

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Twentieth Century Arianism

*An Examination of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ
held by Jehovah's Witnesses*

BY MAURICE BURRELL

JEHOVAH'S Witnesses interpret Christ's existence in three chronological phases. Each phase is, in a sense, a complete existence of its own.

1. *The Pre-existent Christ*

Jehovah's Witnesses are so determined to safeguard the truth of God's unity that they reject the idea that Jesus Christ is God in the full sense of that word. For them, Jehovah is the only living and true God and as such He is the source of all life. He alone never had a beginning. That being so, they claim, there was a time when "Jehovah God was all alone in universal space". At that time, not even His Son was present. Jehovah was not "lonesome", however, for "He is complete in himself and lacks nothing". The time came, however, when Jehovah God began to create and His first act of creation was His Son. That being so, Jehovah's Witnesses maintain that the Son of God is to be regarded as a creature. All this is expressed quite clearly in *Let God Be True* (p. 20 ff.), one of the movement's official handbooks of doctrine.

Students of church history will not need to be reminded that this view is as old as Arianism. As early as 319 A.D. Arius, a priest in one of the churches in Alexandria, had begun to propound what Prestige calls "a theological system according to which Christ was neither truly God nor perfectly man" (*Fathers and Heretics*, pp. 67 f.). Stressing the uniqueness and transcendence of God, Arius had maintained that God was "alone ingenerate, alone eternal, alone without beginning, alone possessing immortality, alone wise, alone good, alone sovereign, alone judge of all" (J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, p. 227). He went on to claim that God could not impart His substance to another and yet remain indivisible. Therefore, whatever else existed apart from God must have come into existence by the creative act of God.

The implications for Christology were soon obvious. If all that existed apart from the Father had been brought into being by the Father, then the Word, too, must be a creature. It was readily granted that the Word was a perfect creature. He was beyond comparison with any other creature. Nevertheless, He was a creature.

So Arius taught that Christ was the Father's first creative act. God created His Son as an independent being of exalted wisdom and power. The Son then became the Father's instrument in bringing about the rest of creation. For Arius and his followers, therefore, it could be said of Christ, "There was a time when he was not". This being so, the created Son could have no direct communion with, or knowledge of, the Father, for He was alien from, and utterly dissimilar

to, the Father's essence. To call Him "God" or "Son of God" was merely to give Him courtesy titles, for as a creature He could not be God in the full sense of that word.

Arians laid great stress on such verses as Colossians 1 : 15, where Christ is called "The firstborn of all creation", and Revelation 3 : 14, where He is described as "the beginning of the creation of God". Understandably, Jehovah's Witnesses follow this lead. C. T. Russell, who founded the movement at the end of last century, claimed that both texts pointed to a time when Christ did not exist. In a sermon entitled "When God was Alone", Russell maintained: "There was a time before that beginning of creation when Jehovah God was alone. . . . Not even the great Michael was with Him, the great Messiah, whom God has so highly honoured and whom He declares He will still further honour through a glorious eternity. He was not with the Father before the beginning of creation; for He Himself was 'the beginning of the creation of God'—'the firstborn of every creature' . . . He was the first expression or manifestation of the divine attributes" (*Pastor Russell's Sermons*, p. 483).

Russell also followed Arius in maintaining that after creating His Son, Jehovah used Him as His instrument in bringing about the rest of creation. The Logos was "Jehovah God's first creative act" and ranked above "all other sons of God" because not one of them was, like Himself, "the direct creation of Jehovah". Christ was "the active agent of Jehovah in all His subsequent creative work". Because of this, He was not only the firstborn of all creation but also "the last of Jehovah's creations" (*op. cit.* p. 491).

J. F. Rutherford, who led the movement after the founder's death, followed Russell's views. Expounding Revelation 3 : 14 and Colossians 1 : 15, he too claimed that "the Logo was the first and only direct creation of Jehovah, and thereafter God's creation was performed through his Logos" (*Harp of God*, p. 99).

More recent Jehovah's Witness publications, all of which are now published anonymously in the name of the society, repeat Russell and Rutherford almost parrot-fashion. After God created His Son, He used Him as "his working-partner in the creating of all the rest of creation" (*Let God Be True*, p. 33). The Son was "created by the everlasting God, Jehovah, without the aid or instrumentality of any mother" and was then used to create everything else (*The Kingdom is at Hand*, p. 46 f.).

