarchianism, also known simply as modalism, nevertheless attempted to speak of the full deity of the Son. The earlier modalists (operating between the second and third centuries), such as Noetus, Epigonus, and Praxeas, achieved this objective by identifying the Son as the Father himself. This led to the charge of patripassionism, which became another label for modalism. Patripassionism is the teaching that it was the Father who became incarnate, was born of a virgin, and who suffered and died on the cross. Praxeas attempted to soften this charge by making a distinction between the Christ who is the Father and the Son who was simply a man. In this way the Father cosuffers with the human Jesus. C A Blaising.

(Elwell Evangelical Dictionary)

Bibliography

Eusebius, Church History 5.25; 7.27 - 30; Hippolytus, Contra Noetum; Tertullian, Against Praxeas; R Seeberg, Text book of the History of Doctrines; J N D Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines.

Lucian of Antioch

Lucian of Antioch contributed many points toward Arian theology before Arius. The following summary is from *The Catholic Encyclopedia*.

A priest of the Church of Antioch who suffered martyrdom (7 January, 312), during the reign of Maximinus Daza. According to a tradition preserved by Suidas (s.v.), Lucian was born at Samosata, of pious parents, and was educated in the neighbouring city of Edessa at the school of a certain Macarius. Not much faith can be attached to these statements, which are not corroborated by any other author; Suidas very probably confounded the history of Lucian with that of his famous namesake, the pagan satirist of a century earlier. The confusion is easily pardoned, however, as both exhibited the same intellectual traits and the same love for cold literalism.

Early in life Lucian took up his residence at Antioch, where he was ordained presbyter, and where he soon attained a commanding position as head of the theological school in that city. Though he cannot be accused of having shared the theological views of Paul of Samosata, he fell under suspicion at the time of Paul's condemnation, and was compelled to sever his communion with the Church. This breach with the orthodox party lasted during the episcopates of three bishops, Domnus, Timaeus, and Cyril, whose administration extended from 268 to 303. It seems more likely that Lucian was reconciled with the Church early in the episcopate of Cyril (perhaps about 285) than in that of his successor; otherwise it is hard to understand how bishops in the Orient could have received his pupils. Very little is known about the life of Lucian, though few men have left such a deep print on the history of Christianity. The opposition to the allegorizing tendencies of the Alexandrines centred in him. He rejected this system entirely and propounded a system of literal interpretation which dominated the Eastern Church for a long period. In the field of theology, in the minds of practically all writers (the most notable modern exception being Gwatkin, in his "Studies of Arianism", London, 1900), he has the unenviable reputation of being the real author of the opinions which afterwards found expression in the heresy of Arius. In his Christological system — a compromise between Modalism and Subordinationism — the Word, though Himself the Creator of all subsequent beings was a creature, though superior to all other created things by the wide gulf between Creator and creature. The great leaders in the Arian movement (Arius himself, Eusebius, the court bishop of Nicomedia, Maris, and Theognis) received their training under him and always venerated him as their master and the founder of their system.

Despite his heterodoxy, Lucian was a man of the most unexceptionable virtue (Eusebius, H. E., VIII, xiii, 2); at the height of the Arian controversy his fame for sanctity was not less than his reputation as a scholar. During the persecution of Maximinus Daza he was arrested at Antioch and sent to Nicomedia, where he endured many tortures and, after delivering a long oration in defence of his faith, was finally put to death. The most enduring memorial of the life of Lucian, next to the Christological controversy which his teachings aroused, was his influence on Biblical study. Receiving the literal sense alone he laid stress on the need of textual accuracy and himself undertook to revise the Septuagint on the original Hebrew. His edition was widely used in the fourth century (Jerome, De Vir. III. Ixxvii Praef. ad Paralip.; Adv. Rufium xxvi, Epis., 106). He also published a recension of the New Testament. St. Jerome (De Vir. Ill, 77), in addition to the recension of the Bible, speaks of "Lebelli de Fide", none of which are extant. He is also credited with the composition of a Creed, presented to the Council of Antioch in 341 (Athan., "Ep. de Synod. Arim. et Seleuc". xxiii), but his authorship is doubtful; in fact it is certain he did not compose it in its present form. Rufinus (H. E., IX, vi) has preserved a translation of his apologetic oration. There are

epistles mentioned by Suidas; a fragment of one announces the death of Anthimus, a bishop ("Chronicon Paschale in P.G. XCII, 689).

Tertullian

Though Tertullian lived before Arianism, and was not an Arian, he held to some unusual concepts that helped grow into Arianism. Tertullian's Monarchianism was certain Biblical, but taken out its context, it helped developed Arianism.

Here are some important remarks about Tertullian, I John 5:7 and the ancient old Italic Bible:

Possibly we owe to Tertullian the primordia of the Old African Latin Versions, some of which seem to have contained the disputed text I. John 5:7; of which more when we come to the Praxeas. For the present in the absence of definite evidence we must infer that Tertullian usually translated from the LXX, and from the originals of the New Testament. But Mosheim thinks the progress of the Gospel in the West was now facilitated by the existence of Latin Versions. Observe, also, Kaye's important note, p. 293, and his reference to Lardner, Cred. 27. 19. Anti-Nicene Fathers, page 104.

Again, from Volume 3, page 1082, Tertullian identifies the Patripassionism of Praxeas:

IN various ways has the devil rivaled and resisted the truth. Sometimes his aim has been to destroy the truth by defending it. He maintains that there is one only Lord, the Almighty Creator of the world, in order that out of this doctrine of the unity he may fabricate a heresy. He says that the Father Himself came down into the Virgin, was Himself born of her, Himself suffered, indeed was Himself Jesus Christ.

Here is Tertullian's usage of I John 5:7:

(p.1128)

CHAPTER 25

**THE PARACLETE, OR HOLY GHOST. HE IS
DISTINCT FROM THE FATHER AND THE SON AS TO
THEIR PERSONAL EXISTENCE. ONE AND INSEPARABLE
FROM THEM AS TO THEIR DIVINE NATURE.
OTHER QUOTATIONS OUT OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL**

What follows Philip's question, and the Lord's whole treatment of it, to the end of John's Gospel, continues to furnish us with statements of the same kind, distinguishing the Father and the Son, with the properties of each. Then there is the Paraclete or Comforter, also, which He promises to pray for to the Father, and to send from heaven after He had ascended to the Father. He is called "another Comforter," indeed; but in what way He is another we have already shown, "He shall receive of mine," says Christ, just as Christ Himself received of the Father's. Thus the connection of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Paraclete, produces three coherent Persons, who are yet distinct One from Another. These Three are one essence, not one Person, as it is said, "I and my Father are One," in respect of unity of substance not singularity of number. Run through the whole Gospel, and you will find that He whom you believe to be the Father (described as acting for the Father, although you, for your

part, forsooth, suppose that “the Father, being the husbandman,” must surely have been on earth) is once more recognized by the Son as in heaven, when, “lifting up His eyes thereto,” He commended His disciples to the safe-keeping of the Father. We have, moreover, in that other Gospel a clear revelation, i.e. of the Son’s distinction from the Father, “My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?” and again, (in the third Gospel,) “Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit.” But even if (we had not these passages, we meet with satisfactory evidence) after His resurrection and glorious victory over death. Now that all the restraint of His humiliation is taken away, He might, if possible, have shown Himself as the Father to so faithful a woman (as Mary Magdalene) when she approached to touch Him, out of love, not from curiosity, nor with Thomas’ incredulity. But not so; Jesus saith unto her, “Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren” (and even in this He proves Himself to be the Son; for if He had been the Father, He would have called them His (p.1129) children, (instead of His brethren), “and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God.” Now, does this mean, I ascend as the Father to the Father, and as God to God? Or as the Son to the Father, and as the Word to God? Wherefore also does this Gospel, at its very termination, intimate that these things were ever written, if it be not, to use its own words, “that ye might believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?” Whenever, therefore, you take any of the statements of this Gospel, and apply them to demonstrate the identity of the Father and the Son, supposing that they serve your views therein, you are contending against the definite purpose of the Gospel. For these things certainly are not written that you may believe that Jesus Christ is the Father, but the Son.

Here is Tertullian’s summation of the Patripassionist’s theology with Judaism:

(p. 1140)

CHAPTER 31

RETROGRADE CHARACTER OF THE HERESY OF PRAXEAS. THE DOCTRINE OF THE BLESSED TRINITY CONSTITUTES THE GREAT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY

But, (this doctrine of yours bears a likeness) to the Jewish faith, of which this is the substance — so to believe in One God as to refuse to reckon the Son besides Him, and after the Son the Spirit. Now, what difference would there be between us and them, if there were not this distinction which you are for breaking down? What need would there be of the gospel, which is the substance of the New Covenant, laying down (as it does) that the Law and the Prophets lasted until John the Baptist, if thenceforward the Father, the Son, and the Spirit are not both believed in as Three, and as making One Only God? God was pleased to renew His covenant with man in such a way as that His Unity might be believed in, after a new manner, through the Son and the Spirit, in order that God might now be known openly, in His proper Names and Persons, who in ancient times was not plainly understood, though declared through the Son and the Spirit. Away, then, with those “Antichrists who deny the Father and the Son.” For they deny the Father, when they say that He is the same as the Son; and they deny the Son, when they suppose Him to be the same as the Father, by assigning to Them things which are not Theirs, and taking away from Them things which are Theirs. But “whosoever shall confess that (Jesus) Christ is the Son of God” (not the Father), “God dwelleth in him, and he in God.” We believe not the testimony of God in which He testifies to us of His Son. “He that hath not the Son, hath not life.” And that man has not the Son, who believes Him to be any other than the Son.

Here is a brief survey about Tertullian:

Ecclesiastical writer in the second and third centuries, b. probably about 160 at Carthage, being the son of a centurion in the proconsular service. He was evidently by profession an advocate in the law-courts, and he shows a close acquaintance with the procedure and terms of Roman law, though it is doubtful whether he is to be identified with a jurist Tertullian who is cited in the Pandects. He knew Greek as well as Latin, and wrote works in Greek which have not come down to us. A pagan until middle life, he had shared the pagan prejudices against Christianity, and had indulged like others in shameful pleasures. His conversion was not later than the year 197, and may have been earlier. He embraced the Faith with all the ardour of his impetuous nature. He became a priest, no doubt of the Church of Carthage. Monceaux, followed by d'Ales, considers that his earlier writings were composed while he was yet a layman, and if this be so, then his ordination was about 200. His extant writings range in date from the apologetics of 197 to the attack on a bishop who is probably Pope Callistus (after 218). It was after the year 206 that he joined the Montanist sect, and he seems to have definitively separated from the Church about 211 (Harnack) or 213 (Monceaux). After writing more virulently against the Church than even against heathen and persecutors, he separated from the Montanists and founded a sect of his own. The remnant of the Tertullianists was reconciled to the Church by St. Augustine. A number of the works of Tertullian are on special points of belief or discipline. According to St. Jerome he lived to extreme old age.

A dogmatic work, "Adversus Praezan", is of great importance. Praxeas had prevented, according to Tertullian, the recognition of the Montanist prophecy by the pope; Tertullian attacks him as a Monarchian, and develops his own doctrine of the Holy Trinity (see MONARCHIANS and PRAXEAS).

His Trinitarian teaching is inconsistent, being an amalgamation of the Roman doctrine with that of St. Justin Martyr. Tertullian has the true formula for the Holy Trinity, tres Personae, una Substantia. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are numerically distinct, and each is God; they are of one substance, one state, and one power. So far the doctrine is accurately Nicene. But by the side of this appears the Greek view which was one day to develop into Arianism: that the unity is to be sought not in the Essence but in the origin of the Persons. He says that from all eternity there was reason (ratio) in God, and in reason the Word (Sermo), not distinct from God, but in vulva cordis. For the purpose of creation the Word received a perfect birth as Son. There was a time when there was no Son and no sin, when God was neither Father nor Judge. In his Christology Tertullian has had no Greek influence, and is purely Roman. Like most Latin Fathers he speaks not of two Natures but of two Substances in one Person, united without confusion, and distinct in their operations. Thus he condemns by anticipation the Nestorian, Monophysite, and Monothelite heresies. But he seems to teach that Mary, the Mother of Christ, had other children. Yet he makes her the second Eve, who by her obedience effaced the disobedience of the first Eve. Taken from The Catholic Encyclopedia.

