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Can you understand who God is? Is God some sort of fathomless mystery of a trinity that we Human beings cannot grasp? Is Jesus very God, or was he just a human being like some cults and religions profess? This booklet will shock and surprise you!

Can God be known? Has God left us something to us human beings, his creation, that will be able to help us understand God, who is our creator? The answer is an absolute yes! God has left us his handbook that tell us everything we need to know about who God is, who were are, who is Jesus Christ, and what the very purpose of Human Life is. And that revelation to us from him is, THE BIBLE!

But is God a Trinity? This is the most common belief in the Christian world today that God is a Trinity of One God in three persons! But many people do not understand that explanation of God. Some people say God is an absolute one and that Jesus was an angel or something else entirely. We have the Jesus only movements, the Unitarians, the Jehovah’s Witnesses that have their own concepts about God. All proclaim their belief is from the Bible. But does God want us confused like this? How can his word cause so much confusion? But is it God that causes this confusion or is it men, and Satan the devil? “For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints” (1 Corinthians 14:33). No this confusion does not come from God, so it must come from men, and their ideas about God, with of course the “the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.” (2 Corinthians 4:4). Yes its Satan the devil who has “blinded the minds” of men, this is why there is so much confusion about God.

But can God still be known? Absolutely! Jesus said, “All things are delivered to me of my Father: and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him” (Luke 10:22). Jesus came to reveal the Father. Even in the Old Testament God says the same thing, “But let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the LORD...” (Jer 9:24). God can be known, and when we do know it, we should glory in it, that we know the true and the living God. After you read this, God willing you will glory in it as well.

Before we look into the Bible to see Who God really is, let’s first answer some of the questions about the origins of the trinity, and some of the doctrines about Christ by the Jehovah’s Witnesses and the Church of Christ as well, who deny the divinity of Christ. Are these arguments that these groups claim reasonable and biblical? Let’s examine them and discover the truth.

**The Trinity**

A large portion of my life I have heard that God was a Trinity of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. And because that was my faith and just took the teaching for granted without question, I did not look into it myself, and also I left it up to the priests to explain it, it wasn’t my job. Most people fall into that category of leaving it up to the professionals, and so the confusion about God continues-and it grows so the world will not understand and know God, as Jesus asked the question of his second coming, “Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?” (Luke 18:8). Is the Trinity biblical? Don’t you find it strange that the word “Trinity”
is not in the Bible? But is the concept of the Trinity in the Bible of one God in three persons? The answer is a SURPRISING NO!

What are the origins of the Trinity? Where did it actually come from? The Unger’s Bible Dictionary says “The formal statement, however, is legitimately and necessarily deduced from the Scriptures of the New Testament” (Unger’s Bible Dictionary, art. Trinity. Chicago: Moody Press, 1966). Notice it did not say the Old Testament, just the New. But even in the New Testament you do not find a formal statement in the scriptures to a trinity. The closest thing you find to an actual statement is from the Athanasian Creed. Further, the Creed informs us, “One cannot be saved without believing this firmly and faithfully.” But its vehemence merely highlights its flimsy substance!

Let’s notice what the New Catholic Encyclopedia, article, “Holy Trinity,” has to say: “It is difficult, in the second half of the 20th century, to offer a clear, objective, and straightforward account of the revelation, doctrinal evolution, and theological elaboration of the mystery of the Trinity. Trinitarian discussion, Roman Catholic as well as other, presents a somewhat unsteady silhouette. Two things have happened. There is the recognition on the part of exegetes and Biblical theologians, including a constantly growing number of Roman Catholics that one should not speak of Trinitarianism in the New Testament without serious qualification. There is also the closely parallel recognition on the part of historians of dogma and systematic theologians that when one does speak of an unqualified Trinitarianism, one has moved from the period of Christian origins, say, the last quadrant of the fourth century. It was only then that what might be called the definitive Trinitarian dogma ‘One God in three Persons’ became thoroughly assimilated into Christian life and thought. Herein lies the difficulty. On the one hand, it was the dogmatic formula ‘One God in three Persons’ that would henceforth for more than 15 centuries structure and guide the Trinitarian essence of the Christian message, both in the profession of faith and in theological dialect. On the other hand, the formula itself does not reflect the immediate consciousness of the period or origins; it was the product of three centuries of doctrinal development. But current preoccupation and current emphasis is far less with the subsequent articulations of Christian dogma than with the primitive sources, chiefly the Biblical. It is this contemporary return to the sources that is ultimately responsible for the unsteady silhouette” (emphasis added).

Amazing! Not only do Catholic theologians acknowledge that the current concept of “one God in three persons” (“definitive Trinitarian dogma,” or “qualified” Trinitarianism) was not generally Taught by Christians until the latter part of the fourth century, they admit that when people return to “the primitive sources” - particularly the Holy Bible-serious questions arise concerning the accepted concept of the nature of God.

