

DID ARIUS REALLY BELIEVE CHRIST WAS CREATED?

www.end-times-prophecy.org

There is a popular belief amongst the Trinitarian churches of the world today, which states that Arius, a 3rd-4th century bishop, who opposed the teaching of the Trinity, believed that Christ was a created being. And those of us who oppose the Trinity teaching today are commonly labelled as "Arians". And we are accused also of believing that Christ was a created being. **But did Arius really believe that Christ was created?** Much of Arius' writings were destroyed by order of Constantine and 4th century bishops, but thankfully, we still have historical writings from early historians to help us with this.

Early historians show, as shown below, that Arius did NOT believe Christ was created.

Philippus Van Limborch, a Dutch 17th Century Theologian wrote "The History of the Inquisition". And drawing upon **the historical writings of 5th century historians, such as Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret**, Limborch shows that Arius did NOT believe that Christ was a created being, but rather the **BEGOTTEN Son of God the Father**. Limborch quotes the following in His book "The History of the Inquisition":

*"The Occasion of the Arian Controversy was this. Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria speaking in a very warm Manner concerning the Trinity before the Presbyters and Clergy of his Church, affirmed there was an Unity in the Trinity and particularly that the Son was Co-eternal and Consubstantial, and of the same Dignity -with the Father. Arius, one of his Presbyters, thought that the Bishop, by this Doctrine, was introducing the Sabellian Heresy, and therefore opposed him, arguing in this manner : "a - If the Father **BEGOT** the Son, **HE WHO WAS BEGOTTEN MUST HAVE A BEGINNING OF HIS EXISTENCE**; and from hence, say he, 'tis manifest, that there was a Time when he was not." (Limborch, The History of the Inquisition, p.22)*

*"Arius asserted, 'The Son hath a beginning, and is from none of the Things that do exist', not meaning that he was not from Everlasting, before ever the Creation had a Being, OR THAT HE WAS CREATED LIKE OTHER BEINGS ABSOLUTELY OUT OF NOTHING, or that like the rest of the Creation he was mutable in his Nature. **ARIUS EXPRESSLY DECLARES THE CONTRARY** in his Letter to Eusebius, his intimate Friend, from whom he had no reason to conceal his most secret Sentiments, and says... "This is what we have and do profess, **THAT THE SON IS NOT UNBEGOTTEN** nor in any manner a part of the unbegotten God, nor from any part of the material World, but that by the Will and Council of the Father he existed before all Times and Ages, perfect God, **THE ONLY BEGOTTEN** and unchangeable, and that therefore before he was begotten or formed he was not", as he explains himself, "There never was a Time when he was unbegotten". His affirming therefore that the Son had a Beginning, was only saying, that he was in the whole of his Existence from the Father, as the Origin and Fountain of his Being and Deity, and not any Denial of his being from before all Times and Ages-, and his saying that he was no part of God, nor derived from Things that do exist, WAS NOT DENYING HIS GENERATION FROM GOD*

BEFORE ALL AGES, or his being completely God himself, or his being produced after a more excellent Manner than the Creatures, but that as he was always from God, so he was different both from him, and all other Beings." (Limborch, The History of the Inquisition , p.24)

IMPORTANT NOTE: When Arius said things like Christ is "not in any manner part of the unbegotten God", what he simply meant was that Christ was a completely separate being from God the Father. And this was part of the twisting that the other bishops did concerning Arius' writings. They took some words Arius spoke and wrote and misconstrued them into meaning something else.

"And yet notwithstanding all these Things, when Alexander gives an Account of the Principles of Arius to the Bishops, he represents them in all the Consequences he thought fit to draw from them, AND CHARGES HIM [Arius] WITH HOLDING, THAT THE SON WAS MADE LIKE EVERY OTHER CREATURE ABSOLUTELY OUT OF NOTHING, and that therefore his Nature was mutable, and susceptible equally of Virtue and Vice ; with many other insidious and unscriptural Doctrines, WHICH ARIUS PLAINLY APPEARS NOT TO HAVE MAINTAINED OR TAUGHT." (Limborch, The History of the Inquisition, p.25)

*"Arius... in his Letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia ... charges Pope Alexander with violently persecuting and oppressing him upon account of what he called the Truth, and using every Method to ruin him, driving him out of the City as an atheistical Person, **FOR NOT AGREEING WITH HIM IN HIS SENTIMENTS ABOUT THE TRINITY.**" (Limborch, The History of the Inquisition, p.31)*