Everything from the Papal writhers has to be taken with a grain of salt. In the past they have been well known to teach and state many falsehoods. Whey they try to make it appear that Tertullian held to the essentials of the Roman Catholic Trinity, this is another falsehood. Let me add further from the *Writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers*.

Taken from Volume 3, in a summation of Tertullian's Trinity views:

ELUCIDATIONS

I

(SUNDRY DOCTRINAL STATEMENTS OF TERTULLIAN.)

I am glad for many reasons that Dr. Holmes appends the following from Bishop Kaye's Account of the Writings of Tertullian: "On the doctrine of the blessed Trinity, in order to explain his meaning Tertullian borrows illustrations from natural objects. The three Persons of the Trinity stand to each other in the relation of the root, the shrub, and the fruit; of the fountain, the river, and the cut from the river; of the sun, the ray, and the terminating point of the ray. For these illustrations he professes himself indebted to the Revelations of the Paraclete. In later times, divines have occasionally resorted to similar illustrations for the purpose of familiarizing the doctrine of the Trinity to the mind; nor can any danger arise from the proceeding, so long as we recollect that they are illustrations, not arguments — that we must not draw conclusions from them, or think that whatever may be truly predicated of the illustrations, may be predicated with equal truth of that which it was designed to illustrate."

"Notwithstanding, however, the intimate union which subsists between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, we must be careful," says Tertullian, "to distinguish between their Persons." In his representations of this distinction he sometimes uses expressions which in after times, when controversy had introduced greater precision of language, were studiously avoided by the orthodox. Thus he calls the Father the whole substance — the Son a derivation from or portion of the whole." (p.1143)

"After showing that Tertullian's opinions were generally coincident with the orthodox belief of the Christian Church on the great subject of the Trinity in Unity, Bp. Kaye goes on to say: 'We are far from meaning to assert that expressions may not occasionally be found which are capable of a different interpretation, and which were carefully avoided by the orthodox writers of later times, when the controversies respecting the Trinity had introduced greater precision of language. Pamelius thought it necessary to put the reader on his guard against certain of these expressions; and Semler has noticed, with a sort of ill-natured industry (we call it *ill-natured industry*, because the true mode of ascertaining a writer's opinions is, not to fix upon particular expressions, but to take the general tenor of his language), every passage in the Tract against Praxeas in which there is any appearance of contradiction, or which will bear a construction favorable to the Arian tenets. Bp. Bull also, who conceives the language of Tertullian to be explicit and correct on the subject of the pre-existence and the consubstantiality, admits that he occasionally uses expressions at variance with the co-eternity of Christ. For instance, in the Tract against Hermogenes, we find a passage in which it is expressly asserted that there was a time when the Son was not. Perhaps, however, a reference to the peculiar tenets of Hermogenes will enable us to account for this assertion. That heretic affirmed that matter was eternal, and argued thus: 'God was always God, and always Lord; but the word Lord implies the existence of something over which He was Lord. Unless, therefore, we suppose the eternity of something distinct from God, it is not true that He was always Lord.' Tertullian boldly answered, that God was not always Lord; and that in Scripture we do not find Him called Lord until the work of creation was completed. In like manner, he contended that the titles of *Judge* and *Father* imply the existence of *sin*, and of a *Son*. As, therefore, there was a time when neither sin nor the Son existed, the titles of Judge and Father were not at that time applicable to God. Tertullian could scarcely mean to affirm (in direct opposition to his own statements in the Tract against Praxeas) that there was ever a time when the *logos*, or *Ratio*, or *Sermo Internus* did not exist. But with respect to *Wisdom* and *the Son* (*Sophia*

and *Filius*) the case is different. Tertullian assigns to both a beginning of existence: Sophia was created or formed in order to devise the plan of the universe; and the Son was begotten in order to carry that plan into effect. Bp. Bull appears to have given an accurate representation of the matter, (p.1144) when he says that, according to our author, the Reason and Spirit of God, being the substance of the Word and Son, were co-eternal with God; but that the *titles* of Word and Son were not strictly applicable until the former had been emitted to arrange, and the latter begotten to execute, the work of reation. Without, therefore, attempting to explain, much less to defend, all ertullian’s expressions and reasonings, we are disposed to acquiesce in he statement given by Bp. Bull of his opinions (*Defense of the Nicene Creed*, sec. 3. ch. 10. (p. 545 of the Oxford translation): ‘From all this it is lear how rashly, as usual, Petavius has pronounced that, “*so far as relates to the eternity of the Word, it is manifest that Tertullian did not by any means acknowledge it.*”’ To myself, indeed, and as I suppose to my reader also, after the many clear testimonies which I have adduced, the very opposite is manifest, unless indeed Petavius played on the term, *the Word*, which I will not suppose. For Tertullian does indeed teach that the Son of God was made and was called the Word (*Verbum* or *Sermo*) from some definite beginning, *i.e.* at the time when He went out from God the Father with the voice, ‘Let there be light’ in order to arrange the universe. But, for all that, that he really believed that the very hypostasis which is called the Word and Son of God is eternal, I have, I think, abundantly demonstrated.” (The whole of Bp. Bull’s remark is worth considering; it occurs in the translation just referred to.) “In speaking also of the Holy Ghost, Tertullian occasionally uses terms of a very ambiguous and equivocal character. He says, for instance (*Adversus Praxean*, chap. 12.), that in Genesis 1:26, God addressed the Son, His Word (the Second Person in the Trinity), and *the Spirit in the Word* (the Third Person of the Trinity). Here the distinct personality of the Spirit is expressly asserted; although it is difficult to reconcile Tertullian’s words, ‘*Spiritus in Sermone*,’ with the assertion. It is, however, certain both from the general tenor of the Tract against Praxeas, and from many passages in his other writings (for instance, *Ad Martyres*, 3.), that the distinct personality of the Holy Ghost formed an article of Tertullian’s creed. The occasional ambiguity of his language respecting the Holy Ghost is perhaps in part to be traced to the variety of senses in which the term ‘*Spiritus*’ is used. It is applied generally to God, for ‘God is a Spirit’ (*Adv. Marcionem*, 2. 9); and for the same reason to the Son, who is frequently called ‘the Spirit of God,’ and ‘the Spirit of the Creator’ (*De Oratione*, 1.; (p.1145) *Adv. Praxean*, 14., 26.; *Adv. Marcionem*, 5. 8; *Apolog.* 23.; *Adv. Marcionem*, 3. 6, 4. 33). Bp. Bull likewise (*Defense of the Nicene Creed*, 1. 2), following Grotius, has shown that the word ‘*Spiritus*’ is employed by the fathers to express the divine nature in Christ.” — (Pp. 525, 526.)

Here is a definition of Arniamism

ARIANISM

A heresy which arose in the fourth century, and denied the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

DOCTRINE

First among the doctrinal disputes which troubled Christians after Constantine had recognized the Church in A.D. 313, and the parent of many more during some three centuries, Arianism occupies a large place in ecclesiastical history. It is not a modern form of unbelief, and therefore will appear strange in modern eyes. But we shall better grasp its meaning if we term it an Eastern attempt to rationalize the creed by stripping it of mystery so far as the relation of Christ to God was concerned. In the New Testament and in Church teaching Jesus of Nazareth appears as the Son of God. This name He took to Himself (Matthew 11:27; John

10:36), while the Fourth Gospel declares Him to be the Word (Logos), Who in the beginning was with God and was God, by Whom all things were made. A similar doctrine is laid down by St. Paul, in his undoubtedly genuine Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians. It is reiterated in the Letters of Ignatius, and accounts for Pliny's observation that Christians in their assemblies chanted a hymn to Christ as God. But the question how the Son was related to the Father (Himself acknowledged on all hands to be the one Supreme Deity), gave rise, between the years A.D. 60 and 200, to a number of Theosophic systems, called generally Gnosticism, and having for their authors Basilides, Valentinus, Tatian, and other Greek speculators. Though all of these visited Rome, they had no following in the West, which remained free from controversies of an abstract nature, and was faithful to the creed of its baptism. Intellectual centres were chiefly Alexandria and Antioch, Egyptian or Syrian, and speculation was carried on in Greek. The Roman Church held steadfastly by tradition. Under these circumstances, when Gnostic schools had passed away with their "conjugations" of Divine powers, and "emanations" from the Supreme unknowable God (the "Deep" and the "Silence") all speculation was thrown into the form of an inquiry touching the "likeness" of the Son to His Father and "sameness" of His Essence. Catholics had always maintained that Christ was truly the Son, and truly God. They worshipped Him with divine honours; they would never consent to separate Him, in idea or reality, from the Father, Whose Word, Reason, Mind, He was, and in Whose Heart He abode from eternity. But the technical terms of doctrine were not fully defined; and even in Greek words like essence (ousia), substance (hypostasis), nature (physis), person (hyposopon) bore a variety of meanings drawn from the pre-Christian sects of philosophers, which could not but entail misunderstandings until they were cleared up. The adaptation of a vocabulary employed by Plato and Aristotle to Christian truth was a matter of time; it could not be done in a day; and when accomplished for the Greek it had to be undertaken for the Latin, which did not lend itself readily to necessary yet subtle distinctions. That disputes should spring up even among the orthodox who all held one faith, was inevitable. And of these wranglings the rationalist would take advantage in order to substitute for the ancient creed his own inventions. The drift of all he advanced was this: to deny that in any true sense God could have a Son; as Mohammed tersely said afterwards, "God neither begets, nor is He begotten" (Koran, 112). We have learned to call that denial Unitarianism. It was the ultimate scope of Arian opposition to what Christians had always believed. But the Arian, though he did not come straight down from the Gnostic, pursued a line of argument and taught a view which the speculations of the Gnostic had made familiar. He described the Son as a second, or inferior God, standing midway between the First Cause and creatures; as Himself made out of nothing, yet as making all things else; as existing before the worlds of the ages; and as arrayed in all divine perfections except the one which was their stay and foundation. God alone was without beginning, unoriginate; the Son was originated, and once had not existed. For all that has origin must begin to be.

Such is the genuine doctrine of Arius. Using Greek terms, it denies that the Son is of one essence, nature, or substance with God; He is not consubstantial (homoousios) with the Father, and therefore not like Him, or equal in dignity, or co-eternal, or within the real sphere of Deity. The Logos which St. John exalts is an attribute, Reason, belonging to the Divine nature, not a person distinct from another, and therefore is a Son merely in figure of speech. These consequences follow upon the principle which Arius maintains in his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, that the Son "is no part of the Ingenerate." Hence the Arian sectaries who reasoned logically were styled Anomoeans: they said that the Son was "unlike" the Father. And they defined God as simply the Unoriginate. They are also termed the Exucontians (ex ouk onton), because they held the creation of the Son to be out of nothing.

But a view so unlike tradition found little favour; it required softening or palliation, even at the cost of logic; and the school which supplanted Arianism from an early date affirmed the likeness, either without adjunct, or in all things, or in substance, of the Son to the Father, while denying His co-equal dignity and co-eternal existence. These men of the Via Media were named Semi-Arians.

Semiarians and Semiarianism

A name frequently given to the conservative majority in the East in the fourth century as opposed to the strict Arians. More accurately it is reserved (as by St. Epiphanius, "Hær" lxxiii) for the party of reaction headed by Basil of Ancyra in 358. The greater number of the Eastern bishops, who agreed to the deposition of St. Athanasius at Tyre in 335 and received the Arians to communion at Jerusalem on their repentance, were not Arians, yet they were far from being all orthodox. The dedication Council of Antioch in 341 put forth a creed which was unexceptionable but for its omission of the Nicene "of One Substance". Even disciples of Anius, such as George, Bishop of Laodicea (335-47) and Eustathius of Sebaste (c. 356-80), joined the moderate party, and after the death of Eusebius of Nicomedia, the leaders of the count faction, Ursacius, Valens, and Germinius, were not tied to any formula, for Constantius himself hated Arianism, though he disliked Athanasius yet more. When Marcellus of Ancyra was deposed in 336, he was succeeded by Basil. Marcellus was reinstated by the Council of Sardica and the pope in 343, but Basil was restored in 350 by Constantius, over whom he gained considerable influence. He was the leader of a council at Sirmium in 351 held against Photinus who had been a deacon at Ancyra, and the canons of this synod begin by condemning Arianism though they do not quite come up to the Nicene standard. Basil had afterwards a disputation with the Arian Aëtius. After the defeat of Magnentius at Mursa in 351, Valens, bishop of that city, became the spiritual director of Constantius. In 355 Valens and Ursacius obtained the exile of the Western confessors Eusebius, Lucifer, Liberius, and that of Hilary followed. In 357 they issued the second Creed of Sirmium, or "formula of Hosius", in which homoousios and homoiousios were both rejected. Eudoxius, a violent Arian, seized the See of Antioch, and supported Aëtius and his disciple Eunomius.