It is evident that, by the fourth century, Christian thought had been strongly influenced by the cultures within which it existed. This fact is acknowledged by numerous theologians and historians, “The missionary requirements of the task of the early Christian theologian were dictated, naturally, by the kind of theology then emerging from the dominant religious vision of the culture within which emerging Christianity then had to grapple” (Westminster Dictionary of Christian Theology, p.582).
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According to the same source, the trinity doctrine as we know it today “owes more to the controversial needs of [the fourth century] and to the religious imagery accepted by Christians and non-Christians alike at that time than to any other influence either before or since” (p. 581). As the Catholic Encyclopedia says it “was the product of three centuries of doctrinal development.” In the writings of a lot of the so-called “Church Fathers” we see a continual mixture of trying to fit Greek Philosophy with the Bible. As it continued and especially into the 4th century the concept of the Trinity finally took its full form.

Donna and Mal Broadhurst writes, “The problem with gentile Christians was...their excessive fascination with their Greek Philosophical speculations, which conditioned their understanding of biblical truths...Gentile Christians often erred in the direction of philosophical speculations which sundered Christianity from its historical roots” (Passover: Before Messiah and After, p.142, emphasis added). These speculations are extant all over the early writings to justify Sunday as the Lord’s Day and not the Sabbath, the immortality of the Human soul, and also the Trinity.

The Development of the Trinity Doctrine

The Christian leaders following the apostles did not allude to a Trinity, but rather they affirmed their belief in the monotheism of the Old Testament and accepted without question the deity and the humanity of Jesus Christ (see Otto Heick, A History of Christian Thought (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1965), I, 46-48). When you read of the ministers of God’s church after the death of the apostles, the Biblical definition of God they use is from the Old and New Testaments. These are “Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD:” (Deuteronomy 6:4), and what Jesus said about himself and the Father, “I and my Father are one” (John 10:30). This is the “Shema” of the New Testament.

What you see is duality in their writings of the Father as God and the Son as God. Now how can God be one? We will examine biblical oneness that the apostles understood in the Old and New Testaments of the duality of the Godhead and how there are one later in the booklet.

But notice first their writings. We will go into the bible’s definition of God later in the booklet but first let’s focus on the centuries following the apostles.

You do not find a belief of a trinity but a duality of the Godhead of Father and Son. The Four Major authors of writings immediately following the death of the last of the 12 apostles, John, were CLEMENT, IGNATIUS, POLYCARP and HERMAS. This is called the Post Apostolic Age.

Ignatius 110-117 AD

Ignatius wrote words testifying that Jesus was the One God manifest in the flesh. In His Epistle to the Ephesians he says of Jesus, “By the will of the Father and of Jesus Christ, our God” (1:1 salutation). And “God Himself being manifested in human form” (19). He believed Jesus was very God and so did the church he was writing to. It was common knowledge as we shall see later.
In the Epistle to the Trallians he writes: “Jesus Christ our God” (7) The Epistle to the Romans: “Jesus Christ our God” (salutation). “The passion [suffering] of my God” (6).

Now what of the Father? He wrote, Magnesians 6, Jesus was “with the Father before the beginning of time.” And in the Epistle to the Smyrnaeans: “I glorify God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Here we see a duality of belief in these early Epistles of the church.

There are FEW phrases that some try to interpret as Trinitarian, but the same phrases are easily regarded as Oneness; the manner that the New Testament threefold references are taken. Similar to 2 Cor. 13:14 and 1 Peter 1:2, we read from Ignatius in Ephesians 9 that God the Father, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit are mentioned in distinguishing aspects of salvation.

Saints are, “prepared for the building of God the Father, and drawn up on high by the instrument of Jesus Christ, which is the cross, making use of the Holy Spirit as a rope.” We are thus said to be saved (designed to be God’s Temple) through Jesus’ atoning death which is applied to us by the regenerating work of the Holy Ghost (which is the power of God explain later).

**POLYCARP 110-117 AD**

All we have of Polycarp is a brief Epistle to the Philippians. Polycarp said, “God and our Lord” (1) He said Jesus Christ was “our Lord and God” (6) and “the Son of God” (12).

In chapter 12, Polycarp prayed, “the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ Himself, who is the Son of God, and our everlasting High Priest, build you up in faith and truth”. Here again we see the belief of one God consisting of the Father and the Son, a duality of the God Head.

**HERMAS**

The Hermas of The Shepherd is not the Hermas as found in Romans 16:14. The letter The Shepherd was written in 140-145 A.D. He is claimed to be the brother of Pius, Bishop of Rome, according to the Muratorian Fragment written in 170 A.D.

Notice what he says about the Son: “The Son of God is older than all His creatures, so that He was a fellow-councilor with the Father in His work of creation” (Similitude 9:12). Jesus and the Father created everything. He believed that Jesus Was God in the flesh, he wrote, “The holy, pre-existent Spirit that created every creature, God made to dwell in flesh, which He chose. This flesh, accordingly, in which the Holy Spirit dwelt, was nobly subject to that Spirit” (Sim. 5:6). Clearly here a belief in the duality of the Godhead of Father and Son. The Holy Spirit mentioned dwelt in Christ as shown in the scriptures, and was under Jesus’ power in his pre-existent life. The dwelling of the Holy Spirit we will deal with later in the booklet.