Because Revelation 3 : 14 and Colossians 1 : 15 are quoted so often by Jehovah's Witnesses to support their view that Christ was created by God, it will be necessary to consider these verses in some detail—and in their context! In Colossians 1 : 15 (R.V.) Christ is described as "the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation". The original reads *prototokos pases ktiseos*. *Prototokos* means properly the firstborn of a father or mother or the firstborn of animals. Used figuratively it is equivalent to "the first" or "the chief" and points to pre-eminence. *Prototokos* does not mean "first-created". This would require something like *protoktistos*. Moreover, it is important to notice that in the context the point at issue is not so much the Son's relation to the Father but rather the Son's relation to the whole of

creation. Colossians 1 : 15 means that Christ is superior over, and existed before, all creation.

Vincent Taylor discusses the use of the title "firstborn" and concludes that "the Pauline passages, and in particular Colossians 1 : 15 and 18, imply that Christ occupies a place of absolute supremacy" (*The Names of Jesus*, p. 148). He agrees with Lightfoot that the phrase "firstborn of all creation" means that Christ stands in the relationship of firstborn to all creation. Noting that the phrase was included in the baptismal creed of Caesarea, he says : "Its future was compromised by its ambiguity, and at Nicaea the inclusion of 'homouosios', 'of one substance', was felt to be necessary to safeguard the essential divinity of Christ". He adds : "In the intention of St. Paul, however, there is no ambiguity ; the name describes Christ as sovereign Lord before creation" (*op. cit.*, p. 149). The New English Bible translators have rendered the phrase, "His is the primacy over all created things".

Jehovah's Witnesses translate Revelation 3 : 14 as "the beginning of creation by God" (New World Translation). In support they give a cross reference to Proverbs 8 : 22, which they prefer in its Septuagint form : "The Lord formed me as the beginning of his way, the first of his works of old". The Arians also used this latter verse as one of their chief proof texts that the Son, God's Wisdom, was not eternal. Those who disagreed with them pointed out that although the Hebrew *qanah* could mean "create" it could also mean "acquire" or "possess". The orthodox also said that it was foolish to argue that God created wisdom, for it suggested that He was devoid of it until He had done so.

Regarding Revelation 3 : 14, everything depends on the meaning of "beginning", a word which is obviously ambiguous. Jehovah's Witnesses claim it means that Christ had a beginning. Christians maintain it means no more than that Christ was the One through whom the creation was performed : in other words, He began it. It should be noted that God also is described as "the beginning" in Revelation 21 : 6. No Jehovah's Witness would claim from this that there was a time when Jehovah Himself came into existence, yet it is precisely the same word, *arche*, which is used to describe Him. The New English Bible seems to have given the best translation of Revelation 3 : 14 : Christ is "the prime source of all God's creation".

* * * *

It will have been observed from all that is written above, that although Jehovah's Witnesses deny the eternity of the Son, they do not deny His pre-existence. On the contrary, His pre-existence forms a very important part of their doctrine of Christ's Person. Russell was quite definite that Christ had an existence before coming to earth and put forward two propositions that still form the basis of the Jehovah's Witness view.

- (1) Our Redeemer existed as a spirit being before He was made flesh and dwelt amongst men.
- (2) At that time, as well as subsequently, he was properly known as "a god"—a mighty one. As chief of the angels, the next to the

Father, He was known as the Archangel Michael (*Studies in the Scriptures*).

One of Russell's sermon headings, "A God But Not The God", has remained a Jehovah's Witness slogan to this day. Noting the plural form of the Hebrew *elohim*, Russell had commented in that sermon: "Thus we read in Genesis 'The Elohim (Gods) said, Let us make man in our image'. This would very properly apply to the Heavenly Father and the Heavenly Son." He explained *elohim* as "the mighty, the powerful, the great" and said the word could be used of the Logos, angels (Psalm 8 : 5), and judges (Exodus 21 : 6) (*Pastor Russell's Sermons*, p. 497).

In the light of all this, Russell felt justified in translating John 1 : 1-2, "In the beginning was the Word (Logos) and the Word (Logos) was a God. The same was in the beginning with the God. By him were all things made and without him was not anything made that was made" (*Pastor Russell's Sermons*, p. 491). He claimed that the Authorized Version misrepresented the Greek but that his own version showed "the fine distinction of the Greek original" and made it so simple that even a child could understand its meaning (*op. cit.* p. 497).