In the Lent of 358 Basil with many bishops was holding the dedicatory feast of a new church he had built at Ancyra, when he received a letter from George of Laodicea relating how Eudoxius had approved of Aëtius, and begging Macedonius of Constantinople, Basil, and the rest of the assembled bishops to decree the expulsion of Eudoxius and his followers from Antioch, else that great see were lost. In consequence the Synod of Ancyra published a long reply addressed to George and the other bishops of Phoenicia, in which they recite the Creed of Antioch (341), adding explanations against the "unlikeness" of the Son to the Father taught by the Arians (Anomoeans, from anomoiōs), and showing that the very name of father implies a son of like substance (homoiousios, or homoios kat ousian) Anathematisms are appended in which Anomoeanism is explicitly condemned and the teaching of "likeness of substance" enforced. The nineteenth of these canons forbids the use also of homoousios and tautoousios; this may be an afterthought due to the instance of Macedonius, as Basil does not seem to have insisted on it later. Legates were dispatched to the Count at Sirmium—Basil, Eustathius of Sebaste, an ascetic of no dogmatic principles, Eleusius of Cyzicus, a follower of Macedonius, and Leontius, a priest who was one of the emperor's chaplains. They arrived just in time, for the emperor had been lending his ear to an Eudoxian; but he now veered round, and issued a letter (Sozomen, IV, xiv) declaring the Son to be "like in substance" to the Father, and condemning the Arians of Antioch.

According to Sozomen it was at this point that Libenius was released from exile on his signing three formulæ combined by Basil; against this story see LIBERIUS, POPE. Basil persuaded

*Constantius to summon a general council, Ancyra being proposed then Nicomedia; but the latter city was destroyed by an earthquake; Basil, therefore, was again at Sirmium in 359 where the Arianizers had meanwhile regained their footing With Germinius of Sirmium, George of Alexandria, Ursacius and Valens, and Marcus of Arethusa, he held a conference which lasted until night. A confession of faith, ridiculed under the name of the "dated creed", was drawn up by Marcus on 22 May (Hilary, "Fragment. xv"). Arianism was of course rejected, but the *homoios kata ten ousian* was not admitted, and the expression *kata panta homoios*, "like in all things", was substituted. Basil was disappointed, and added to his signature the explanation that the words "in all things" mean not only in will, but in existence and being (*kata ten hyparxin kai kata to einai*). Not content with this, Basil, George of Laodicea, and others published a joint explanation (Epiph., lxxiii, 12-22) that "in all things" must include "substance";*

*The court party arranged that two councils should be held, at Rimini and Seleucia respectively. At Seleucia (359) the Semiarians were in a majority, being supported by such men as St. Cyril of Jerusalem, his friend Silvanus of Tarsus, and even St. Hilary, but they were unable to obtain their ends. Basil, Silvanus, and Eleusius, therefore, went as envoys to Constantinople, where a council was held (360) which followed Rimini in condemning *homoiousios* together with *homoousios*, and allowed *homoios* alone, without addition. This new phrase was the invention of Acacius of Cæsarea, who now deserted the extremers Arians and became leader of the new "Homoean" party. He procured the exile of Macedonius, Eleusius, Basil, Eustathius, Silvanus, Cyril, and others.*

*Constantius died at the end of 361. Under Julian the exiles returned. Basil was probably dead. Macedonius organized a party which confessed the Son to be *kata panta homoios*, while it declared the Holy Ghost to be the minister and servant of the Father and a creature. Eleusius joined him, and so did Eustathius for a time. This remnant of the Semiarian party held synods at Zele and elsewhere. The accession of Jovian, who was orthodox, induced the versatile Acacius, with Meletius of Antioch and twenty-five bishops, to accept the Nicene formula, adding an explanation that the Nicene Fathers meant by *homoousios* merely *homoios kat ousian*. Thus Acacius had taken up the original formula of the Semiarians. In 365 the Macedonians assembled at Lampsacus under the presidency of Eleusius, and condemned the Councils of Ariminum and Antioch (360), asserting again the likeness in substance. But the threats of the Arian emperor Valens caused Eleusius to sign an Arian creed at Nicomedia in 366. He returned to his diocese full of remorse, and begged for the election of another bishop; but his diocesans refused to let him resign. The West was at peace under Valentinian, so the Semiarians sent envoys to that emperor and to the pope to get help. Liberius refused to see them until they presented him with a confession of faith which included the Nicene formula. He seems to have been unaware that the party now rejected the Divinity of the Holy Ghost; but this was perhaps not true of the envoys Eustathius and Silvanus. On the return of the legates, the documents they brought were received with great joy by a synod at Tyana, which embraced the Nicene faith. But another synod in Caria still refused the *homoousion*. For the rest of the history of the sect, who are now to be called Macedonians, see PNEUMATOMACHI.*

Arius

An heresiarch, born about A.D. 250; died 336. He is said to have been a Libyan by descent. His father's name is given as Ammonius. In 306, Arius, who had learnt his religious views from Lucian, the presbyter of Antioch, and afterwards the martyr, took sides with Meletius, an Egyptian schismatic, against Peter, Bishop of Alexandria. But a reconciliation followed, and Peter ordained Arius deacon. Further disputes led the Bishop to excommunicate his restless churchman, who, however, gained the friendship of Achillas, Peter's successor, was made

presbyter by him in 313, and had the charge of a well-known district in Alexandria called Baucalis. This entitled Arius to expound the Scriptures officially, and he exercised much influence when, in 318, his quarrel with Bishop Alexander broke out over the fundamental truth of Our Lord's divine Sonship and substance. (See ARIANISM.) While many Syrian prelates followed the innovator, he was condemned at Alexandria in 321 by his diocesan in a synod of nearly one hundred Egyptian and Libyan bishops. Deprived and excommunicated, the heresiarch fled to Palestine. He addressed a thoroughly unsound statement of principles to Eusebius of Nicomedia, who yet became his lifelong champion and who had won the esteem of Constantine by his worldly accomplishments. In his house the proscribed man, always a ready writer, composed in verse and prose a defence of his position which he termed "Thalia". A few fragments of it survive. He is also said to have published songs for sailors, millers, and travellers, in which his creed was illustrated. Tall above the common, thin, ascetical, and severe, he has been depicted in lively colours by Epiphanius (*Heresies*, 69, 3); but his moral character was never impeached except doubtfully of ambition by Theodoret. He must have been of great age when, after fruitless negotiations and a visit to Egypt, he appeared in 325 at Nicæa, where the confession of faith which he presented was torn in pieces. With his writings and followers he underwent the anathemas subscribed by more than 300 bishops. He was banished into Illyricum. Two prelates shared his fate, Theonas of Marmarica and Secundus of Ptolemais. His books were burnt. The Arians, joined by their old Meletian friends, created troubles in Alexandria. Eusebius persuaded Constantine to recall the exile by indulgent letters in 328; and the emperor not only permitted his return to Alexandria in 331, but ordered Athanasius to reconcile him with the Church. On the saint's refusal more disturbance ensued. The packed and partisan Synod of Tyre deposed Athanasius on a series of futile charges in 335. Catholics were now persecuted; Arius had an interview with Constantine and submitted a creed which the emperor judged to be orthodox. By imperial rescript Arius required Alexander of Constantinople to give him Communion; but the stroke of Providence defeated an attempt which Catholics looked upon as sacrilege. The heresiarch died suddenly, and was buried by his own people. He had winning manners, an evasive style, and a disputatious temper. But in the controversy which is called after his name, Arius counted only at the beginning. He did not represent the tradition of Alexandria but the topical subtleties of Antioch. Hence, his disappearance from the scene neither stayed the combatants nor ended the quarrel which he had rashly provoked. A party-theologian, he exhibited no features of genius; and he was the product, not the founder, of a school.

Taken from *The Catholic Encyclopedia*.

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS & RESEARCH MINISTRY www.carm.org

Arianism

Arianism developed around 320, in Alexandria Egypt concerning the person of Christ and is named after Arius of Alexandar. For his doctrinal teaching he was exiled to Illyria in 325 after the first ecumenical council at Nicaea condemned his teaching as heresy. It was the greatest of heresies within the early church that developed a significant following. Some say, it almost took over the church.

Arius taught that only God the Father was eternal and too pure and infinite to appear on the earth. Therefore, God produced Christ the Son out of nothing as the first and greatest creation. The Son is then the one who created the universe. Because the Son relationship of the Son to the Father is not one of nature, it is, therefore, adoptive. God adopted Christ as the Son. Though Christ was a creation, because of his great position and authority, he was to be worshipped and even looked upon as God. Some Arians even held that the Holy Spirit was the first and greatest creation of the Son

At Jesus' incarnation, the Arians asserted that the divine quality of the Son, the Logos, took the place of the human and spiritual aspect of Jesus, thereby denying the full and complete incarnation of God the Son, second person of the Trinity.

In asserting that Christ the Son, as a created thing, was to be worshipped, the Arians were advocating idolatry.

Arianism

Arianism is an heretical error regarding the Trinity, denying the deity of Christ. This doctrine had its roots in Tertullian, who made the Son subordinate to the Father. Origen took this further by teaching that the Son was subordinate to the Father "in respect to essence." The result was ultimately Arianism which denied the deity of Christ. Arius taught that only God was the uncreated One; because Christ was begotten of the Father it meant Christ was created by the Father. Arius believed there was a time when Christ did not exist. Arius and his teaching was condemned at the Council of Nicea in A.D. 325.36.

What God is like, Bible.org, citing Paul Enns, *The Moody Handbook of Theology*, Moody Press, Chicago, IL, 1989, p. 199.

Arianism

A Christian heresy first proposed early in the 4th century by the Alexandrian presbyter Arius. It affirmed that Christ is not truly divine but a created being. Arius' basic premise was the uniqueness of God, who is alone self-existent and immutable; the Son, who is not self-existent, cannot be God. Because the Godhead is unique, it cannot be shared or communicated, so the Son cannot be God. Because the Godhead is immutable, the Son, who is mutable, being represented in the Gospels as subject to growth and change, cannot be God. The Son must, therefore, be deemed a creature who has been called into existence out of nothing and has had a beginning. Moreover, the Son can have no direct knowledge of the Father since the Son is finite and of a different order of existence.

Arianism, Encyclopedia Britannica

Jehovah's Witnesses teach arianism

Trinity The true nature of God from: An Apologetics Index research resource

Arianism, and Arius (4th century CE)

Arianism was a Christian heresy first proposed early in the 4th century by the Alexandrian presbyter Arius. It affirmed that Christ is not truly divine but a created being. The fundamental premise of Arius was the uniqueness of God, who is alone self-existent and immutable. The Son, who is not self-existent, cannot be God.

*An ascetical, moral leader of a Christian community in the area of Alexandria, Arius attracted a large following through a message integrating Neoplatonism, which accented the absolute oneness of the divinity as the highest perfection, with a literal, rationalist approach to the New Testament texts. Christ was viewed as the most perfect creature in the material world, whose moral integrity led him to be "adopted" by God as a son but who nevertheless remained a secondary deity, or Logos substantially unlike the eternal, uncreated Father and subordinate to his will. Because the Godhead is unique, it cannot be shared or communicated so that the Son cannot be God. Because the Godhead is immutable, the Son, who is mutable (being represented in the Gospels as subject to growth and change) cannot be God. The Son must, therefore, be deemed a creature who has been called into existence out of nothing and has had a beginning. Moreover, the Son can have no direct knowledge of the Father since the Son is finite and of a different order of existence. This thesis was publicized ~323 through the poetic verse of his major work, *Thalia (Banquet)*, and was widely spread by the tactic of popular songs written for laborers and travelers.*

According to its opponents, especially Athanasius, Arius' teaching reduced the Son to a demigod, reintroduced polytheism (since the worship of the Son was not abandoned), and undermined the Christian concept of redemption since only Christ who was truly God could redeem the world. From the outset, the controversy between both parties took place upon the common basis of the Neoplatonic concept of ousia ("substance" or "stuff"), which was foreign to the New Testament itself.