**Clement of Rome - 96 AD**

Clement of Rome believed also that Jesus is God. He wrote that God suffered: “Content with the provision which God had made for you, and carefully attending to His words, ye were inwardly filled with the doctrine, and His sufferings were before your eyes.” Clement called the Father the
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Creator: “Father and creator of the universe” (19); “Creator and Lord of all” (20,33) “Creator and Father of all worlds, the most holy”(35); “only benefactor of spirits and God of all flesh... the Savior of those in despair, the Creator and Guardian of every spirit” (59). Clement consistently called Jesus “our Lord”, which title He also gave to the Father. Clearly he believed in the duality of the God Head. From I Clement, only one sentence may allude to a Trinity: “Let us cleave, therefore, to the innocent and righteous, since these are the elect of God. Why are there strife’s, and tumults, and divisions, and schisms, and wars among you? Have we not [all] one God and one Christ? Is there not one Spirit of grace poured out upon us? And have we not one calling in Christ?” (Epistle of Clement 46:17,18). But when seeing an allusion to Eph. 4:4-6, which refers to one body, one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one Baptism, one hope, and one God and Father. Eph. 4:6 refers to the titles of Lord and Spirit as being those of the one God who is Father: “One God and Father of all, who is above all [i.e., who is Lord], and through all, and in you all [i.e., who poured the Holy Spirit in you].

He also said, “…we must look on Christ as God” (An Ancient Homily of Clement, 1:1). “For as God liveth, and as the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Spirit, the confidence and hope of the elect,” (58:2).

What I have quoted speaks of God in the singular, and it speaks of salvation we have from God through Jesus Christ, thus using a twofold reference instead of a threefold reference which accepts all of that. The particular passage focuses upon salvation. We see words like, “faith”, “hope”, “elect” and “being saved”. The focus is not upon the context of the doctrine of God. We simply read of the living God and of the glorified Christ through whom God provided salvation and reveals Himself now and for eternity, and to the Holy Ghost as regenerating people.

Some might want to go into the New Testament Apocrypha to prove a trinity. But the problem with that is, these are all dated in the latter half of the 2nd, 3rd centuries and were already subject to Greek philosophies and corruption.

As for the Holy Spirit mentioned in ALL these passages: “The early Christians weren’t thinking much about the Spirit; they were busy with teaching and telling non-believers about Jesus. But as people started asking themselves questions about Jesus, how He was always with us, and how the Christian believer could be more Christ-like, the early followers found that they had to think through what they were saying about God.

“A sampling of the earliest writings confirms this vague sense of confusion. The Didache (probably the earliest of the Church’s non-Scriptural writings) uses the threefold Name once (Did 7.1.3); otherwise, the Spirit is not discussed. In First Clement, the Triune Name is used in an oath, and lies behind two other passages. Ignatius used the Triune Name several times (in Magn 13.2 and Eph 9.1), but in its parts rather than in the Matthew formula. The Martyrdom of Polycarp reports that Polycarp used the Triune Name in a doxology. Yet the Shepherd of Hermas and 2 Clement didn’t clearly distinguish the Son from the Spirit. It may be that some of these authors were Binitarian, seeing the Spirit as an spinoff of Christ or the presence of the Father. Or, they just felt no need to go into that sort of thing, stressing the united purpose within God. The written prayers of early Christians often praised the Holy Spirit toward the end of the prayer, at the same time that they praised the Father and the Son. They didn’t need to say how
or why this was so in order to do such praising. This is the Unseen Wind they were talking about, and even vague definitions may not yet have been seen as desirable or even wise. These early authors did not come right out and say ‘the Holy Spirit is God and not some separate or created entity or a divine function.’ Given how clear they were making themselves about the humanity and divinity of Jesus Christ and about the deceptive teachings of the Gnostics, it’s surprising to see such a lack of definition, especially since Gnostics used any fuzziness by the Church to boast of their own ‘inside’ knowledge. The more the Church thought about it and the more situations it lived through, the more important it became that something more was said about the Spirit. Some ideas about the Spirit were leading people away from the truth about Jesus; since the Spirit’s main task is to lead people to Christ, those ideas must be very wrong. And at some point, they knew they had to come to grips with what Scripture was saying about God, and why it refers to God in three ways.

An early sign that the Church was waking up to this came from Theophilos of Antioch. He held that the Spirit was pre-existent (that is, the Spirit was there before the universe was created), and thus definitely not a created being. Theophilos stated a Trinity as such in formalized terms (Autol. 2:15), but the form he used was God/Word/Wisdom.

Athenagoras of Athens wrote that the Holy Spirit was an ‘effluence of God, flowing forth and returning to God like a ray of the sun’ (Supp. 10). The first hints of an internal explanation of how the Spirit came to be comes in Athenagoras; his logic (not stated out rightly) leads one to think in terms of a doctrine that would arise a generation later, that of the essence of the Spirit ‘proceeding’ from the Father. But there are also some echoes of his view today, in the more New Age-influenced writers.

Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons (d. 202 AD) spent almost all of his considerable theological talent on shaping an understanding of Jesus Christ as God, but in doing so he touched on the Holy Spirit as well. Irenaeus saw the Spirit as being divine, pre-existent and involved in creation, though he too preferred to speak of Wisdom, the Spirit of Christ, and the image of the Father. He did not use the concept of the Trinity directly in his theology, even if the logic of his descriptions of the Spirit and of Christ, as well as his praises, leads one to the conclusion he was decisively Trinitarian” (Article: The Spirit in the Trinity, by Robert Longman Jr. member of (ELCA) ). This author demonstrates that the early Christians were more Binitarian instead of Trinitarian. The Holy Spirit is mentioned, but for praise or for quoting the formula of Baptism, but none came out and said, “God, the Holy Spirit.” or “the Holy Spirit is God”! Interesting how this same author says that they give great detail on Christ and his divinity but are fuzzy when it comes to the description of the Holy Spirit.

Although few people today have ever heard the term “Binitarianism.” The belief in two divine Beings was widely held among Christians in early New Testament times. As one authority states,”...the whole history of early Christianity gives us abundant examples of Binitarian thought” (Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation, edited by A. E. J. Rawlinson, p. 201).

In fact, a study of early Christian beliefs shows that “contemporary [New Testament] thought—if it had been allowed to mould or influence the [modern] Christian conception of God in any
way—would have produced a doctrine not of three, but of two persons in the Godhead. Further, there is ample evidence to show that it did actually have such an effect; and that Trinitarianism had to fight its way and make good its footing against a strong tendency, both within and without the Church, towards belief in a Godhead of two persons only” (Ibid., p.162, emphasis added).

Even early Jewish belief did not totally reject the concept of a Bi-personal or Binitarian God. Here is a striking admission: “If, then, we find that, without abandoning his dominant monotheism, the pious Jew was prepared to admit a divine Being distinguishable in name and function from Jahweh, and to some degree self-existent, of whom personal relationship with man is predicable, we must conclude that even this strict school of monotheism recognized at least the possibility of a bi-personal God” (Ibid., p. 184, emphasis added).

As the doctrine of Trinitarianism began to develop, the early Binitarian Christians were caught in a controversy over the two opposing beliefs. It was “a struggle between a Binitarian and Trinitarian interpretation of the Christian facts—a struggle which maintained itself for nearly four centuries [spanning one fifth of the entire history of Christianity]” (Ibid., p. 199, emphasis added).

As we have seen a major element of the controversy was the relationship of Christ and the Holy Spirit. Was the Spirit a distinct person, or did the Spirit come from Christ as His power? Rawlinson, an Anglican bishop and scholar, finds abundant evidence in the New Testament to illustrate a strong Christian belief in the Spirit as the power of Christ and the Father. He states, “...in the New Testament, there can be no doubt that the other strain of thought in which the Spirit is regarded in the main as an ‘influence,’ ‘gift,’ or ‘power’ sent by the Father and the Son, and not as a distinct person, is fully represented. M. Lebreton [Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinite, pp. 347-348] repeatedly admits that large numbers of texts represent the Spirit as an impersonal force, both in Acts and in St. Paul” (Ibid., p. 203, emphasis added).

**How it all Started**

Starting from Justin Martyr’s “Baptismal Formula” of Matt. 28:19 (explained later), “baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;” Theophilus of Antioch utilized the Greek term trias for three-in-one-ness: “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.

“This was translated by Tertullian (ca. 200 A.D.) the father of Latin Theology, as trinitas, explained as ‘three persons in one substance.’ This was adopted as the viewpoint of main-line Christianity at the Council of Nicea (325 A.D.). It was then further developed by the Cappadocian monks (Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa), and formally proclaimed at the Council of Constantinople (381 A.D.). Augustine of Hippo’s De Trinitate became its authoritative explanation.

“The doctrine of the Trinity was not based on the Bible, but was formulated apart from the Bible. For instance, ‘Two of the Cappadocians, Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus, admit silently
that the Scriptural evidence for the Spirit as a distinct hypostasis within the Godhead is inadequate. Basil in his De Spiritu tries to take refuge in a most unsatisfactory doctrine of secret unscriptural tradition on the subject. Gregory, though he tacitly rejects Basil’s device, in effect appeals to the experience and practice of the Church to supplement Scripture at this point.” (R.P.C. Hanson, “Studies in Christian Antiquity”, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1985, p. 245, emphasis added).

Tertullian further admits (indirectly) that the majority of the believers in his day continued to believe in the biblical Oness of God: “…the simple, indeed (I will not call them unwise and unlearned), who always constitute the majority of believers, are startled at the dispensation (of the Three in One), on the ground that their very rule of faith withdraws them from the world’s plurality of gods to the one only true God….They are constantly throwing out against us that we are preachers of two gods and three gods, while they take to themselves pre-eminently the credit of being worshipers of the One God” (Against Praxeas, p. 598, emphasis added).

