



Steve Ritchie · Feb 27, 2017 · 31 min read

The Son Had His Beginning By His Begetting



The Trinity doctrine alleges that the Son never had a beginning because the Son as the Son is supposed to have always coeternally existed with the Father throughout eternity past. In contradistinction to the traditional Roman Catholic Trinity doctrine, the scriptures prove that the Son was not always a Son to the Father and the Father was not always a Father to the Son because the Son is the man who was conceived in the virgin who had his beginning by his virgin conception and birth.

Therefore, the whole Trinity idea of an alleged timeless God the Son without a beginning completely collapses in light of the scriptural evidence.

The Father and Son Relationship Began in Time

Hebrews 1:5 cites 2 Samuel 7:14 where the Father said, "I will be to him a Father, and he WILL BE TO ME A SON".

If a God the Son was eternally "at the Father's side" as James White and other Trinitarian apologists have alleged, how then could the Son have been literally alive at the Father's anthropomorphic side while the Father prophetically spoke of His future Son by saying, "I will be to him a Father, and he will be to Me a son"? For how can any father have his own living son at his side while saying, "I will be to him a father, and he will be to me a son"? Such Trinitarian eisegesis of inspired texts contradicts many passages of inspired scripture, including the words of Christ himself when he said, "As the Father has life in himself, so he has granted the Son life in himself" (*John 5:26*).

Since the Son of God was "granted" a distinct "life in himself", the Son could not have existed as a living Son before being granted that life by the Father through his virgin conception and birth.

A Foreknown Son Could Not Be Timelessly Foreknown

1 Peter 1:20 proves that the Son was “foreknown before the foundation of the world”. The Greek verb “proginosko” is defined as being “known beforehand”.

How could a timeless Son have literally existed while being known beforehand? If an angel appeared to a married couple and said, “Your wife shall conceive and bear a son” then that son would be foreknown by that couple. Yet that couple could not say that their son literally existed before being “foreknown”. Therefore, a foreknown son could not have literally existed before being foreknown without the use of the word “foreknown” being rendered meaningless.

The Son was Begotten on a Specific Day

Psalms 2:7, “You are My Son, THIS DAY (yom) HAVE I BEGOTTEN (yalad) YOU”. Both Strong’s Concordance and the New American Standard Concordance say that “yom” means “day”. In fact, not a single verse of scripture ever indicates that the Hebrew noun “yom” ever means a timeless day.

Could Pharaoh have given a timeless command to the Israelite slaves in Exodus 5:6-7 (“*So the same day [yom] Pharaoh commanded the taskmasters over the people and their foremen, saying, You are no longer to give the people straw to make brick as previously; let them go and gather straw for themselves....*” – Ex. 5:6-7)? The same Hebrew verb “yalad” is used for the births of Cain and Abel in Genesis 4:1-2 which proves that the Son was born at a specific point in time rather than being “eternally begotten” as Trinitarians falsely allege.

Since not a single verse of scripture ever indicates that the Hebrew verb “yalad” means a timeless birth, we know that the Son of God had to have been begotten on a specific day. Therefore the Son of God could not have always been a timeless Son because the Son was literally conceived and born as a true Son on a specific day.

The Son Was Made Lord and Christ

Acts 2:36 proves that the Son of God was “made ... both Lord and Christ:” “God has MADE this same Jesus both Lord and Christ:” “MADE” is translated from the Greek verb ποιεό (poy-eh'-o) which Strong’s defines as to “make, manufacture, construct,” (b) “cause”. It is hard to imagine that a timeless God the Son was “made Lord” or “caused” to be the “Lord” if he was already an alleged coequal God the Lord of the universe to begin with.

To be “made ... both Lord and Christ” is the same thing as saying that the Son was “appointed heir of all things” by God in Hebrews 1:2 (*Helps Word Studies defines Lord [Greek - 'Kurios'] “property, a person exercising absolute ownership rights; lord [In the papyri, 2962 (kýrios) likewise denotes an owner (master) exercising full rights.”*]). Therefore the title Son of God refers to the man who was made Lord and Christ (Christ literally means “anointed one”) rather than to an alleged coequally distinct timeless God the Son.

The Son is the Reproduced Copy of the Father’s Person as a Human Person

Hebrews 1:3 states that the Son “is the brightness (*apaugasma* = “*Reflected Brightness*” - Thayer) of His glory (the Father’s glory), and the express image (*charakter* = “*reproduction*” / “*imprinted copy*”) of His Person (*hypostasis* = “*Substance of Being*” of the Father’s Person)”.

If the words of inspired scripture mean anything, then the Son could not have always existed before being “reproduced” as the “imprinted copy” of the Father’s Person. Luke 1:35 and Matthew 1:20 prove that the Son was reproduced or copied from the Father’s Person when the Holy Spirit descended upon the virgin (Luke 1:35 “*the Holy Spirit will come upon you*”; Matthew 1:20 “*the child which has been conceived in her is out of the Holy Spirit*”) to produce a man child.