Following and exchange of condemnations (323-324) between the Arians and various gatherings of clergy in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria, Constantine, eager for unity and peace, sent emissaries to mediate the conflict. This effort failed, and he summoned the Council of Nicaea (the First Ecumenical Council) in May 325, to settle what he termed "a fight over trifling and foolish verbal differences". The bishops issued a creed to safeguard orthodox Christian belief. This creed states that the Son is homoousion to Patri (of one substance with the Father), thus declaring him to be all that the Father is: he is completely divine. When Arius refused to sign the creed, the bishops declared him a heretic and exiled him and the Arian leaders. This seemed to end the controversy, but it was only the beginning of a long-protracted dispute.

Although the Arian leaders were exiled, they tried by intrigue to return to their churches and sees and to banish their enemies. They were partly successful. Influential support from colleagues in Asia Minor and from Constantia, the Emperor's daughter, succeeded in effecting Arius' return from exile and his readmission into the church after consenting to a compromise formula, despite the opposition from Athanasius. Shortly before he was to be reconciled, however, Arius collapsed and died while walking through the streets of Constantinople in 336.

When Constantine died in 337, Constans became emperor in the West and Constantius II became emperor in the East. The former was sympathetic to the orthodox Christians and the latter to the Arians. At a council held at Antioch (341), an affirmation of faith that omitted the homoousion clause was issued. Another council was held at Sardica in 342, but little was achieved by either council.

In 350 Constantius II became sole ruler of the empire, and under his leadership the Nicene party (orthodox Christians) was largely crushed. The extreme Arians then declared that the Son was anomoios (unlike) the Father. These Anomoeans succeeded in having their views endorsed at Sirmium in 357, but their extremism stimulated the moderates, who asserted that the Son was homoiousios (of similar substance) with the Father, and conservatives, who asserted that the Son was homoios (like) the Father. Constantius at first supported the Homoiousians but soon transferred his support to the Homoians, led by Acacius. Their views were approved in 360 at Constantinople, where all previous creeds were rejected, the term ousia ("substance" or "stuff") was repudiated, and a statement of faith was issued stating that the Son was "like the Father who begot him".

After Constantius' death in 361, the orthodox Christian majority in the West consolidated its position. The Arian persecution conducted by Emperor Valens (364-378) in the East and the success of the teaching of Basil the Great of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzus led the Homoiousian majority in the East to realize its fundamental agreement with the Nicene party. When the emperors Gratian (367-383) and Theodosius I (379-395) took up the defense of orthodoxy, Arianism collapsed. In 381 the Second Ecumenical Council met at Constantinople. Arianism was proscribed and the Nicene Creed was approved.

Although this ended the heresy in the empire, Arianism continued among some of the Germanic tribes to the end of the 7th century. In modern times some Unitarians are virtually Arians in that they are unwilling either to reduce Christ to a mere human being or to attribute to him a divine nature identical with that of the Father. The Christology of the Jehovah's Witnesses is also a form of Arianism; they regard Arius as a forerunner of Charles Taze Russell, the founder of their movement. The above was taken from the Encyclopædia Britannica.

Taken from the site: **The Development of the Canon of the New Testament.**

Arianism

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Arianism is a heresy of early Christianity involving the nature of Jesus Christ. Arians denied that Jesus Christ and God the Father were one, seeing them as different Divine entities. The conflict between Arianism and traditional trinitarianism was the first important doctrinal difficulty in the Church after the legalization of Christianity took place under Emperor Constantine I, and ended with Arianism being declared a heresy by the first Council of Nicaea. At a point in the conflict, the majority of Christianity followed the Arianistic belief system.

Arius was a Christian priest in Alexandria, Egypt. In A.D. 321 he was condemned by a synod at Alexandria for teaching a heterodox view of the relationship of Jesus Christ to God the Father. Arius himself died without repudiating his doctrine. Arius and his followers agreed that Jesus was the son of God, but denied that they were one substance (Greek: homo-ousios). Instead, they viewed God and the Son as having distinct but similar substances (Greek: homoi-ousios). The difference in Greek was literally one iota or "letter i" of difference. Jesus is, for Arianism, inferior or subordinate to God the Father. The specific summary statement that was rejected by the councils, is that "there was a time when Jesus Christ was not"; the rejected statement meant that Jesus was a created being, rather than being coeternal with the Father and the Holy Spirit. At issue was the doctrine of the Trinity.

Because Arius and his followers had great influence in the schools of Alexandria - predecessors of modern universities or seminaries - their theological views spread, especially in the eastern Mediterranean. By 325 the controversy had become significant enough that Emperor Constantine I called an assembly of bishops, the first Ecumenical council at Nicaea, (modern Iznik, Turkey) (the First Council of Nicaea). The arguments that prevailed at Nicaea were formulated in the Nicene Creed, which is still recited in Catholic, Orthodox, and some Protestant services. Emperor Constantine ordered Arius exiled and the Arian books to be burned.

Despite the decision of the Council of Nicaea, Arianism not only survived but flourished for some time. The patronage of members of the imperial family allowed Arian bishops to rule in many centers. Having never converted any sizeable group of the laity, Arianism had died out inside the Empire by the 380s; it was debated and rejected again by the Second Ecumenical Council in Constantinople in 381.

However, during the time of Arianism's flowering in Constantinople a missionary named Ulfilas was sent out to the Gothic barbarians across the Danube River. His initial success in converting this Germanic people to an Arian form of Christianity was strengthened by later events. When the Germanic peoples entered the Roman Empire and founded successor-kingdoms, many of them used their Arian religion to differentiate their people from the local inhabitants and maintain their group identity against the Catholic population. See: Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Vandals, Burgundians, Lombards. By the 8th century assimilation had ended any surviving Arian churches. Only the Franks among the Germanic peoples entered the empire as pagans and converted to Catholic Christianity directly.

The modern Jehovah's Witnesses and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints have beliefs similar, but different from those of Arius. Jesus is seen as subordinate to God the Father (e.g., he acts on his Father's wishes), but the primary teaching is that as they are both perfect and free from sin, there is no possibility of a disagreement between them.

See also Christology

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Christology is that part of Christian theology that studies and defines who Jesus Christ is. It is generally less concerned with the minor details of his life; rather it deals with who he was, and the major events of his life (his birth, death, and resurrection).

Important issues in Christology include:

- *was Jesus human, divine, or both*
- *whether he actually performed miracles*
- *whether he rose from the dead, and if so, whether his resurrection was of the body or strictly of the soul*

Christology may also cover questions concerning the Trinity, and what if anything Christ accomplished for the rest of humanity.

There are almost as many Christological views as there are variants of Christianity. The different Christological views of various Christian sects have led to accusations of heresy, and subsequent religious persecution.

Some Christological viewpoints

Some important controversies have included the controversy with Arians over his divinity and relationship with the Father, which led to the adoption of the Nicene creed; and the controversies over Nestorianism, Monophysitism (and its derivatives Monothelitism and Monoenergism), which lead to the adoption of the traditional (in both the East and West) Chalcedonian view of Christology. Other controversies included that with Docetists and the Adoptionists.

We can describe most of these views in terms of whether they believed Christ had a divine nature, human nature or both; and if both, in terms of how the two natures coexisted or interacted. All of these views will be presented in simplified form; see the related articles for more complete treatment.

- *The Chalcedonian view is that Christ possesses two natures, divine and human, which were united in the one person of Jesus Christ without either nature losing any of its properties. This view is the dogma of the Catholic and Eastern Orthodox churches, having been defined by the Council of Chalcedon.*
- *The Arian view is that Christ is not fully divine, but was created by God for the purpose of accomplishing our salvation.*
- *The Docetist view is that Christ was never fully human, but only appeared to be human.*
- *The Adoptionist view is that Christ was born a man only, but became God's son by adoption when he was baptized in the Jordan. (This is not an accurate statement of this faith. They held this as relating only to His Humanity. REP)*

Taken:

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

CONCLUSION TO ARIANISM

At first many like Eusebius, struggled to understand Arianism. After it became systematized, several, including Eusebius, rejected it. Arianism teaches that Jesus Christ is a created God. The *Nicene Creed* teaches that He is a Begotten God. If those who helped create the foundation for the Papal Church, had not formulated their opinions into making Christ into a Begotten God, perhaps the Arians would not have made Him into a Created God.

The Arian foundation for their view that Christ was a created God came from Proverbs 8. Here is this passage in the Ancient Greek Text of the Old Testament, the LXX:

- 20 I walk in ways of righteousness, and *am* conversant with the paths of judgement;
21 that I may divide substance to them that love me, and may fill their treasures with good things.
(8:21A) If I declare to you the things that daily happen, I will remember *also* to recount the things of old.
22 *The Lord made me the beginning of his ways for his works.*

- 23 *He established me {1} before time was in the beginning, before he made the earth: {1} Gr. before the age}*
 24 *even before he made the depths; before the fountains of water came forth:*
 25 *before the mountains were settled, and before all hills, he begets me.*
 26 *The Lord made countries and uninhabited tracks, and the highest inhabited parts of the world.*
 27 *When he prepared the heaven, I was present with him; and when he {1} prepared his throne upon the winds: {1} Or, marked out}*
 28 *and when he strengthened the clouds above; and when he secured the fountains of the earth:*
 29 *{1} and when he strengthened the foundations of the earth: {1} Alex. When he set to the sea its bound, and the waters shall not pass his (2) decree 2) Gr. mouth}*
 30 *I was by him, {1} suiting myself to him, I was that wherein he took delight; and daily I rejoiced in his presence continually. {1} Or, arranging all things}*
 31 *For he rejoiced when he had completed the world, and rejoiced among the children of men.*

In this celebrated passage, both the Arians and the growing Papists understood that the Father did something to produce Christ. The Arians said *Created* Christ. The growing Papists said *Begot* Christ. The semi-Arians did not understand create in the sense of bringing into being something or someone out of nothing, but, but rather of establishing someone or something. Eusebius explains his position on this passage in this manner:

Moreover, inasmuch as Arius has dared to say that the Son is a creature, as one of the others, observe what Eusebius says on this subject in his first book against Marcellus: “He alone, and no other, has been declared to be, and is the only-begotten Son of God; whence any one would justly censure those who have presumed to affirm that he is a Creature made of nothing, like the rest of the creatures; far how then would he be a Son? and how could he be God’s only-begotten, were he assigned the same nature as the other creatures, and were he one of the many created things, seeing that he, like them, would in that case be partaker of a creation from nothing? The sacred Scriptures do not thus instruct us concerning these things.’ He again adds a little afterwards: ‘Whoever then determines that the Son is made of things that are not, and that he is a creature produced from nothing pre-existing, forgets that while he concedes the name of Son, he denies him to be so in reality. Far he that is made of nothing cannot truly be the Son of God, any more than the other things which have been made: but the true Son of God, forasmuch as he is begotten of the Father, is properly denominated the only-begotten and beloved of the Father.

CHRIST IS THE OFFSPRING OF GOD

Far this reason also, he himself is God: for what can the offspring of God be but the perfect resemblance of him who begat him? A sovereign, indeed, builds a city, but does not beget it; and is said to beget a son, not to build one. An artificer may be called the framer, but not the father of his work; while he could by no means be styled the framer of him whom he had begotten. So also the God of the Universe is the father of the Son; but would be fitly termed the Framer and Maker of the world. And although it is once said in Scripture, The Lord created me the beginning of his ways on account of his works, yet it becomes us to consider the import of this phrase, which I shall hereafter explain; and not, as Marcellus has done, from a single passage to subvert one of the most important doctrines of the Church.’