This formulation began to snow ball, “After Tertullian, the development of the doctrine passed again to the Greek theologians, and especially to the famous Catechetical School of Alexandria, second only to Athens in intellectual brilliance. It was a distinguishing feature of this School that it adopted a tolerant and genial attitude to heathen culture, and sought to assimilate into the Christian doctrine all that was good in Greek philosophy” (Tertullian and the Doctrine of the Trinity Article).

Athanasius is responsible for taking Tertullian’s structure and building on it, giving the Christian doctrine of the Trinity the form it has today. He makes it clear that the Spirit is God by what he says about the Spirit, that is, the same basic things he says about the Father and Son. The Spirit doesn’t change, it is present everywhere, and is intimately involved in all the doings of the Father and the Son.

The time had come for efforts for the Church to become clearer about the Holy Spirit. Thus the work of Athanasius, the Cappadocian Fathers (Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzos) and Ambrose bishop of Milan, led the Church to understand what it meant when it said “the Holy Spirit.” For instance, Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394 AD) pointed to the Holy Spirit’s work in Baptism to show that the Spirit is God. Basil (d. 379 AD) argued that the Spirit was to be worshipped as God based on the blessings that the Spirit gives, including adoption as children of God, the inheritance of God’s blessings now and (fully) to come and for giving us cause to rejoice.

Gregory of Nazianzos (d. 389 AD) undertook the practical task of leading the church in Constantinople away from Arianism. Another key leader, Hilary of Poitiers (d. 367 AD), wrote about the Spirit’s role in “‘divinizing’ the faithful — influenced by the ‘Eastern churches’ idea of ‘theosis,’ wherein the Christian follower is being re-made by God to be like God, in a process which is not completed until the Kingdom comes.

The Trinitarian formulation presented by Tertullian determined the course of the development of the doctrine of the Trinity for centuries to come. The terms he coined, una substantia and tres personae, had a considerable influence on the Councils of Nicea (325) and of Constantinople.
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(381), the first two Ecumenical Councils in the history of Christianity. The Council of Nicea affirmed the consubstantiality (*homoousion*) of the Father and the Son against Arianism, while the Council of Constantinople in turn upheld the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son against Semi-Arianism. The Cappadocian Fathers (Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa), who were instrumental in the decision of the Council of Constantinople, made a distinction between the two Greek words of *ousia* and *hypostasis*, having them mean substance and person, respectively. They made their distinction in accordance with the thought of Tertullian because they wanted to maintain that God has only one *ousia* (substance) but three *hypostases* (persons). Since the time of the Cappadocian Fathers many people have made various statements about the Trinity, but the fundamental Trinitarian teaching about one substance and three persons has never altered.

The work of these thinkers led to the additions to the Nicene Creed which came out of the **Council of Constantinople** in 381. These changes gave the Church the version of the Nicene Creed now used in worship services, except for one small change made later that is not used in the Orthodox churches.

The “Nicene-Constantinopolitan” creed states that: “We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceeds from the Father, who with the Father and the Son is worshiped and glorified, who spoke through the prophets”.

**Why the Councils?**

The whole purpose of the Council of Nicaea was not to develop the doctrine of the Trinity as some people believe. But to settle the controversy of Arianism, teachings from a presbyter who was a bishopric of Alexandria. It was all about the DIVINITY OF CHRIST, not to develop the Trinity. The Trinity doctrine was already established by Tertullian, and believed on by many of the people at the Council of Nicaea.

“…in Alexandria a presbyter named Arius gathered a significant following around his teaching that Jesus was a created being and not God. As his teachings spread, the controversy grew and Constantine realized it needed to be addressed. He thus called for the first universal church council at Nicaea to debate the matter.

“Although the doctrine of the Trinity itself was not discussed, the doctrine of the deity of Christ was confirmed. In attendance were approximately 300 bishops, many of whom were divided over the issue. Arius with his supporters, Theonas, Secundus, and Eusebius of Nicomedia, held the view that Jesus was an inferior creature to God the Father. The orthodox camp was led by Bishops Hosius, Alexander of Alexandria, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Athanasius who argued that Jesus is God.

“After hours of debate, the council concluded the following in their creed: ‘We believe . . . in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten from the Father, only-begotten, that is from the substance of the Father, God from God, light from light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, of one substance (*homoousios*) with the Father. . . .’
While the deity of Christ—a crucial aspect of the doctrine of the Trinity—was affirmed, Arius nevertheless continued to teach his doctrine of Christ’s inferiority, and Arianism came back into favor for a short time. Fifty years later, in 381 A.D., the Council of Constantinople was called by Emperor Theodosius. Here the Nicene Creed was reaffirmed and further clarified. It is at this council that the Holy Spirit was declared equal in divinity with the Father and the Son. The councils of Nicæa and Constantinople did not establish a new creed. The councils clarified and formalized the belief in the deity of Christ and the Holy Spirit [because of Tertullian’s doctrine] . . .” (Why should we believe in the Trinity, by Patrick Zukeran, Probe Ministries, emphasis added).

