

Monogenés: Only-Begotten

- “For God (Theos) so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten (monogenés) Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” John 3:16

In this verse, God (the Father) - Theos, is saying that He gave His Son for us. Theos is a singular noun and grammatically cannot mean three persons.

- “And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten (monogenés) of the Father,) full of grace and truth.” John 1:14

Christ possesses the glory of His Father by Divine birth. Yet, Trinitarians take this verse and the adjective monogenes as evidence for their doctrine: Jesus in the Old Testament before His coming to the earth wasn't a Son, but rather only became the Son upon His coming. What does the Spirit of Prophecy say? It's totally clear that the title “Only-Begotten” applies to Christ in heaven before His coming to the earth:

- “The dedication of the *first-born* had its origin in the **earliest** times. God had promised to give the **First-born of heaven** to save the sinner.” Ellen White: Desire of Ages, p. 51.1

Often it is claimed that the notion “Only-Begotten” means “Unique of its kind,” and not an only Son, and that the title of the Son was just an “earthly role.” That is an abuse of language, of a similar kind to how God's name of Elohim is claimed to signify the Trinity in plurality. Does the expression “‘monogenes’ means ‘only’ means ‘unique’” only apply to Jesus? What does the Bible say?

- “For he (Jairus) **had one only daughter (monogenés)**, about twelve years of age, and she lay a dying...” Luke 8:42
- “And, behold, a man of the company cried out, saying, Master, I beseech thee, look upon my son: for he is mine **only child (monogenés)**.” Luke 9:38

Monogenés is an exclusive characteristic of the only child in a family, not some new symbolic type of Son, as we see in the case of Jairus the Roman centurion and his only daughter, his monogenes. Does God maybe have another literal Son? No, that's why He so clearly says that only Jesus is His unique, only-begotten Son! This word exclusively signifies number and affiliation, despite others' attempts to prove it means something it doesn't - that Jesus was only a Son on earth! The whole Bible says that Jesus was always a Son!

- “Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God: and every one that **loveth him that begat** (God the Father) **loveth him also that is begotten of him** (Jesus).” 1 John 5:1

Here we read that anyone who is born of God first believes in God the Father and Jesus, His only-begotten. It doesn't explain the specifics of how He was begotten, yet the Bible clearly explains that Jesus wasn't created as we were. But this verse nevertheless also confirms that Jesus was literally begotten of God the Father. If we had only taken this verse in isolation, as the Trinitarians do with many texts, then according to that principle we could say that Jesus is a created Being. But that would obscure the fact of Jesus' birth in heaven, which the above verse clearly indicates. Who was the one who sought to obscure that Jesus is the literal only-begotten Son? Satan himself:

- “Angels were expelled from heaven because they would not work in harmony with God. They fell from their high estate because they wanted to be exalted. They had come to exalt themselves, and they forgot that their beauty of person and of character came from the Lord Jesus. **This fact the [fallen] angels would obscure, that Christ was the *only begotten Son of God*, and they came to consider that they were not to consult Christ.**” Ellen White, This Day with God, p 128.2, **1910!**

As we see in the above quote, Ellen White hadn't accepted the Trinity even in 1910, but rather again extremely clearly emphasized that even before Satan's rebellion Jesus was the literal only begotten Son of God the Father!

Despite such clear facts, you will ultimately encounter the following "arguments" that since Isaac was Abraham's "only begotten" despite not being his only son, this "proves that this doesn't mean just one son, and therefore neither is Jesus truly the only begotten Son of God the Father in heaven." Unbelievable argumentation from trinitarians!

- "By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his **only begotten son**, Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called:" Hebrews 11:17-18

How could Isaac be called the only begotten, when Abraham had other children? Does God, in His word, wisdom and purposes, contradict Himself?

- "**Abraham** had accepted without question the promise of a son, but **he did not wait for God to fulfill His word in His own time and way. A delay was permitted, to test his faith in the power of God; but he failed to endure the trial.** Thinking it impossible that a child should be given her in her old age, Sarah suggested, as a plan by which the divine purpose might be fulfilled, that one of her handmaidens should be taken by Abraham as a secondary wife." Ellen White, Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 145.1

Could the only begotten, promised by God to Abraham, come from any woman? Could the promise of God be changed, since Abraham had manservants and maidservants by the hundreds? Abraham didn't understand the representation that God had intended for his faithful servant.

- "When Abraham was nearly one hundred years old, **the promise of a son was repeated to him, with the assurance that the future heir should be the child of Sarah. But Abraham did not yet understand the promise...** Again the promise was given, in words that could not be mistaken: 'Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son **indeed**; and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish My covenant with him.'" Ellen White, Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 146.1

Although Abraham his son Ishmael from his servant Hagar, God made the promise exclusively in the marriage between Abraham and Sarah! God truly wanted Isaac to be Abraham's only begotten son.

Below we can see why Isaac represents the One who will come:

- "It was to impress Abraham's mind with the reality of the gospel, as well as to test his faith, that God commanded him to slay his son. The agony which he endured during the dark days of that fearful trial was permitted that he might understand from his own experience something of the greatness of the sacrifice made by the infinite God for man's redemption. **No other test could have caused Abraham such torture of soul as did the offering of his son.** God gave His Son to a death of agony and shame. The angels who witnessed the humiliation and soul anguish of the Son of God were not permitted to interpose, as in the case of Isaac. There was no voice to cry, 'It is enough.' To save the fallen race, the King of glory yielded up His life. What stronger proof can be given of the infinite compassion and love of God? 'He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?' Romans 8:32." Ellen White, Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 154.2

In Abraham and Isaac, **the only begotten son from Sarah**, we see a representation of the great sacrifice. The enemy tried with all his might to prevent such a clear message to future generations, but God's promises are faithful and true!

Since Isaac was a type of Jesus and His sacrifice, he was also called the only begotten, to lead our thoughts to Jesus and teach us of Him, just as how through Abraham we view God's terrible sorrow as He sacrificed His Son on the cross.

Abraham, Isaac and Sarah weren't sinless, and neither was Isaac only begotten the way Jesus was, but on a human level they revealed and proclaimed Christ's sacrifice.

So it is totally meaningless to try to use the only begotten Isaac as proof that in the case of Jesus it doesn't mean that He was the only Son of God the Father.

By that reasoning we could also try to claim that since Isaac was sinful, Jesus was therefore also sinful. Hereby we see whence comes this whole teaching of refuting the fact that Jesus is truly the only begotten heavenly Son of God the Father.

Sadly, as an addition to this "logic," our highest theologians have begun spreading claims the Codex Sinaiticus, which comes from spiritualist Alexandria, contains proof that Jesus isn't truly the Son. What does Helena P. Blavatsky, the founder of modern spiritism, a declared satanist and indirect organizer of the changes in all modern Bible versions?

In her books "Isis Unveiled" Vol. 1 & 2 and "The Secret Doctrine" Vol. 1 & 2, we find the following:

- "...we have the Bible in true in Codex Sinaiticus (κ) and Codex Vaticanus (B)."
- "Westcott and Hort were true scholars that corrected the errors in previous versions."

Although all modern manipulations of the Bible are based on these Codices, which are described in more detail in Chapter 75, even in these codices we find the word γεννάω (gennaō) in all its forms, which means "I beget, bring forth, give birth to".