“These and many other such expressions are found in the first book of Eusebius Pamphilus against Marcellus; and in his third book, declaring in what sense the term creature is to be taken, he says: ‘Accordingly these (119) things being established, it follows that in the same sense as that which preceded, these words also are to be understood, The Lord created me in the beginning of his ways on account of his works. For although he says that he was created, it

is not as if he should say that he had arrived at existence from what was not, nor that he himself also was made of nothing like the rest of the creatures, which some have erroneously supposed: but as subsisting, living, pre-existing, and being before the constitution of the whole world; and having been appointed to rule the universe by his Lord and Father: the word created being here used instead of ordained or constituted. Certainly the apostle expressly called the rulers and governors among men creature, when he said, Submit yourselves to every human creature for the Lord's sake; whether to the king as supreme, or to governors as those sent by him. The prophet also does not use the word eJktisen created in the sense of made of that which had no previous existence, when he says, Prepare, Israel, to invoke thy God. For behold he who confirms the thunder, creates the Spirit, and announces his Christ unto men. For God did not then create the Spirit when he declared his Christ to all men, since There is nothing new under the sun; but the Spirit was, and subsisted before: but he was sent at what time the apostles were gathered together, when like thunder, There came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind: and they were filled with the Holy Spirit. And thus they declared unto all men the Christ of God in accordance with that prophecy which says, Behold he who confirms the thunder, creates the spirit, and announces his Christ unto men: the word creates being used instead of sends down, or appoints; and thunder in a similar way implying the preaching of the Gospel. Again he that says, Create in me a clean heart, O God, said not this as if he had no heart; but prayed that his mind might be purified. Thus also it is said, That he might create the two into one new man, instead of unite. Consider also whether this passage is not of the same kind, Clothe yourselves with the new man, which is created according to God; and this, if, therefore, any one be in Christ, he is a new creature, and Whatever other expressions of a similar nature any one may find who shall carefully search the divinely-inspired Scripture. Wherefore one should not be surprised if in this passage, The Lord created me the beginning of his ways, the term created is used metaphorically, instead of appointed, or constituted.'. (P.120) "These quotations from the books of Eusebius against Marcellus have been adduced to confute those who have slanderously attempted to traduce and criminate him. Neither can they prove that Eusebius attributes a beginning of subsistence to the Son of God, although they may find him often using the expressions of dispensation: and especially so, because he was an emulator and admirer of the works of Origen, in which those who are able to comprehend that author's writings, will perceive it to be everywhere stated that the Son was begotten of the Father. These remarks have been made in passing, in order to refute those who have misrepresented Eusebius."

I have now declared the decree of God respecting the life which he prescribes to man, neither ignorantly, as many have done, nor resting on the ground of opinion or conjecture. But it may be that some will ask, (p. 833) Whence this title of Son? Whence this generation of which we speak, if God be indeed only One, and incapable of union with another? We are, however, to consider generation as of two kinds; one in the way of natural birth, which is known to all; the other, that which is the effect of an eternal cause, the mode of which is seen by the prescience of God, and by those among men whom he loves. For he who is wise will recognize the cause which regulates the harmony of creation. Since, then, nothing exists without a cause, of necessity the cause of existing substances preceded their existence.

Christ as the Cause of Preservation and the Father is the Cause of the Son

But since the world and all things that it contains exist, and are preserved, their preserver must have had a prior existence; so that Christ is the cause of preservation, and the preservation of things is an effect: even as the Father is the cause of the Son, and the Son the effect of that cause. Enough, then, has been said to prove his priority of existence.

CHAPTER 19
OF THE CREED SENT BY THE EASTERN BISHOPS
TO THOSE IN ITALY, CALLED THE LENGTHY CREED.

AFTER the lapse of about three years from the events above recorded, the Eastern bishops again assembled a Synod, and having composed another form of faith, they transmitted it to those in Italy by the hands of Eudoxius, at that time bishop of Germanicia, and Martyrius, and Macedonius, who was bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia. This expression of the Creed, being written in more lengthy form. contained many additions to those which had preceded it, and was set forth in these words: ‘We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the Creator and Maker of all things, of whom the whole family in heaven and upon earth is named; and in his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was begotten of the Father before all ages; God of God; Light of Light; through whom all things in the heavens and upon the earth, both visible and invisible, were made: who is the Word, and Wisdom, and Power, and Life, and true Light: who in the last days for our sake was made man, and was born of the holy virgin; who was crucified, and died, and was buried, and rose again from the dead on the third day, and ascended into heaven, and is seated at the right hand of the Father, and shall come at the consummation of the ages, to judge the (p.128) living and the dead, and to render to every one according to his works: whose kingdom being perpetual shall continue to infinite ages; for he sits at the right hand of the Father, not only in this age, but also in that which is to come. We believe also in the Holy Spirit, that is, in the Comforter, whom the Lord according to his promise sent to his apostles after his ascension into heaven, to teach them and bring all things to their remembrance, through whom also the souls of those who sincerely believe on him are sanctified. But those who assert that the Son was made of things not in being, or of another substance, and not of God, or that there was a time or age when he did not exist, the holy catholic Church accounts as aliens. The holy and catholic Church likewise anathematizes those also who say that there are three Gods, or that Christ is not God before all ages, or that he is neither Christ, nor the Son of God, or that the same person is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, or that the Son was not begotten, or that the Father begat not the Son by his own will or desire. Neither is it safe to affirm that the Son had his existence from things that were not, since this is nowhere declared concerning him in the divinely inspired Scriptures. Nor are we taught that he had his being from any other preexisting substance besides the Father, but that he was truly begotten of God alone; for the Divine word teaches that there is one unbegotten principle without beginning, the Father of Christ. But those who unauthorized by Scripture rashly assert that there was a time when he was not, ought not to preconceive any antecedent interval of time, but God only who without time begat him; for both times and ages were made through him. Yet it must not be thought that the Son is coinoriginate, or co-unbegotten with the Father: for there is properly no father of the coinoriginate or co-unbegotten. But we know that the Father alone being inoriginate and incomprehensible, has ineffably and incomprehensibly to all begotten, and that the Son was begotten before the ages, but is not unbegotten like the Father, but has a beginning, viz. the Father who begat him, for “the head of Christ is God.” Now although according to the Scriptures we acknowledge three things or persons, viz. that of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, we do not on that account make three Gods: since we know that that there is but one God perfect in himself, unbegotten, inoriginate, and invisible, the God and Father of the only-begotten, who alone has existence from himself, and alone affords existence abundantly to all other things. But neither while we assert that (p.129) there is one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten, do we therefore deny that Christ is God before the ages, as the followers of Paul of Samosata do, who affirm that after his incarnation he was by exaltation deified, in that he was by nature a mere man. We know indeed that he was subject to his God and Father:

nevertheless he was begotten of God, and is by nature true and perfect God, and was not afterwards made God out of man; but was for our sake made man out of God, and has never ceased to be God. (p. 129)

Since it has been long ages ago when this controversy took place, it will be difficult to determine what men like Paul of Samosata really believed. We only have the pre-Papal writers and their questionable understanding and dubious presentations to glean information from and conclude our evaluations of their theology.

However, if Paul and the others understood that at Christ's baptism the Holy Spirit came upon Christ's humanity, this is Biblical doctrine. If Paul and the other Adoptionists maintained that at Christ's exaltation He, in His humanity, returned back to the glory He had with the Father before the world was, this is also true and Biblical, see John 17. But if they meant that Christ was not Divine before His baptism nor His exaltation, even in His sacred Humanity, then they were heretics. Certainly He was divine before His incarnation, His baptism and His exaltation, even in His humanity because of the union of His deity with His humanity.

Here is a sample of some of the early Adoptionists teachings:

The conflict which these churches of God in the Taurus Mountains and adjacent countries maintained with their persecutors in Constantinople led to their laying more emphasis on some portions of Scripture than on others. The great professing Church had incorporated Paganism with its system by the gradual introduction of the worship of the Virgin Mary, and had brought the world into its ranks by its practice of infant baptism. (p. 54)

This caused the primitive churches to lay great stress on the Lord's perfect humanity at His birth, showing that Mary, though the Lord's mother, cannot properly be called the mother of God, and to emphasise the importance of the baptism of Jesus, when the Holy Spirit descended upon Him and the voice from heaven declared: "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased". In the many controversies as to the Divine and human nature of Christ, which after all efforts at explanation still remains a mystery, they used expressions which their adversaries construed as implying their disbelief in the Divinity of Christ before His baptism. They seem, rather, to have held that His Divine attributes were not in exercise from His birth to His baptism. They taught that it was at His baptism, when 30 years old, that our Lord Jesus Christ received authority, the high-priesthood, the kingdom; then He was chosen and won lordship; it was then that He became the Saviour of sinners, was filled with the Godhead, ordained king of beings in heaven and on earth and under the earth, even as He Himself said in Matthew 28.18, "All authority is given unto Me in heaven and on earth".

From *THE PILGRIM CHURCH* By: EDMUND HAMER BROADBENT; pages 54, 55.

The Semi-Arians, The Arians and the Nicenians

This is a brief summary of the attitudes expressed at that time. Eusebius and others like him, semi-Arians, maintained that the creation term in Proverbs 8 did not mean to being into being from nothing, but exalt or establish. The Arians said it mean to **bring into Being from Nothing**. The Pre-Papists said it meant to **generate**.

Defeating Arianism

First, the historic Arians, with the modern day Jehovah's Witnesses, deny the Deity of Jesus Christ. Most also deny a Trinity of Deity, affirming only One Divine Being, the Father. So what must be done to establish the Deity of Jesus Christ and maintain a Trinity of Deity? Here is a brief summation:

I. Show the passages in the Bible that teach the Deity of Jesus Christ.

A. From the Old Testament: In Isaiah 6, Jehovah is presented in the fullness of His Divine Being.

- 1 *In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. {his...: or, the skirts thereof}*
- 2 *Above it stood the seraphims: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly.*
- 3 *And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory. {one...: Heb. this cried to this} {the whole...: Heb. his glory is the fulness of the whole earth}*
- 4 *And the posts of the door moved at the voice of him that cried, and the house was filled with smoke. {door: Heb. thresholds}*
- 5 *Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the LORD of hosts. {undone: Heb. cut off}*
- 6 *Then flew one of the seraphims unto me, having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar: {having...: Heb. and in his hand a live coal}*
- 7 *And he laid it upon my mouth, and said, Lo, this hath touched thy lips; and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged. {laid...: Heb. caused it to touch}*
- 8 *Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I; send me. {Here...: Heb. behold me}*
- 9 *And he said, Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. {indeed, but understand: or, without ceasing, etc: Heb. in (hearing, etc}*
- 10 *Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed.*
- 11 *Then said I, Lord, how long? And he answered, Until the cities be wasted without inhabitant, and the houses without man, and the land be utterly desolate, {utterly...: Heb. desolate with desolation}*
- 12 *And the LORD have removed men far away, and there be a great forsaking in the midst of the land.*

Isaiah 53: MT.

- 1 *Who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the LORD revealed? {report: or, doctrine?: Heb. hearing?}*
- 2 *For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.*

- 3 *He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not. {we hid...: or, he hid as it were his face from us: Heb. as an hiding of faces from him, or, from us}*
- 4 *Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.*
- 5 *But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. {wounded: or, tormented} {stripes: Heb. bruise}*
- 6 *All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. {laid...: Heb. made the iniquity of us all to meet on him}*

Isaiah 53: LXX.

- 1 *O Lord, {1} who has believed our report? and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed? {1} Joh 12:38; Ro 10:16}*
- 2 *We brought a report as of a child before him; he is as a root in a thirsty land: he has no form nor comeliness; and we saw him, but he had no form nor beauty.*
- 3 *But his form was ignoble, and inferior to that of the children of men; he was a man in suffering, and acquainted with the bearing of sickness, for his face is turned from us: he was dishonoured, and not esteemed.*
- 4 *{1} He bears our sins, and is pained for us: yet we accounted him to be in trouble, and in suffering, and in affliction. {1} Mt 8:17}*
- 5 *But he was wounded on account of our sins, and was {1} bruised because of our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and by his {2} bruises we were healed. {1} Or, made sick 2) Gr. bruise; 1 Pe 2:24}*
- 6 *All we as sheep have gone astray; every one has gone astray in his way; and the Lord gave him up for our sins.*

b. This is quoted in the New Testament in John 12 and other places and applied to Jesus Christ:

- 5 *Then Jesus said unto them, Yet a little while is the light with you. Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you: for he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth.*
- 36 *While ye have light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light. These things spake Jesus, and departed, and did hide himself from them.*
- 37 *But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him:*
- 38 *That the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?*
- 39 *Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again,*
- 40 *He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them.*
- 41 *These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him.*
- 42 *Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue:*
- 43 *For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.*

B) From the New Testament, show the ways in which Jesus Christ is spoken of as God such as:

1) Matthew 1: Jesus is Emmanuel:

- 20 But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. {conceived: Gr. begotten}*
- 21 And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins. {JESUS: that is, Saviour, Heb}*
- 22 Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying,*
- 23 Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. {they...: or, his name shall be called}*
- 24 Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife:*
- 25 And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS.*

2) The Deity of the Eternal Word

John 1:

- 1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.
- 2 The same was in the beginning with God.
- 3 All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.
- 4 In him was life; and the life was the light of men.