Trinity & Paganism

Since the early church fathers tried to explain biblical truths through Greek philosophy do we find the same type of explanation and beliefs in Paganism about a three in one deity? Absolutely! Ancient relics and writings prove conclusively that triad gods have been worshipped in many cultures throughout history. And, though the various triads have been called by different names, they have many similarities.

Remember it was Athanasius who built upon Teutullian’s formulation of the Trinity. He was an Egyptian from Alexandria and his philosophy was also deeply rooted in Platonism.

“The Alexandrian catechetical school, which revered Clement of Alexandria and Origen, the greatest theologians of the Greek Church, as its heads, applied the allegorical method to the explanation of Scripture. Its thought was influenced by Plato: its strong point was theological speculation. Athanasius and the three Cappadocians had been included among its members. . .” (Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church, by Hubert Jedin, p. 29, emphasis added). One ancient Greek author Plutarch says, “Triplicity is a symbol of godhead, and it means that god is the origin of all life.”

Interesting that we find in Egypt, “Several groups of triple deities existed at certain major cult centers in ancient Egypt. The trio is usually composed of father, mother and son. It is possible that the triads grew up as a convenient theological answer and means of bringing together deities of an area previously separate. The major triads were extremely powerful, or more correctly, their priests were. At Thebes there were Amun, Mut and Khons (their moon-god son); at Memphis, Ptah, Sekhmet and Nefertem; at Edfu, Horus, Hator and Harsomtus (Horus the Younger); and at Elephantine there were Khnum, Anukis and their daughter Satie. The most widely worshipped of the triads, Osiris, Isis and Horus (later Hippocrates) did not have a joint cult centre or specific area of worship but individual major shrines at Abydos, Philae and Edfu respectively.” (The Gods and Symbols of Ancient Egypt, page 124). In order to explain the relationship of Christ to God the Father, the church fathers felt that it was necessary to use the philosophy of the day. They obviously thought that their religion would be more palatable if they made it sound like the pagan philosophy that was extant at the time. These men were versed in philosophy, and that philosophy colored their understanding of the Bible.

It was the doctrine of the Trinity - colored by the philosophy of the time – “Christianity did not destroy paganism - it adopted it. . . From Egypt came the idea of a divine trinity.” (Historian
Who, What is God?

Will Durant). Of course the Trinity goes back farther than Egypt. All paganism started in Babylon, and “Babylon was, at that time, the center of the civilized world; and thus Paganism...had opportunities of sending forth its debased counterfeit of the truth to all the ends of the earth...the recognition of a Trinity was universal in all the ancient nations of the world” (Hislop, A., The Two Babylons, Loiseaux Brothers, Neptune, N.J. pp 18, 99).

Ancient relics which picture three-headed gods, or gods that are in some way “three-in-one,” have been found and preserved. Interestingly, some of the same relics, or similar ones, are used by the Roman Catholic Church. Ancient Babylonians, Assyrians, Siberians, Indians, and Japanese all had their “three-in-one” deities.

“Toward the end of the 1st century, and during the 2nd, many learned men came over both from Judaism and paganism to Christianity. These brought with them into the Christian schools of theology their Platonic ideas and phraseology” (McClintock and Strong article “Trinity,” Vol. 10, p. 553).

State of Denial

Many theologians and Christians deny the fact that the Trinity actually has its roots in Paganism. Many believe that this is “without foundation” since the pagans had a “perversion” of the truth, like the creation and the flood. They had a perverted version of the biblical stories in their writings; therefore they conclude that the pagan trinities are perversions of the true biblical trinity. Problem is, the trinity is found nowhere in the Bible! Max Hatton admits its “nowhere full explained” (Understanding the Trinity, p.128). So if it’s not fully explained then how do they know that the true trinity is biblical and the pagan trinity is a perversion of the biblical?

Also, the full explanation of the trinity did not take its full form until the 4th century A.D. “There is recognition on the part of exegetes and Biblical theologians, including a constantly growing number of Roman Catholics that one should not speak of Trinitarianism in the New Testament without serious qualification. There is also the closely parallel recognition - that when one does speak of unqualified Trinitarianism, one has moved from the period of Christian origins to say, the last quadrant of the 4th century. It was only then that what might be called the definitive Trinitarian dogma ‘one God in three persons’ became thoroughly assimilated into Christian life and thought” (New Catholic Encyclopedia, article “Trinity,” Vol. 14, p. 295, emphasis added). These pagan trinities existed long before the first century, and the Trinity in Christianity did not
take full form until the 4th century. The connection cannot be made of a perversion of the Biblical trinity. In Jewish history there is no connection to a trinity belief as well, so the connection is lacking.

Now other authors of the Trinitarian doctrine admit the borrowing from paganism but argue it this way, “…the Church was now forced to give philosophic and sophisticated answers to Arian’s philosophic and sophisticated questions about the relationship between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Since these questions were posed in philosophic language borrowed from contemporary Greek philosophy, the church had to respond using the same language.