Matthew 1:20 states that the Son was produced “ek” “out of the Holy Spirit” (Matthew 1:20) and Galatians 4:4 states that the Son was produced “ek” “out of the woman” (Gal. 4:4). Thus, inspired scripture calls Jesus both “the Mighty God” and “the Everlasting Father” (Isaiah 9:6) according to his divinity from the Father’s Holy Spirit and “the child born and Son given” (Isaiah 9:6) according to his humanity from his mother Mary.

Under Hebrews 1:3, the Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, 3rd edition (BDAG) confirms that the Greek noun “CHARAKTER” used in Hebrews 1:3 proves that the Son is God the Father’s “*produced ... reproduction, representation*” as “*a human being as the reproduction of his own identity/reality ... Christ is an exact representation of God’s real being Hb 1:3*”.

Since Hebrews 1:3 clearly states that the Son is “the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person” referencing the Father’s Person, the Son must be the “human being as the reproduction of his (the Father’s) own identity”.

Trinitarian theology alleges that a coequally distinct timeless God the Son Person has always existed throughout eternity past. How then could an alleged timeless God the Son be the “**produced ... reproduction**” “**of God’s real being**” as “**a human being**” who is “**the reproduction of his (the Father’s) own identity**” if the Son has always timelessly existed without being “produced”?

Since Greek Lexicons show that Hebrews 1:3 in the original Greek proves that Jesus is a “produced ... human being” “out of” (“*ek*” = “*out of*” - Matthew 1:20) the Father’s “own identity”, we know that the Son is the man who is “God’s real being” who became “a human being” in the incarnation through the virgin. Thus, we can clearly see that Hebrews 1:3 is addressing the Son as “the brightness of his glory (the Father’s glory) and the express image of his person (the Father’s Person)” as a fully complete human person in the incarnation within the Hebrew virgin rather than an alleged coequal and coeternally distinct timeless God the Son Person.

No Trinitarian apologist has ever been able to answer why Hebrews 1:3 uses the Greek noun “CHARAKTER” which shows that the Son was “produced” as “an exact reproduction” or “copy” of the Father’s “substance of being” (“hypostasis”) while remaining timeless. For it is

impossible for something to be reproduced or copied from an original without a specific time of origin. How then could the Son have always existed as an alleged timeless Son while being "reproduced" as the "copy" of the Father's Person as a "human being" (a human person)?

The Son is God with us as an Authentic Human Being who Began in Time

Just as I have been criticized for agreeing with Arius' statement, "there was a time when the Son did not exist (*in my debate with Trinity apologist Ethan Smith – 'Is Jehovah Tri-Personal or Uni-Personal'*)", so Trinitarian apologist Edward Dalcour criticized Oneness author David K. Bernard for teaching like Arius, that "THERE WAS A TIME WHEN THE SON DID NOT EXIST..."

Dr. David Bernard wrote, "There was a time when the Son did not exist (*The Oneness of God, pg. 105*)..." Trinitarian author Edward Dalcour condemns David Bernard for "rejecting the preexistence of the Son" and for using a phrase "comparable to the key phrase in Arius's teaching: 'There was a time when He [the Son] was not (*A Definitive Look At Oneness Theology, Edward Dalcour, pg. 108*)'" without bothering to mention the doctrinal distinction between Arianism and Oneness.

While Oneness theology can agree with the key phrase of Arius ("*there was a time when the Son was not*"), we differ from Arius in that we believe that the He who became the Son has always pre-existed his virgin conception and birth as the "Mighty God" and "Everlasting Father" (*Isaiah 9:6*) before also becoming incarnate as a true man.

Hence, Oneness theology affirms the deity of the God who became a child born and son given while Arius completely denied the deity of Christ. Therefore, while we deny Arius' rejection of the timeless existence of the Holy Spirit of the Father who descended upon the virgin (*Luke 1:35; John 6:38*) to become incarnate as the Son (*1 Tim. 2:5; Matthew 1:20; Heb. 1:3; Heb. 2:14*), we agree with Arius in that the Son as a Son was never an eternal Son with no beginning.

Oneness theology believes that the Son of God lived an authentic human life because the Son is the Holy Spirit of God the Father who also became the man who was formed in the Hebrew virgin. Thus, the Son of God is not God living with humanity as God, but rather, the Son of God is God living with humanity as a true man among men. Since it is impossible for God as God to pray to God and for God as God be tempted of evil as God, we know that Jesus Christ of Nazareth is God incarnate with us as a genuine human being who was made exactly like all humans are made (*Heb. 2:17*).

The following excerpts are from J. L. Hall's article in the Pentecostal Herald (*a UPCI Publication*):

"Did Jesus pray to Himself? No, not when we understand that Jesus was both God and man. In His deity Jesus did not pray, for God does not need to pray to anyone. As a man, Jesus prayed to God, not to his humanity. He did not pray to Himself as humanity, but to the one true God, to the same God who dwelled in His humanity and who also inhabits the universe."