I John 1:

- 1 That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life;
- 2 (For the life was manifested, and we have seen *it*, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;)
- 3 That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship *is* with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.
- 4 And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full.
- 5 This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.

These passages teach us the Deity and previous existence of Jesus Christ, the eternal Word, the Word of Life and the Light of God to this sinful world.

3) Thomas's Confession of Faith:

24 But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came.

- 25 *The other disciples therefore said unto him, We have seen the Lord. But he said unto them, Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe.*
- 26 *And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you.*
- 27 *Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing.*
- 28 *And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God.*
- 29 *Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.*
- 30 *And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book:*
- 31 *But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.*

3) Jesus Own Teachings:

- 25 *Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed not: the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me.*
- 26 *But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you.*
- 27 *My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me:*
- 28 *And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand.*
- 29 *My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.*
- 30 **I and my Father are one.**
- 31 *Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him.*
- 32 *Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me?*
- 33 **The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.**
- 34 *Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?*
- 35 *If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken;*
- 36 *Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?*
- 37 *If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not.*
- 38 *But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him.*
- 39 *Therefore they sought again to take him: but he escaped out of their hand,*
- 40 *And went away again beyond Jordan into the place where John at first baptized; and there he abode.*
- 41 *And many resorted unto him, and said, John did no miracle: but all things that John spake of this man were true.*
- 42 *And many believed on him there.*

PLEASE NOTE THIS

If Jesus was not Divine and One with His Father in the essential unity of the Divine Nature, then why did He allow this concept to go uncorrected? The Jews certainly

understood what He was saying and hated Him for such a doctrine. If Jesus is not Divine, even God, then why did He deceive the people?

Jesus also taught that He existed as the Great **I AM** before the time of Abraham:

- 44 Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. {of his own: or, from his own will or disposition}*
- 45 And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not.*
- 46 Which of you convinceth me of sin? And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me?*
- 47 He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God.*
- 48 Then answered the Jews, and said unto him, Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil?*
- 49 Jesus answered, I have not a devil; but I honour my Father, and ye do dishonour me.*
- 50 And I seek not mine own glory: there is one that seeketh and judgeth.*
- 51 Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death.*
- 52 Then said the Jews unto him, Now we know that thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead, and the prophets; and thou sayest, If a man keep my saying, he shall never taste of death.*
- 53 Art thou greater than our father Abraham, which is dead? and the prophets are dead: whom makest thou thyself?*
- 54 Jesus answered, If I honour myself, my honour is nothing: it is my Father that honoureth me; of whom ye say, that he is your God:*
- 55 Yet ye have not known him; but I know him: and if I should say, I know him not, I shall be a liar like unto you: but I know him, and keep his saying.*
- 56 Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad.*
- 57 Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?*
- 58 Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.*
- 59 Then took they up stones to cast at him: but Jesus hid himself, and went out of the temple, going through the midst of them, and so passed by.*

3) The Scriptures speak of Jesus Christ being called both Son and God in the same connection:

- 8 But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. {righteousness: Gr. rightness, or, straightness}*
- 9 Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.*
- 10 And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:*
- 11 They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment;*
- 12 And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.*

Psa. 44:

6 (44:6) {1} Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a sceptre of righteousness. {1} Heb 1:8-10}

7 (44:7) *Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity: therefore God, thy God, has anointed thee with the oil of gladness beyond thy fellows.*

In this passage both Christ and His God, His Father, are presented and both addressed as God.

Anti-Trinitarians and Other Arians often say:

that the Bible does not say that there is God the Father and God the Son. Therefore to refer to God the Father and God the Son is unscriptural. Is this correct? No, it is not. While these statements may not appear in that exact form, they do appear in nearly that form and justify our using God the Father and God the Son.

God the Father:

1 Corinthians 8:6: there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him. {in: or, for}

2 Corinthians 11:31 The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not.

Ephesians 1:3 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: {places: or, things}

Ephesians 4:6 One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

1 Peter 1:3 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, {abundant: Gr. much}.

Therefore, we are justified in using the expression, *God the Father*.

God the Son:

8 *But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. {righteousness: Gr. rightness, or, straightness}*

9 *Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.*

The expression “But unto the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God...” also justifies our saying God the Son.

What about the Holy Spirit? S. E. Pierce, in his work on The Holy Spirit states:

One and the same divine nature, life, perfection's, blessedness, glory, and immortality subsist in each, and in their utmost fullness, in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. This the scripture gives evidence of in the name Jehovah (which expresses the incommunicable nature of God) that occurs in the Old Testament 6,855 times, and is applied to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost: which proves the unity of essence. The Father is Jehovah (Isa. 42:5). The

Son is Jehovah (Isa. 43: 11). The Spirit is Jehovah (Isa. 11:2). The Godhead is the fountain of the divine persons. Their relation to each other is essential to it. Hence their unity in the essence is included in the name Jehovah, which is given to the Eternal Three: "Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of Hosts" (Isa. 6:3). The distinct personality of the Holy Ghost, with his existence, co-equality, co-eternity, and coessentiality with the Father and the Son in the incomprehensible Godhead, is a truth of eternal importance. It is an article of faith once delivered to the saints: to which all the scripture bears testimony. In it he is joined with the Father and the Son in all the works of nature, providence, and grace. The essential perfection's of deity are ascribed to him, and he is declared to be the object of worship equally with the Father and the Son in the form of baptism prescribed by Christ himself (Matt. 28:19). All which are full proofs of his distinct personality and co-equality with the Father and the Son. As I design to treat of the distinct personality, title, names, and perfection's of the essential Godhead of the Holy Ghost, I shall begin with his real personality. In the Bible, that book of books, the Holy Ghost is spoken of as a person towhom personal properties, acts, and perfection's are attributed: and divine perfection's are ascribed unto Him, as life, understanding, love, and will; which prove him to be a person. As such he is spoken of by Christ himself: "When he is come, he shall reprove the world of sin" (John 16:8).

He is said to search "all things, yea, the deep things of God" (I Cor. 2: 10); and to bestow his gifts "severally as he will" I Cor. 12: 11). These are personal acts, and plainly prove to him to be a divine person in the incomprehensible Godhead. Personal properties and actions are attributed unto him. He is said to speak; and his speeches are frequently recorded. The Spirit said unto Peter, "Arise therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them" (Acts 10:20). And "the Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them" (Acts 13:2). Such things and actions are attributed to him as can in no sense be attributed to the Father; and which could not be attributed to the Spirit if he were only the virtue or power of the Father, and not a real distinct person from him. Thus, for instance, the Holy Ghost is said to be sent from the Father in the name of Christ. And he is said to make intercession for the saints. None of which can be said of God the Father.

We have him speaking to the Father and the Son as personally distinct from them, yet co-essential with them, saying, "Whom shall I send and who will go for us? (Isa. 6:8). Our Lord Jesus Christ speaks of him as a person: "When the comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me" (John 15:26). In which words we have an account of the essential and distinct personality of the Holy Ghost. He proceeds from the Father and the Son by an incomprehensible and eternal procession; so that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are relatively distinct, and yet really united in the divine essence, one eternal and incomprehensible God; and in these words of our Lord the procession of the Holy Ghost, according to the economy of the divine persons in their everlasting covenant-contract, is also implied, contained, and expressed.

His title, by which he is very eminently distinguished in the Old and New Testament, is that of the Spirit of holiness, or Holy Spirit: which he is essentially, as the Spirit of the living God. And he is also so denominated on account of his work and office in the souls of the elect.

His names throughout the Old Testament are the Spirit Of God, the Spirit of the Lord (2 Sam. 23:2), the Spirit of the Almighty (job 33:4), the breath of Jehovah's mouth (Psalm 33:6), the Spirit of the Lord God (Isa. 61: 1), the most high God (Psalm 78:56), the Lord God (Psalm 68:18), the Spirit of grace and supplications (Zech. 12: 10), Holy Spirit (Isa. 63: 10). And in

the New Testament, he is styled the power of the highest (Luke 1:35), the Spirit of God (Matt. 3:16), the Spirit of the Father (John 15:26), the Spirit of his Son (Gal. 4:6), the Spirit of Christ (Rom. 8:9), Lord and God (I Cor. 12: 5, 6), the Spirit of the living God (2 Cor. 3:3), and the Spirit of glory (I Peter 4:14). And various other names are given him descriptive of his work and office in the economy of grace. Divine attributes and the essential perfection's of Godhead are ascribed unto him personally: as eternity (Heb. 9:14), immensity, omnipresence, omniscience (Psalm 139:1-16), and omnipotence (Isa. 40:12). Immutability, and necessary and self-existence are included in the incommunicable nature of the Godhead, which is given him (Jer. 31:33). This is applied by the apostle to, the Holy Ghost (Heb. 10: 15, 16). All these perfection's, eternity, immensity, omnipresence, omnipotence, omniscience, immutability, necessary and self existence are essential to Godhead. And the whole fullness of the divine nature, in all these boundless and immense perfection's, dwells invariably in the person of the Holy Ghost. The works of creation, providence, and grace, are attributed to him also, as personally considered. His concern in creation is asserted by Moses in the book of Genesis (Chap. 1: 2). The Psalmist says, "By the word of the Lord were the Heavens made: and all the host of them by the breath, or spirit, of his mouth (Psalm 33:6). job says, "By his spirit he hath garnished the Heavens; his hand hath formed the crooked serpent" (job 26:13). Elihu says, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath, or Spirit, of the Almighty hath given me life" (job 33:4). The concern of the eternal Spirit in the government of the world, which must include the whole process of Providence, is set forth by the prophet thus:

Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counselor hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and shewed unto him the way of understanding? Behold the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance: behold he taketh up the isles as a very little thing. And Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt-offering. All nations before him are as nothing, and they are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity (Isa. 40:13-17).

I proceed to give some scriptural proofs of the personal existence of the Holy Ghost in the Godhead, and of his being co-equal and co-eternal with the Father and the Son, the incomprehensible Jehovah.

The first scriptural proof, on which all others are naturally, necessarily, and absolutely founded, is in the first chapter of Genesis, which begins thus:

In the beginning God created the Heavens and the earth, and the earth was without form, and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep: and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light, and there was light.

The original word rendered by our translators God is universally allowed by the learned, both Jews and Christians, to be a plural one. It is in the Hebrew Elohim: and it is used in the plural form on purpose to point out the personalities in God. In the scripture quoted there are plain evidences of the Trinity. Here is God, the Spirit of God, and God said, equally united, and engaged in creating and forming all things and in producing them all out of nothing. The Psalmist comments on it saying, "By the word of the Lord were the Heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth" (Psalm 33:6). To be before the world was, is a proof of Jehovah's eternity (Psalm 90:2), as also to be before the day was (Isa. 43:13). And here is the Holy Spirit, co-equal with the Father and the Son' existing before the world was, and equally present with them at the creation of all things. At the twenty-sixth verse of this chapter we have the Elohim, God, speaking in the plural number, and using the words us and our:

which most clearly evinces a plurality of persons in the self-existing Godhead: "And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness." As this address must necessarily be to the other persons in the essence-existing, consequently the Holy Ghost, as one of the us, must be co-equal and co-eternal with the Father and the Son, in the incomprehensible Jehovah.

Please note, I do not agree with S. E. Pierce's usage of the term person to refer to Deity. Nor do I agree with his usage of the term Personality to refer to the Divine Beings in the Eternal Godhead. However, these terms were then used without questions and did not carry with them the actual meaning of Person or Personality.

How do these statements teach that the Holy Spirit is God? The Spirit of God denotes the nature of Deity. There is the spirit of man, the spirit of the beasts that go down to the earth and the angels who were created as ministering spirits. However, the expression, The Spirit of God denotes the Divine Spirit even as the spirit of man denotes the human spirit.