“In all fairness, we must point out that when the Nicene Fathers borrowed philosophic terms from contemporary culture in order to respond to the heresy of Arianism, they were not doing something inherently wrong. After all, the words ‘covenant’ in the Old Testament and ‘Word’ (Logos) in the New Testament was borrowed from contemporary culture by the biblical authors. All of us use terms which come from modern as well as ancient philosophy.

“The fact that the Church was now forced to use Platonic or Aristotelian Terminology does not mean that they were Platonists or Aristotelians” (The Trinity Evidences and Issues, pp.470-471, emphasis added). Let’s break down this argument to see if it is correct.

First he says, “…these questions were posed in philosophic language borrowed from contemporary Greek philosophy” and that the church had to respond in the same way! Why respond with Greek Philosophy in the first place or even used philosophical terms? In fact that would be the best way to expose Arian beliefs as rooted in Paganism and not the Bible!

Then he says, “After all, the words ‘covenant’ in the Old Testament and ‘Word’ (Logos) in the New Testament was borrowed from contemporary culture by the biblical authors.” Really! The first time we see the word “Covenant” is in the Bible with Noah in Genesis 6. The word originated in the bible and the cultures borrowed from the Bible NOT the other way around.

The Word “Logos” meaning the “Word” in John the first chapter, did that come from Greek Philosophy? Would John try and use paganism to describe Jesus? No he did not! But the Converted Pagans sure did!

The Apostle John was a Jew, and his background was in the Jewish culture. No doubt, John fully intended to convey to his Greek readers the thought of divine wisdom, but most tend to overlook John’s Jewish background and the fact that many of his readers were Jewish. Are we to conclude that his use of the word Logos had little meaning for his Jewish readers?

The truth is, any Jew of John’s time would have immediately understood the Logos of God to be the “Spokesman” of God. According to the Encyclopedia Judaica, certain rabbinic writings that date later than John’s Gospel “understand logos as a second god.... Among the rabbis a belief in a ‘second God,’ or divine intermediary, is represented in the heretical views of Elisha b. Avuyah.... His views seem related to speculations about the Creation, in which the voice, or Word, of the Lord on the waters (Ps.29:3 and Gen. 1) and at the revelation of Sinai (l’x. 20) are hypostatized” (Volume 11, p. 462).
Though the rabbinic concept of “logos” as “a second god,” or “divine intermediary Spokesman” postdates John’s Gospel, its appearance in rabbinic writings, without Christian influence, suggests that the concept originated much earlier. At least, it shows that, in Jewish thought, the term *Logos* can and *does* connote “Spokesman.”

Further, John was familiar with the ancient custom of a king’s use of a spokesman (an “interpreter,” or *logos*) who exercised the judicial authority of the king when petitioners sought audience with the monarch. The king’s throne was inaccessible to the public, so the spokesman served as the king’s visible representative. In the same way, when the *Logos* “was made flesh,” He served as the Father’s visible representative. “He that hath seen me,” Jesus said, “hath seen the Father” (John 14:9). In addition, had John written in Aramaic, a language commonly used by the Jews of his time, he would have used the word *Memra*, the title in Aramaic equivalent of *Logos*, which was often viewed as a messenger, or spokesman, sent from God. Those who claim that *Logos* cannot mean “Spokesman” are wrong! It can, and does. Thus, in the beginning the Spokesman was with God, and the Spokesman was *God*, not an angelic intermediary or “divine principle” (see John 1:1).

Some Trinitarians object to our description of the preexistent Christ as the Spokesman of God, pointing out that the term *Logos* does not mean “Spokesman,” but refers to the “thoughts and utterances” of God. The *Logos*, they claim, is the “thought” of the Father; and since there was never a time when the Father was without thought, there was never a time when the *Logos* did not exist. God’s “thought” is supposedly His image of Himself. His self-image is so perfect that it is as personal as the Father and is a distinct *hypostasis* who is capable of communicating with the Father and returning love to Him.

Here’s the way *My Catholic Faith* explains it: “This is the simplest way by which the distinct origin of each Divine Person has been explained: *God is a spirit, and the first act of a Spirit is to know and understand. God, knowing Himself* from all eternity *brings forth the knowledge of Himself*. His own image. This was not a mere thought, as our knowledge of ourselves would be, but a *Living Person*, of the same substance and one with the Father. *This is God the Son. Thus the Father ‘begots’ the Son*, the Divine Word, the Wisdom of the Father” (Louis Laravoire Morrow, S.T.D., *My Mission House*, Kenosha, Wisconsin, 1961, p. 31). When one examines the pagan Greek philosophers’ concept of *logos* as “inner reason,” and compares the Greek ideas with the speculative ideas of the early church “fathers,” many of whom were strongly influenced by Greek philosophy, one can see how such a concept came to be infused with Christian thought.