Brother Hall went on to write in the same publication, "Biblical facts reveal that Jesus lived as **an authentic human being**, that He did not merely assume the appearance of flesh (1). Therefore we should not be surprised that He prayed to God, seeking strength, guidance, and assurance. Moreover, we should not be surprised that Jesus had a will distinct from God (2), that He was truly human in spirit and soul, that He possessed a self-awareness of His humanity. Jesus' prayers to God the Father came from His human life, from the Incarnation. His prayers were not those of one divine person to another divine person of God, but those of an authentic human praying to the one true God. Prayer is based on an inferior being in supplication before a superior being. If the one praying is equal in power and authority to the one to whom he is praying, there is no genuine prayer." (*Did Jesus Pray to Himself? Article from the July Pentecostal Herald, UPCI Publication, by J. L. Hall*)

Oneness theology clearly teaches that God became "a genuine human being" in the incarnation through the virgin who lived as "an authentic human being". This explains the prayers and temptations of Jesus Christ as a true man living among men. Therefore, Oneness theologians acknowledge that Jesus Christ is both "God Almighty" as to his true divine identity and "fully man" as to his true human identity because God Himself became a man within the Hebrew virgin.

Oneness author Talmadge French affirmed that God became a man in the incarnation through the virgin. At 9:40 into Dr. Talmadge French's lecture on "Oneness Pentecostalism in Global Perspective" Talmadge French said, "**How did God become a man and yet remain God? How is God Father, Son, and Spirit and yet One God? It is an awesome revelation.**" (*Dr. Talmadge French's lecture, Oneness Pentecostalism in Global Perspective / YouTube Video: <https://youtu.be/Ag4taz7GRS8>*).

Oneness author Dr. Daniel Segraves wrote that Jesus is God manifest in genuine and FULL HUMAN EXISTENCE, "Everything that Jesus did and said He did and said as who He was, God manifest in genuine and full human existence." (*Dr. Daniel Segraves Article, Thoughts on John 17:5, 3/23/2010 <http://evidentialfaith.blogspot.com/2010/03/thoughts-on-john-17-5-by-dr-daniel-l.html>*)

William Chalfant is a respected Oneness author who wrote the following in A Critique of "Bible Writers" Theology:

"If Jesus Christ is not **God Almighty** (God the Father) then He is not able to save us (but He is). On the other hand, **if Jesus of Nazareth is not the true Son of Mary, and a genuine human being, descended from David and Abraham, then He cannot be our Redeemer and our sacrifice for sins.** To deny His wonderful divinity (as God the Father) is to rob Him of His rightful glory. On the other hand, to deny His genuine humanity is to rob us of our blood sacrifice, who hung in our place on the old rugged cross. If He is not one of us, then we do not have a true Mediator. 1 Timothy 2:5 states, "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man (anthropos) Christ Jesus". If He was not true anthropos and true God, then our faith is in vain. But it is not in vain, because He stood in my place."

At approximately twenty three minutes and forty five seconds into David Bernard's Debate with Robert Morey, brother Bernard stated, "When we speak of Jesus conversing with the Father, it is understandable that Jesus was speaking as AN AUTHENTIC HUMAN BEING." And at

twenty three minutes and thirteen seconds into the same debate, Dr. Bernard said that the prayers of Jesus were "always in the context of A REAL HUMAN LIFE".

Then at approximately twenty four minutes and thirty seconds brother Bernard said, "You must understand that it was as A REAL HUMAN BEING that he submitted his will to God." (*From David K. Bernard's Debate with Robert Morey, YouTube Video: <https://youtu.be/MiWZKjbeMMc>*)

The Oneness theological position does not teach that Jesus ever prayed to the Father as the Father, as our position affirms that Jesus prayed and submitted his human will to the Father as "a real human being". Hence, God the Father was able to operate as the unchangeable God outside of the incarnation with only one Divine will, while the child born and son given is God the Father with us as "an authentic HUMAN BEING" who prayed "in the context of A REAL HUMAN LIFE" with a real human will.

Thus, we have One Divine God Person as the Father and one mediator between that God Person and all humanity, the man Christ Jesus (*1 Tim. 2:5*). For "the only true God" (*John 17:3*) also became "an authentic human being" as a human person because one person as one person cannot mediate or interact with himself.

Therefore, Dr. David Bernard's theological position is the same theological position as mine even though Trinitarian apologist Ethan Smith has claimed that I have "contradicted Oneness Theology" because I have stated that the Father's Person also became a human person: God as One Divine Person and as one human person. (*Ethan Smith's YouTube Video: <https://youtu.be/nk2kdrm4pT4> – Steve Ritchie's responding YouTube videos: <https://youtu.be/HxdDQqshMkY> and <https://youtu.be/hqgns1Dtrbk>*)

I have found that