On purpose I have not used the so-called disputed Texts, such as I John 5:7, I Tim. 3:15, 16 and Acts 20:28, to disprove Arianism. I believe these passages are a part of the Divine and Inspired Written Word, but the doctrines of the Trinity and the Deity of Christ are so clearly presented in the Written Word that they do not hinge upon these disputed passages. We are justified in saying God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit. These Three dwell in the Divine Unity of the Eternal Trinity or Godhead.

2) SHOW THE BIBLICAL TEACHING ABOUT CHRIST AND HIS RELATION TO THE CREATION.

In order to overcome historic Arianism, and the modern Arians, such as the Jehovah Witnesses, we must understand the place of Jesus Christ and His relation with creation. Did only the Father create the material and spiritual worlds, or did Jesus Christ also create the material and spiritual worlds?

1. John 1:1-3:

- 1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.*
- 2 The same was in the beginning with God.*
- 3 All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.*
- 4 In him was life; and the life was the light of men.*

Please turn to and read from Dr. Gill's comments on these verses. Briefly he shows us that Christ has made or created all things. Nothing has been created that Christ did not create. This does not reject the Father or the Holy Spirit, but rather the entire Divine Trinity is all included in the creation of all things.

The main point here is that Christ created all things as the eternal Word. If He were merely a created being, He would have to pre-exist in order to create Himself. Certainly He did pre-exist before creation, but He did not help create Himself as He is God and uncreated.

2. Colossians 1:16:

For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him:

Dr. Gill comments:

*Ver. 16. **For by him were all things created**, &c.] This is a reason proving Christ to be before all creatures, to be the common Parent of them, and to have the government over them, since he is the Creator of them. The creation of all things, by him, is not to be understood of the new creation, for whenever that is spoken of, the word "new" is generally used, or what is equivalent to it, or some clause or phrase added, which determines the sense, and is not the case here: besides, all things that are in heaven are said to be created here: which, to say nothing of the sun, moon, and stars, which are not capable subjects of the new creation, to restrain them to angels, cannot be true of them; for as for those who were once in heaven, but kept not their first estate, and quitted their habitation, these find no place there any more; they never were, nor will be renewed and restored by Christ; and as for the good angels, since they never sinned, they stand in no need of renovation. Moreover, all things that are on earth are also said to be created by him, and are, but not anew: for to confine these only to men, all men are not renewed in the spirit of their minds; all have not faith, nor a good hope through grace, nor love to God and Christ, the greater part of the world lies in open wickedness; and all that profess religion are not new creatures, these are a chosen generation, and a peculiar people: wherefore these words must be understood, not metaphorically, but literally; in which sense all things are created by Christ, not by him as an instrument, but as the efficient cause; for the preposition "by" does not always signify the former; but sometimes the latter; see #1Co 1:9 Ga 1:1; nor to the exclusion of the Father and Spirit, who, with the Son, were jointly concerned in the creating of all things out of nothing: and these "all things" can only refer to the things that are made: eternal things can never be said to be created; this is a contradiction in terms; the Father is not created by him, nor he himself as the Son of God, nor the Spirit; but everything that is made is created by him: hence it follows, that he himself is no creature, otherwise he must create himself, which also is a contradiction, since every creature is made by him; and consequently he must be God, for he that made and built all things is God. These are divided as to the subject of them, or place where they are, into things*

3. I Corinthians 8:6:

6 But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him. {in: or, for}

4. Ephesians 3:

9 And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ:

10 To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God,

5. Hebrews 1:

1 God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets,

2 Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;

10 And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:

11 They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment;

12 And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.

In Revelation 4:11 and 10:6, God the Father is seen as the creator in the same way the Lord Jesus Christ is. This shows the unity and oneness between the Father and the Son in the great work of Creation.

6. Revelation 4:11:

*Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for thou hast **created** all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were **created**.*

Dr. Gill on Revelation 4:11:

*Ver. 11. **Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory honour, and power,** &c.] The Alexandrian copy, and some others, the Complutensian edition, the Vulgate Latin version, and all the Oriental ones, read, "thou art worthy, O Lord, and our God, to receive"; that is, to receive the acknowledgment and ascription of glory, honour, and power; for otherwise God cannot be said to receive these from his creatures, than by their confessing and declaring that they belong unto him: and that for the reasons following,*

***for thou hast created all things;** the whole universe, the heavens, the earth, and sea, and all that in them are:*

***and for thy pleasure they are and were created;** God is the first cause, and the last end of all things; by his power they are made, and according to his will, and for his own glory, and therefore is worthy of such a doxology; see **#Pr 16:4 Ro 11:36**. What is here said is contrary to a notion imbibed by the Jews {z}, that the world was not created but for the sake of the Israelites: and elsewhere {a} they say,*

"the world was not created but for David; and one says for Moses; and Rabbi Jochanan says for the Messiah; "

which last is truest.

{z} Zohar in Exod. fol. 6. 3. & Tzeror Hammor, fol. 109. 1. & 161. 3.

{a} T. Bab. Sanhedrin, fol. 98. 2.

Hansard Knollys Hansard Knollys, Commentary on Revelation, London; 1676: stated: on Revelation 4:11:

#Re 4:11 Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.

In this verse we have,

*first, the elders confession, **Thou are worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power.***

*Secondly, the reason they give. **For thou hast created all things** visible and invisible. {#Joh 1:1-3 Col 1:16-18} For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth- And by him all things consist-That in all things he might have the pre-eminence.*

7. Revelation 10:6:

*And sware by him that liveth for ever and ever, who **created** heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein, that there should be time no longer:*

Dr. Gill on Revelation 10:6:

*Ver. 6. **And sware by him that liveth for ever and ever**, &c.] That is, by the living God, who is the true God: and is so described to distinguish him from idol gods, who have no life nor breath in them; and to assert the excellency and perfection of his nature, who has life in himself originally, and independently, is the fountain of life to all creatures living, and who are supported in their life and being by him; and so he always was, is, and ever will be; this is the same as swearing by Ancuialus {p}:*

***who created heaven, and the things that therein are;** the airy, starry, and third heavens, and the inhabitants of them, the fowls of the air, the sun, moon, and stars, and the angels of heaven, as well as the souls of departed saints, and the bodies of as many as are there:*

***and the earth, and the things that therein are;** men, beasts, and creeping things, trees, herbs, minerals, &c.*

***and the sea, and the things which are therein:** the several sorts of fishes in it: this is also said to distinguish the great God from all false gods, who made not the heavens and the earth, who alone is, and ought to be the object of an oath, or by whom an oath is to be made, and not any creature whatsoever; and since the Angel that here swears is the Lord Jesus Christ, this may be understood of him either as man, swearing by God the Father, in which respect the Father is greater than he; or as a divine person, and so swears by himself, #Heb 6:13; for to himself do these characters belong of living for ever and ever, and of having made the heaven, earth, and sea, and all in them:*

Hansard Knollys stated:

*#Re 10:5-7 **And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the earth lifted up his hand to heaven,** 6 **And sware by him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are therein, that there should be time no longer:** 7 **But in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets.***

These three verses contain the oath of Christ, for the confirmation of the truth and certainty of what He Himself spake and witnessed unto his servant John. #Heb 6:13-17 God willing to show the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath. Whence we may observe, first, that an oath is a sacred and solemn adoration and invocation of the only true living God.

Secondly, that it is lawful in some cases or matters to swear by Almighty God. Thirdly, that the most usual gesture of them that sware was by lifting up their hands towards heaven, #Ge 14:22 Da 12:7 and our Lord Jesus Christ (as Man and Mediator between God and men) #1Ti 2:5 here lifted up his hand to Heaven.

And sware by him that liveth forever and ever

that is, the eternal JEHOVAH. {#Isa 65:16 Jer 4:1-2}

The matter of Christ's oath here was, that there should be time no longer; that is, for the beast, the great whore, and the false prophet; and those kings of the earth, (that give their kingdom, power and strength unto the beast) to reign, rule and exercise dominion after the seventh trumpet begin to sound, (#Re 11:15 compared with #1Co 15:24-25). And this 7th verse. {#Re 10:7}

But in the days of the voice of the Seventh Angel when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished. By the mystery of God here, we may understand the conversion of the Jews unto Jesus Christ. {#Ro 11:25-27} Also the building and restoring of the church of God unto its primitive purity of worship and ordinances, according to the institutions of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the Head of the Church, {#Eph 5:25-32}

As he hath declared to his servants the prophets, {#So 6:10 Re 12:1-2 21:1-6}

The True and Proper Place of Jesus Christ and the Father in Creation

These New Testament passages show that it is true and proper to teach that God the Father created all things by, through and for Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ's involvement in the creation is clearly stated just as is the Father's. If Jesus is a created God, then He would have to pre-exist in order to help create Himself.

We will now conclude this point with Dr. Gill's statements on John 1:3:

Ver. 3. All things were made by him, &c.] Which is a proof at once of all that is said before; as that he was in the beginning; and that he was with God the Father in the beginning; and that he was God; otherwise all things could not have been made by him, had either of these been untrue: which is to be understood, not of the new creation; for this would be a restraining "all" things to a "few" persons only; nor is it any where said, that all things are new made, but made; and it is false, that all were converted, that have been converted, by the ministry of Christ, as man: all men are not renewed, regenerated, nor reformed; and the greater part of those that were renewed, were renewed before Christ existed, as man; and therefore could not be renewed by him, as such: though indeed, could this sense be established, it would not answer the end for which it is coined; namely, to destroy the proof of Christ's deity, and of his existence before his incarnation; for in all ages, from the beginning of the world, some have been renewed; and the new creation is a work of God, and of almighty power, equally with the old; for who can create spiritual light, infuse a principle of spiritual life, take away the heart of stone, and give an heart of flesh, or produce faith, but God? Regeneration is denied to be of man, and is always ascribed to God; nor would Christ's being the author of the new creation, be any contradiction to his being the author of the old creation, which is intended

here: by "all things", are meant the heaven, and all its created inhabitants, the airy, starry, and third heavens, and the earth, and all therein, the sea, and every thing that is in that; and the word, or Son of God, is the efficient cause of all these, not a bare instrument of the formation of them; for the preposition by does not always denote an instrument, but sometimes an efficient, as in #1Co 1:9, 2Co 1:1, Ga 1:1 and so here, though not to the exclusion of the Father, and of the Spirit:

and without him was not any thing made that was made: in which may be observed the conjunct operation of the word, or Son, with the Father, and Spirit, in creation; and the extent of his concern in it to every thing that is made; for without him there was not one single thing in the whole compass of the creation made; and the limitation of it to things that are made; and so excludes the uncreated being, Father, Son, and Spirit; and sin also, which is not a principle made by God, and which has no efficient, but a deficient cause. So the Jews ascribe the creation of all things to the word. The Targumists attribute the creation of man, in particular, to the word of God: it is said in #Ge 1:27. "God created man in his own image": the Jerusalem Targum of it is,

"and the word of the Lord created man in his likeness."

And #Ge 3:22 "and the Lord God said, behold the man is become as one of us", the same Targum paraphrases thus;

"and the word of the Lord God said, behold the man whom I have created, is the only one in the world."

Also in the same writings, the creation of all things in general is ascribed to the word: the passage in #De 33:27 "the eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms", is paraphrased by Onkelos,

"the eternal God is an habitation, by whose word the world was made."

In #Isa 48:13 it is said, "mine hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth". The Targum of Jonathan ben Uziah on it is,

"yea, by my word I have founded the earth:"

which agrees with what is said in #Heb 11:3, 2Pe 3:7,5, and the same says Philo the Jew, who not only calls him the archetype, and exemplar of the world, but the power that made it: he often ascribes the creation of the heavens, and the earth unto him, and likewise the creation of man after whose image, he says, he was made {t}. The Ethiopic version adds, at the end of this verse, "and also that which is made is for himself".

{t} De Mundi Opificio, p. 4, 5, 31, 32. De Alleg. l. 1. p. 44. De Sacrificiis Abel & Cain, p. 131. De Profugis, p. 464. & de Monarch. p. 823.

FINAL STATEMENTS AS TO JESUS CHRIST AND HIS DEITY

In Hebrews 1 we note the following Scriptures:

1 God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets,

2 Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;

3 Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;

4 Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.

5 For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?

6 And again, when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him. {again...: or, when he bringeth again}

7 And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. {And of: Gr. And unto}

8 But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. {righteousness: Gr. rightness, or, straightness}

9 Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

10 And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:

11 They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment;

12 And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.

13 But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?

Please note verses 3 and 4 again:

3 Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;

4 Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.