Rutherford's view was essentially the same. Christ pre-existed in glory with the Father before the world existed, but He was God only in a secondary sense. Rutherford too felt it necessary to paraphrase John 1 : 1 and his version reads: "In the beginning (which means the beginning of God's creative activity) was the Logos, and the Logos was with God (the God, Jehovah), and the Logos was God (a mighty one)" (*Harp of God*, p. 99).

Modern Jehovah's Witness writers follow this lead. One says: "Being a mighty one and holding this high official capacity as Logos and being before all other creatures, he was a God, but not the Almighty God, who is Jehovah" (*Let God Be True*, pp. 33f). He approves of his movement's New World Translation of John 1: 1, "Originally the Word was, and the Word was with God, and the Word was a god".

This distinction between "the God" and "a god" is not new. G. L. Prestige discusses it in *God in Patristic Thought*. He says the distinction between *theos* (God) and *ho theos* (the God) had its origin in Philo and was imported into Christian theology by Origen, who distinguished between *autotheos* (the Supreme Being who is Absolute God) and the Logos. Prestige comments: "All that is deified, he observes, by participation in the Godhead of the *autotheos*, ought more properly to be called not 'ho theos' but 'theos', and in that category the most honourable is the first-born of all creation, since He first, by being 'with God', drew Godhead into Himself" (*op. cit.* pp. 144f).

This distinction did not go unchallenged. Cyril quickly pointed out that in John 20 : 28 Thomas called Christ *ho theos* (the God) not *theos* (a God). Nearer our own time, Alford has made comments on John 1: 1 which are very relevant to our discussion. He has pointed out that the omission of the article before *theos* was necessary where the reference was to the Logos for *ho theos* would have identified the Word with God in such a way as to destroy the Word's distinct personality. He has also shown that *theos* without the article does not mean what Jehovah's Witnesses claim it means (a secondary god, god with a small "g")

but simply God in substance and essence (*Greek Testament*, p. 681).

Philippians 2 : 5-11 is another key-passage in the dispute between Jehovah's Witnesses and Christians. One Jehovah's Witness writer claims that the passage means that, " prior to coming to earth, this only-begotten Son of God did not think himself to be co-equal with Jehovah God ; he did not view himself as ' equal in power and glory ' with Almighty God ; he did not follow the course of the devil and plot and scheme to make himself like or equal to the Most High God or usurp God's place. On the contrary, he showed his subjection to God as his Superior by humbling himself under God's almighty hand, even to the most extreme degree, which means to a most disgraceful death on a torture stake " (*Let God Be True*, pp. 34f.).

The Authorized Version's " in the form of God " was not a very happy translation of the Greek *en morphē theou*. Lightfoot and Gifford maintained that *morphe*'s meaning was close to that of *ousia* (essence). The *morphe* of a person or object is that person's or object's essential, unchangeable nature. To be *en morphē theou*, therefore, is to have the essential, unchangeable nature of God.

Another important word in this passage is *harpagmos*. This may be taken in an active or a passive sense. If it is active, it refers to the act of seizing : hence the AV's " robbery ". Understood in this sense, it is asserting the majesty of Christ to whom equality with God belonged as a right. In favour of this view is the fact that nouns ending *-mos* are usually active. Against it is the fact that the passage is dealing with Christ's humility rather than with His majesty.

The passive meaning of *harpagmos* would be " a thing seized " or " a prize ". The phrase would then mean either that Christ did not count equality with God as a prize to be snatched, or that He did not count it as a prize to be retained. The latter seems to fit in better with Paul's theology generally. Thus Lightfoot paraphrases, " He did not treat his equality with God as a prize, a treasure, to be greedily clutched or ostentatiously displayed."

A third word has to be considered, *ekenose*. It means literally " He emptied Himself ". The question then arises, " Of what did He empty Himself ? " Some would say He emptied Himself of His divinity, of the *morphe theou*, and this would favour the Jehovah's Witnesses' view that whereas Christ pre-existed as a divine spirit being, at Bethlehem He became instead a human being. The word must be understood, however, in the light of the passage as a whole. If, as we have maintained, *en morphē theou* indicates that Christ possessed the essential, unchangeable nature of Deity, then this is something of which He could not have emptied Himself. The context suggests that it was not of the divine nature but of the divine prerogatives that Jesus emptied Himself. In other words, He did not cease to be God, but He ceased to be treated as God.