*"The Arian Controversy, that made such Havoc in the Christian Church, was, if I may be allowed to speak it without Offence, in the Beginning only, about words ... Arius, as hath been shown, expressly allowed the Son to be "before all Times and Ages ... perfect God, unchangeable", and **BEGOTTEN AFTER THE MOST PERFECT LIKENESS OF THE UNBEGOTTEN FATHER.**" (Limborch, The History of the Inquisition, p.95)*

Sozomen, a 5th century historian, (whom Limborch uses in his above writings) himself quotes Arius confirming the following:

*"It was not long before he [Constantine] recalled Arius from exile, and demanded of him a written exposition of his faith CONCERNING THE GODHEAD he [Arius] declared upon oath, that he held the doctrines set forth in this exposition ... It was as follows: "Arius and Euzoius, presbyters, to Constantine, our most pious emperor and most beloved of God. According as your piety, beloved of God, commanded, O sovereign emperor, we here furnish a written statement of our own faith, and we protest before God that we, and all those who are with us, believe what is here set forth. **"WE BELIEVE IN ONE GOD, THE FATHER ALMIGHTY, AND IN HIS SON the Lord Jesus Christ, WHO WAS BEGOTTEN FROM HIM BEFORE ALL AGES,** God the Word, by whom all things were made, whether things in heaven or things on earth; He came and took upon Him flesh, suffered and rose again, and ascended into heaven, whence He will again come to judge the quick and the dead. We believe in the Holy Ghost, in the resurrection of the body, in the life to come, in the kingdom of heaven." (Salminius Hermias Sozomen - The ecclesiastical history of Sozomen : comprising a history of the church from A. D. 324 to A. D. 440, p.94)*

So as you can clearly see from the above historians, Arius did **NOT** believe that Christ was a created being. Arius fully believed in the 'begotten' nature of Jesus Christ, as a true SON, begotten of God the Father sometime in eternity past, just as the Bible teaches. But because Arius rejected the Trinity doctrine, which was established by the likes of Athanasius and enforced by Constantine, then the beliefs of Arius were 'twisted' to make it look like he believed Christ was a 'lesser' created being. This is the same false charge laid upon those of us who follow the one true God and His Son truth of the Bible.

It seems that the main point of contention was in Arius' belief that the Son of God at some point in time HAD A BEGINNING, which is clearly what the Bible teaches and is completely logical, if Christ is the actual BEGOTTEN Son of God the Father. But this went fully against the trinity god doctrine the bishops were pushing, which came out of the council of Nicaea-325. And so the bishops had Arius' writings burned and misconstrued his beliefs, making it appear that Arius believe Christ was a created being. As we can see from the below quote, Constantine ordered Arius AND his writings to be banished, and the standard of the Christian faith was no longer the Bible, but the Roman Church, for centuries to come:

*"And with respect to the Arians, he [Constantine] banished Arius himself, ordered all his Followers, as absolute Enemies of Christ, ... ordained that the Books written by them should be burnt, that there might be no Remains of their Doctrine left to Posterity, and cruelly commanded, that if ever any one mould dare to keep in his Possession any Book written by Arius, and should not immediately burn it, he should be no sooner convicted of the Crime but he should suffer Death. Thus the Orthodox first brought in the Punishment of Heresy with Death, and persuaded the Emperor to destroy those whom they could not easily convert. **The Scriptures were now no longer the Rule and Standard of the Christian Faith.**" (Limborch, The History of the Inquisition, p.30)*

In his book "Truth Triumphant", B.G.Wilkinson confirmed that the 'erroneous charge' of Arianism is laid upon all who do not ascribe to the Trinity teaching ... *"Then the papal party proceeded to call those who would not subscribe to this teaching [the trinity], Arians, while they took to themselves the title of Trinitarians. **AN ERRONEOUS CHARGE WAS CIRCULATED THAT ALL WHO WERE CALLED ARIANS BELIEVED THAT CHRIST WAS A CREATED BEING.**" (B.G.Wilkinson, Truth Triumphant)*

And so the controversy still rages today! And the false charge laid against us who are NON-trinitarians still goes on! The world labels us as 'Arians', and yet they are blinded to the truth about Arius, thanks to that 'antichrist' religion, the Roman Catholic Church, who continues to push the FALSE CHARGE against Arius and non-Trinitarians. And so the 'wine of Babylon' continues to be drunk by the world, and those of us who stand for the truth are persecuted, just like Arius was and just like the '3 horns' of the fourth beast in Daniel 7 were destroyed, because they were guess what? ARIAN tribes!