I will comment on two statements here. First, when in verse 4 Christ is *made so much better than the angels*, the term made has to do with being constituted at His resurrection. It was at His resurrection that He was constituted or made the Head over all things in a real and actual way, manifested to all creation. Before His resurrection, He had already been secretly made so, even from all pre-creative eternity, see John 17. But this secret Decree was not manifested until Christ's resurrection.

Second, when it is said that Christ is *the express image of his person* it is His substance or nature. See my work on *Persons in the Godhead*. This is not the Greek term for person, but substance or nature.

Since Christ is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His nature, it follows that Christ is also Divine God just as the Father is or else He could not be the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His nature. If Christ were a

mere man or a created God, this statement could not be true because it would make the Father also into a mere man or created God. The very foundational nature of God the Father, Divine and Spiritual, Jesus Christ is the brightness of that and the express image of that very nature.

In John 1:18, Jesus is separated out from all men as the alone and only revealer of the invisible God. This He could not do if he were also a mere man.

No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.

I ask, has the Son seen the God the Father? Certainly so. Therefore He is not a man. He is not a created Being either.

QUESTION

How could those persons hold to such views when they had the same Bible as we do?

ANSWER

This is the key. They did not have the same Bible as we do. They were using corrupted texts. Texts became altered and parts of the New Testament were left out. Many Books from both Testaments were left out. Each heretic produced his own Bible by correcting what he considered the faulty and improper Scriptures. Therefore it is no wonder that so many strange and differing concepts were then being formulated. We can thank God for the preservation of His pure and true Word maintained in and by the true gospel churches throughout all the age of this, the *Church Age*.

May we all join with Thomas in saying about Jesus Christ:

MY LORD AND MY GOD.

Eusebius on the Deity and Preexistence of Jesus Christ.

I place this here for two reasons: *First* to show the different ways in which the older Fathers, as they were called, used term in their Christological concepts with others; and *secondly*, to show the wonderful manner in which they did set forth Jesus Christ in His Deity and His Preexistence.

Please note that I do not agree with all of Eusebius' theology. I do not believe that the Father did in any way generate or create the Eternal and Divine Word, the Divine Nature of Jesus Christ. I do not believe that the Word became a separate Identity or Being until the Father generated Him out or birthed Him out into a separated Being. This is a foul

doctrine. With that being said, there is still much beauty in what Eusebius did say. In that spirit I offer it here.

This taken from Chapter 2 of his Church History, a part of the Nicene writings.

**CHAPTER 2.
SUMMARY VIEW OF THE PRE-EXISTENCE
AND DIVINITY OF OUR SAVIOR AND LORD JESUS CHRIST.**

SINCE in Christ there is a twofold nature, and the one — in so far as he is thought of as God — resembles the head of the body, while the other may (p.154) be compared with the feet, — in so far as he, for the sake of our salvation, put on human nature with the same passions as our own, — the following work will be complete only if we begin with the chief and lordliest events of all his history. In this way will the antiquity and divinity of Christianity be shown to those who suppose it of recent and foreign origin, and imagine that it appeared only yesterday. No language is sufficient to express the origin and the worth, the being and the nature of Christ. Wherefore also the divine Spirit says in the prophecies, “Who shall declare his generation?” For none knoweth the Father except the Son, neither can any one know the Son adequately except the Father alone who hath begotten him. For alone who beside the Father could clearly understand the Light which was before the world, the intellectual and essential Wisdom which existed before the ages, the living Word which was in the beginning with the Father and which was God, the first and only begotten of God which was before every creature and creation visible and invisible, the commander-in-chief of the rational and immortal host of heaven, the messenger of the great counsel, the executor of the Father’s unspoken will, the creator, with the Father, of all things, the second cause of the universe after the Father, the true and only-begotten Son of God, the Lord and God and King of all created things, the one who has received dominion and power, with divinity itself, and with might and honor from the Father; as it is said in regard to him in the mystical passages of Scripture which speak of his divinity: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” “All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made.” This, too, the great Moses teaches, when, as the most ancient of all the prophets, he describes under the influence of the divine Spirit the creation and arrangement of the universe. He declares that the maker of the world and the creator of all things yielded to Christ himself, and to none other than his own clearly divine and first-born Word, the making of inferior things, and communed with him respecting the creation of man. “For,” says he, “God said, Let us make man in our image and in our likeness.” And another of the prophets confirms this, speaking of God in his hymns as follows: “He spake and they were made; he commanded and they were created.” He here introduces the Father and Maker as Ruler of all, commanding with a kingly nod, and second to him the divine Word, none other than the one who is proclaimed by us, as carrying out the Father’s commands. All that are said (p.155) to have excelled in righteousness and piety since the creation of man, the great servant Moses and before him in the first place Abraham and his children, and as many righteous men and prophets as afterward appeared, have contemplated him with the pure eyes of the mind, and have recognized him and offered to him the worship which is due him as Son of God. But he, by no means neglectful of the reverence due to the Father, was appointed to teach the knowledge of the Father to them all.

For instance, the Lord God, it is said, appeared as a common man to Abraham while he was sitting at the oak of Mambre. And he, immediately falling down, although he saw a man with his eyes, nevertheless worshipped him as God, and sacrificed to him as Lord, and

confessed that he was not ignorant of his identity when he uttered the words, "Lord, the judge of all the earth, wilt thou not execute righteous judgment?" For if it is unreasonable to suppose that the unbegotten and immutable essence of the almighty God was changed into the form of man or that it deceived the eyes of the beholders with the appearance of some created thing, and if it is unreasonable to suppose, on the other hand, that the Scripture should falsely invent such things, when the God and Lord who judgeth all the earth and executeth judgment is seen in the form of a man, who else can be called, if it be not lawful to call him the first cause of all things, than his only pre-existent Word? Concerning whom it is said in the Psalms, "He sent his Word and healed them, and delivered them from their destructions." Moses most clearly proclaims him second Lord after the Father, when he says, "The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord." The divine Scripture also calls him God, when he appeared again to Jacob in the form of a man, and said to Jacob, "Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name, because thou hast prevailed with God." Wherefore also Jacob called the name of that place "Vision of God," saying, "For I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." Nor is it admissible to suppose that the theophanies recorded were appearances of subordinate angels and ministers of God, for whenever any of these appeared to men, the Scripture does not conceal the fact, but calls them by name not God nor Lord, but angels, as it is easy to prove by numberless testimonies. Joshua, also, the successor of Moses, calls him, as leader of the heavenly angels and archangels and of the supermundane powers, and as lieutenant of the Father, entrusted with the second rank of sovereignty and rule over all, (p.156) "captain of the host of the Lords" although he saw him not otherwise than again in the form and appearance of a man. For it is written: "And it came to pass when Joshua was at Jericho that he looked and saw a man standing over against him with his sword drawn in his hand, and Joshua went unto him and said, Art thou for us or for our adversaries? And he said unto him, As captain of the host of the Lord am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth and said unto him, Lord, what dost thou command thy servant? and the captain of the Lord said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy." You will perceive also from the same words that this was no other than he who talked with Moses For the Scripture says in the same words and with reference to the same one, "When the Lord saw that he drew near to see, the Lord called to him out of the bush and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, What is it? And he said, Draw not nigh hither; loose thy shoe from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground. And he said unto him, I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." And that there is a certain substance which lived and subsisted before the world, and which ministered unto the Father and God of the universe for the formation of all created things, and which, is called the Word of God and Wisdom, we may learn, to quote other proofs in addition to those already cited, from the mouth of Wisdom herself, who reveals most clearly through Solomon the following mysteries concerning herself: "I, Wisdom, have dwelt with prudence and knowledge, and I have invoked understanding. Through me kings reign, and princes ordain righteousness. Through me the great are magnified, and through me sovereigns rule the earth." To which she adds: "The Lord created me in the beginning of his ways, for his works; before the world he established me, in the beginning, before he made the earth, before he made the depths, before the mountains were settled, before all hills he begat me. When he prepared the heavens I was present with him, and when he established the fountains of the region under heaven I was with him, disposing. I was the one in whom he delighted; daily I rejoiced before him at all times when he was rejoicing at having completed the world." That the divine Word, therefore, pre-existed and appeared to some, if not to all, has thus been briefly shown by us. (p.157) But why the Gospel was not preached in ancient times to all men and to all nations, as it is now, will appear from the following

considerations. The life of the ancients was not of such a kind as to permit them to receive the all-wise and all-virtuous teaching of Christ. For immediately in the beginning, after his original life of blessedness, the first man despised the command of God, and fell into this mortal and perishable state, and exchanged his former divinely inspired luxury for this curse-laden earth. His descendants having filled our earth, showed themselves much worse, with the exception of one here and there, and entered upon a certain brutal and insupportable mode of life. They thought neither of city nor state, neither of arts nor sciences. They were ignorant even of the name of laws and of justice, of virtue and of philosophy. As nomads, they passed their lives in deserts, like wild and fierce beasts, destroying, by an excess of voluntary wickedness, the natural reason of man, and the seeds of thought and of culture implanted in the human soul. They gave themselves wholly over to all kinds of profanity, now seducing one another, now slaying one another, now eating human flesh, and now daring to wage war with the Gods and to undertake those battles of the giants celebrated by all; now planning to fortify earth against heaven, and in the madness of ungoverned pride to prepare an attack upon the very God of all.

On account of these things, when they conducted themselves thus, the all-seeing God sent down upon them floods and conflagrations as upon a wild forest spread over the whole earth. He cut them down with continuous famines and plagues, with wars, and with thunderbolts from heaven, as if to check some terrible and obstinate disease of souls with more severe punishments. Then, when the excess of wickedness had overwhelmed nearly all the race, like a deep fit of drunkenness, beclouding and darkening the minds of men, the first-born and first-created wisdom of God, the pre-existent Word himself, induced by his exceeding love for man, appeared to his servants, now in the form of angels, and again to one and another of those ancients who enjoyed the favor of God, in his own person as the saving power of God, not otherwise, however, than in the shape of man, because it was impossible to appear in any other way. And as by them the seeds of piety were sown among a multitude of men and the whole nation, descended from the Hebrews, devoted themselves persistently to the worship of God, he imparted to them through the (p.158) prophet Moses, as to multitudes still corrupted by their ancient practices, images and symbols of a certain mystic Sabbath and of circumcision, and elements of other spiritual principles, but he did not grant them a complete knowledge of the mysteries themselves.

But when their law became celebrated, and, like a sweet odor, was diffused among all men, as a result of their influence the dispositions of the majority of the heathen were softened by the lawgivers and philosophers who arose on every side, and their wild and savage brutality was changed into mildness, so that they enjoyed deep peace, friendship, and social intercourse. Then, finally, at the time of the origin of the Roman Empire, there appeared again to all men and nations throughout the world, who had been, as it were, previously assisted, and were now fitted to receive the knowledge of the Father, that same teacher of virtue, the minister of the Father in all good things, the divine and heavenly Word of God, in a human body not at all differing in substance from our own. He did and suffered the things which had been prophesied. For it had been foretold that one who was at the same time man and God should come and dwell in the world, should perform wonderful works, and should show himself a teacher to all nations of the piety of the Father. The marvelous nature of his birth, and his new teaching, and his wonderful works had also been foretold; so likewise the manner of his death, his resurrection from the dead, and finally, his divine ascension into heaven. For instance, Daniel the prophet, under the influence of the divine Spirit, seeing his kingdom at the end of time, was inspired thus to describe the divine vision in language fitted to human comprehension: "For I beheld," he says, "until thrones were placed, and the Ancient of Days did sit, whose garment was white as snow and the hair of

his head like pure wool; his throne was a flame of fire and his wheels burning fire. A river of fire flowed before him. Thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him. He appointed judgment, and the books were opened.” And again, “I saw,” says he, “and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and he hastened unto the Ancient of Days and was brought into his presence, and there was given him the dominion and the glory and the kingdom; and all peoples, tribes, and tongues serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom shall not be destroyed.” It is clear that these words can refer to no one else than to our Savior, the God Word who was in the beginning with God, and who (p.159) was called the Son of man because of his final appearance in the flesh. But since we have collected in separate books as the selections from the prophets which relate to our Savior Jesus Christ, and have arranged in a more logical form those things which have been revealed concerning him, what has been said will suffice for the present.