* * * *

2. The Human Christ

Jehovah's Witnesses believe that when Jesus Christ was alive in the flesh He was simply and solely a human being—no more, and no less. From the first Russell had dismissed the idea of two natures in the one

Christ. Jesus was not "a combination of two natures, human and spiritual" for such a "blending" would produce "neither the one nor the other, but an imperfect hybrid thing, which is obnoxious to the divine arrangement". That being so, "when Jesus was in the flesh, he was a perfect human being; previous to that time, he was a perfect spiritual being; and since his resurrection he is a perfect spiritual being" (*Studies in the Scriptures*).

Russell and his followers have given strange definitions of the Incarnation and then rejected them without really trying to discover what Christians actually mean by Incarnation. Russell claimed that it meant "assuming a human body" by means of some kind of materialization such as that of the angels who appeared to Abraham (Genesis 18 : 1-2). He pointed out that Jesus did not *assume* flesh but *became* flesh; He did not *appear to be* man, but *was* man; and that to *become* flesh and to *be* man involved divesting Himself "of that glorious condition on the spirit plane" and exchanging it for human nature (*Pastor Russell's Sermons*, pp. 659f.).

Rutherford defined Incarnation as the view that while on earth Jesus was still a spirit being and that "his flesh was merely a covering or house in which that spirit being resided" (*Harp of God*, p.102). He then set out his own view. Jesus was begotten in the womb of the Virgin Mary by the Holy Spirit and was born in the same general manner as other children are born of women. He grew to manhood and increased in stature and in favour with God and man. "None of these things would have been necessary", claimed Rutherford, "were he merely an incarnated being, a spirit being inhabiting a body of flesh." Likewise Christ's sojourn in the wilderness would have been "wholly unnecessary" if He had been God incarnate (*op. cit.*, p. 103).

What Rutherford said about the connection between the pre-existent Christ and the human Christ is rather striking and, as we shall see, raises certain problems. "The germ of him who was born Jesus was transferred from the spirit plane or nature to the human plane or nature." Therefore "Jesus was not a sinner. He was pure, holy, sinless, without spot or blemish" (*op. cit.*, p. 98). Two more recent writers are even more specific. One says: "At the time that the young woman conceived by the miracle-working power of Almighty God then the life of the Son of God was transferred from his glorious position with God his Father in heaven to the embryo of a human" (*Let God Be True*, p. 36). The other attempts a more biological explanation of this phenomenon. "The life-force of Jesus as 'the Word' in heaven was transferred from heaven to the ovum or egg-cell in the womb of the unmarried Mary, and thereby she was blessed with the privilege of supplying Jesus' human body. It was a perfect body, because its life was not from the sinner Adam, but was the original life of the Word from the great Life-giver Jehovah-God." Tying in this view with Philippians 2 : 5-11, this writer continued: "That the heavenly Word of God divested himself as a God-like spirit, except his life-force, and that he lowered himself to become no more than a perfect man, his inspired apostle bears witness" (*The Kingdom is at Hand*, p. 49).

It is seriously to be doubted whether Jehovah's Witnesses have

thought out the full implications of this view. They maintain that when on earth Jesus was a perfect human being, no more and no less. But if the "life", "germ of life", or "life-force" of the pre-existent heavenly Logos became the source of the sinless life of the earthly Jesus, surely Jesus becomes more than a human being. Mary supplied His human body, but God supplied the supernatural life of the Logos to vitalize that body. Jesus becomes, it would seem, a human body in which a divine spirit lives, which is precisely the point Rutherford argues against orthodox Christians in the *Harb of God* (p. 103). The Jehovah's Witnesses' view leads logically to this error.

But this is only one of their difficulties. They trace a connection between the pre-existent Logos or Michael and the human Jesus by means of this transference of the life-force of the one to the body of the other. What connection is there between the earthly Jesus and the exalted Christ who is in their view, a spirit being once more? All that there was of the human Jesus was offered as a sacrifice at Calvary, they affirm. Does this include whatever was transferred from heaven to the human embryo? If so, then what was raised? Or to look at the problem in a slightly different way, if the humanity of Jesus was something He sacrificed at Calvary forever, should not Jehovah's Witnesses speak of what followed on the first Easter morning as a re-creation rather than a resurrection? I have seen no solution to this problem in any of their literature.

Perhaps the problem could be solved as follows. Jehovah's Witnesses could say that the life-force of the Logos was present in each phase of the Son's existence. This would mean they would have to re-write a great deal of their doctrine, for this view would make the human Jesus more than a mere man. The alternative would seem to be to say there is no real connection between the three phases of Christ's existence, but this would mean that Christ was not just one divine creative act (as their present theology claims) but three separate and independent divine creative acts.

Regarding attacks by Jehovah's Witnesses on the orthodox Christian doctrine of the Incarnation, it cannot be stated too emphatically that the views they set forward as those of orthodox Christianity are not those found in any of the credal statements of the Christian churches. Christians do not believe that Jesus materialized "just as he and the angels did back in the time of Abraham" (*Pastor Russell's Sermons*, p. 659). Nor do they believe in "a spirit being inhabiting a body of flesh" (*Harb of God*, p. 103). Incarnation is a word coined by the Christian Church to give full expression to such teaching as that contained in John 1 : 1, namely, that One who was fully God was born as Man, and that the result of this birth was a unique Person, One who was perfect God and perfect Man. Jehovah's Witnesses are entitled to disagree with this view, if they wish, but it is intellectually dishonest of them to misrepresent the Christian view and then to condemn us for their own misrepresentation.

It needs to be stressed that Christians are as anxious as Jehovah's Witnesses to safeguard the reality of Christ's humanity. They would agree heartily with Russell that Jesus really *was* man and did not simply appear to be man. Despite what Rutherford said (*Harb of God*, p. 102),

Christians do not hold that the flesh of Jesus was merely a covering or house in which a divine being dwelt. As we have shown, it is the Jehovah's Witness view which is more likely to give rise to this error. As for the Christian Church, however, from her earliest days she was strongly opposed to all tendencies to undermine the reality of Christ's humanity. Docetism was a heresy rejected by Christians as far back as the Fourth Gospel.

The Christian view may be summarized as follows. The Son, who had been with the Father from all eternity, became Man, being born of the Virgin Mary. He did not cease to be God when He was born at Bethlehem, but in addition He took upon Himself a real human nature. He is to be regarded, therefore, as a Unique Person, Perfect God and Perfect Man.

In contrast with this, Jehovah's Witnesses maintain that Jesus on earth was a mere man. Despite this claim, however, they make Him more than a man, for His life-force is that of the pre-existent Logos. In fact, it may be said of them, as it was said of the Arians before them, that their Christ is neither God nor man but a kind of intermediate being between the two, a demi-god, a secondary god, and quite definitely a god with a small "g". To worship Him, therefore, is to practise idolatry.

This charge of Arianism is not abuse of Jehovah's Witnesses by bigoted Christians. Jehovah's Witnesses are ready to concede that they follow the teaching of Arius. They see in him a champion of the true minority view against the erroneous majority view of the insincere ecclesiastics, who, they claim, were perverting Christian truth with their man-made and devil-inspired dogmas.

Marley Cole, in a book favouring the movement, sets out the Jehovah's Witnesses' interpretation of this period of church history. By A.D. 100 apostasy was rife within the Christian Church and it developed over the years into several distinct schisms. "Then", says Cole, "Constantine hit upon the idea of a compound faith as a solution. He called together the religious leaders of the Empire to Nicea in Asia Minor in the year 325. The purpose of the conclave was to set down a body of religious doctrines that would suit everybody. There would be one universal, or catholic, code of religion; ruling the Empire would be easier with the churches organized."

However, not everyone agreed with the Nicene doctrines. "Arius spoke up for the dissident Christians," taking issue with the Council over the doctrine of the Trinity. As a result, he was condemned by the pagan Caesar, Constantine. "From the time that the Nicene Creed was promulgated and accepted," Cole continues, "there was practically no more Bible study for more than twelve centuries"; the Church veered right away from Scripture. "A hierarchical system of pagan origin took the place of the congregational system of Christian origin. . . . The authority of man-made doctrines and traditions replaced the God-breathed authority of the Scriptures" (*Jehovah's Witnesses*, pp. 45f.).

The facts of history force upon us a very different interpretation of what happened at Nicea. It is probable that Constantine understood very little of what was being discussed by the Council. Earlier he had

expressed the view that the differences between Arians and non-Arians were so insignificant that there was no need to discuss them. In his opinion, they were simply a quibble about mere words. No doubt his primary concern was the unity of the Empire, but his idea of encouraging unity was to let the whole matter drop, not to force Arians to accept a non-Arian point of view. If the emperor had had his way, this is what would have happened. But the Christian leaders had other ideas. Arius was not condemned simply on political grounds, therefore, but because the Council came to the conclusion that the view expressed by him and his supporters undermined and endangered the Christian idea of redemption.

In view of their interpretation of what happened at Nicea, it is not surprising to find that Jehovah's Witnesses agree with Arians on every major point. We are not "smearing" Jehovah's Witnesses when we call them Twentieth Century Arians. Our name is their claim.

* * * *

3. *The Exalted Christ*

Jehovah's Witnesses hold that it was necessary for Jesus to be a perfect man—no more and no less—in order that He might do His atoning work. When Adam disobeyed God, a perfect man sinned. To right this wrong and its consequences for the whole human race, it was necessary for another perfect man to forfeit his right to life. It was essential, therefore, that Jesus should be a perfect man "to meet the exactness of God's perfect law". It follows, say Jehovah's Witnesses, that to make atonement Jesus had to sacrifice His humanity for ever. That being so, when He was raised from the dead, He was no longer human in any sense of that word. "Because Jesus was bound to lay aside his humanity for ever as a sacrifice, God begot him by his spirit to become again a spirit Son of God. . . . So he laid down his humanity for ever" (*Let God Be True*, pp. 39f.). Logically, Jehovah's Witnesses deny the orthodox interpretation of Christ's resurrection and ascension. At His resurrection, they say, He did not take back a human body, but He returned to that spirit state He had enjoyed before He became a man.

However, more is involved in Christ's resurrection than a mere return to this pre-human state. "Our Lord was not only raised up out of death, but raised up as a new Creature, to a still higher nature than that which He had before he undertook the Father's commission to be the world's Redeemer, Prophet, Priest, and King. His resurrection was (Phil. 2 : 10) to glory, honour, and immortality, far above human nature, angelic nature, principalities and powers and every name that is named" (*Pastor Russell's Sermons*, p. 74).

Rutherford speaks of the risen Christ as the express image of Jehovah God. He says Jesus was begotten to the divine nature at His baptism and born on the divine plane to the divine nature at His resurrection. Therefore, "when he was raised from the dead he was both Lord and Christ." As "Lord" means one who owns and "Christ" means one appointed by Jehovah, the risen and exalted Christ is "both owner of

all things and endued with power and authority to carry out Jehovah's plan" (*Harp of God*, p. 168).

How then are we to explain Christ's resurrection appearances? Jehovah's Witnesses have their answer. After being exalted, Christ had power to create fleshly bodies at any time and then dissolve them when their purpose had been fulfilled. Rutherford maintains, however, that a materialized body was not essential to Christ's exalted nature and he denies that Christ ascended with one. "The body with which he ascended on high and which he has in heaven is a glorious body which no man can look upon and live except by the miraculous power of Jehovah." In this glorious state Christ may be described as "a divine being" (*op. cit.*, pp. 171f.).

It follows that because they believe Christ is now invisible, Jehovah's Witnesses do not expect a visible second advent of Christ. He returned invisibly in 1914. "The world will see him no more" (*Let God Be True*, p. 138).

The last half-dozen paragraphs will have raised many questions in the minds of Christians who know their Bibles. We shall content ourselves with the following comment.

Are Jehovah's Witnesses right in affirming the necessity for Jesus to be man—no more and no less—in order that He might ransom us? Surely the New Testament doctrine of atonement is quite the opposite. It was necessary for God to send His own divine Son because no one who was *only* human could redeem us. The weakness of the Witnesses' view is that it drives a great gulf between the Father and the Son. Christ the man wrings out of God the Judge an unwilling pardon for humanity. The Christian view is that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself. God, through His own Son, was doing something for us that we could not do for ourselves.

1 Timothy 2 : 5 is a sufficient denial of the view that Christ is no longer man : "There is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus." Bishop Wordsworth was right when he wrote,

"Thou hast raised our human nature
On the clouds to God's Right Hand."