Trinitarians argue vigorously that Trinitarian dogma was not derived from paganism. “It is true that the framers of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds did not draw from pagan sources, but it should be noted that Greek philosophical views had already affected Christian thought by the time those creeds were composed. One has but to read the esoteric writings of the Greek ‘fathers’ to see that their ideas played an important role in the later development of full-blown Trinitarian dogma.” (Stinson, *Who is God?* p.22, emphasis added). Like today, Catholics regard other religions as pagan yet their religion is just as pagan as the others, but they still believe their religion is Christian. It’s exactly the same with the Church Fathers. They recognized paganism and fought against it yet they had pagan concepts in their religion as well.
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According to *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, “Justin Martyr, the first of the post-apostolic Fathers, sought to unite the Scriptural idea of the Logos as Word with the Hellenic idea of Reason. According to him God produced in His own nature a rational power which was His agent in creation and took the form in history of the Divine Man” (Vol. III, Wm. B. Edermans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, MI, 1956, article: “Logos,” p. 117). Justin (A.D. 100-165) described Greek philosophy and God’s revelation to the Hebrews as two “streams” flowing through history. He claimed that Christianity was formed where those two streams ran together. *His vigorous renunciation of paganism did not preserve him from the influence of his own culture, so claims that Justin was a good Christian who opposed paganism are inconsequential.* Obviously, the apostles did not think along the same lines as the Greek philosophers. John’s presentation of the *Logos*, therefore, *should not be interpreted on the basis of Greek philosophical concepts.*

It must be remembered that John’s background was Jewish. The Jewish concept of *logos* differed considerably from that of Heraclitus, Anaxagoras, Plato, Aristotle, or the Stoics. The *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* states: “Though strictly speaking it is incorrect to separate the inner Reason from the outer expression in the term Logos, still in the Hellenistic usage the doctrine was substantially a doctrine of Reason, while in Jewish Literature it was more esp. the outward expression or word that was emphasized” (pp. 1912,1913).

John’s concept of *Logos* finds its origin in the Old Testament (in addition to the direct revelation John received) and, perhaps to some extent, in the post-canonical literature, such as *The Wisdom of Solomon*. In the Old Testament, the “Word of the Lord” is the expression of God’s will, and is often presented as being sent, or coming from, God.

Psalm 107:20 states, “He sent His word, and healed them, and delivered them from their destructions.” God says: “So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it” (Isaiah 2:11). God “sendeth forth His commandment upon earth: His word runneth very swiftly” (Psalm 147:15). The Psalmist wrote, “By the word of the Lord were the heavens made...” (Psalm 33:6).

Many such statements are found in the Old Testament. The “word of God” goes forth, creates, heals, judges, returns to God, and is often presented as having personal qualities. Of course, these many descriptions are merely ways of speaking of the expression of God’s will. However, once we see that God’s will was so often carried out through the agency of the Angel of the Lord, it is not difficult to see how the Word of the Lord and the Angel of the Lord came to be associated. The Angel was the *personal* Representative of God who acted as Intermediary between God and man (explained later). Thus to think that John never thought of the *Logos* as the personal Spokesman of God is unconscionable! So the Logos explanation comes from the Bible and *not* Greek Philosophy. But do you see how a pagan explanation of the word “Logos” can lead the church astray? But our Trinitarian author says, “…*they were not doing something inherently wrong.*”

The next part of the argument he says that, “Church was now forced to use Platonic or Aristotelian Terminology does not mean that they were Platonists or Aristotelians.” Then why
use it? Why not respond with Biblical terminology? If they responded that way, everything would be clear instead of delving more and more into Greek philosophy and the truth becoming farther away from them. It is ludicrous to say that paganism did not have an influence on them when you see it splattered all over their writings trying to describe some of the biblical doctrines. To try and interpret the Bible with Greek Philosophy is like trying to interpret the American Constitution with Marxist ideology. Will you in the end get the true meaning of what the American founders of the Constitution wanted for America? Absolutely not!

Even Bullinger’s Companion Bible rejects the idea of pagan explanations for biblical terms and doctrines. Notice what he says in his Appendix 110, in this example under the meaning of the word “Psuche,” he writes, “To ascertain its [Psuche’s] meaning, it is useless to go to heathen authors. The Greek philosophers were at variance among themselves….We must therefore, let Scripture be its own interpreter. Psuche exactly corresponds to the Hebrew Nepesh (Ap. 13), as will be seen from the following passages: Mark 12:29, 30, compared with Deut. 6:4, 5; Acts 2:27 with Ps. 16:10; Rom. 11:3 with 1Kings 19:10; 1Cor. 15:45 with Gen. 2:7. In all these places, psuche in the New Testament represents nepesh in the Old” (emphasis added).

**How They Try To Explain It**

Have you ever heard the Trinity being explained on Televangelism T.V.? Do you get it? Most people, the vast majority of Christians really don’t know how to explain, or even understand the doctrine of the Trinity. Many authors write books about it, lengthy books but in the end they always say, “It’s a mystery,” in other words they cannot explain it. One preacher on radio said once that “if you can understand it, you are elevated to God’s level, and since no man can achieve that level, then no man can fully grasp it.” What nonsense! Jesus came to reveal the Father. Would a parent not want his own child to know him?

There are many attempts by authors to try and explain the Trinity but I will only quote from one book entitled “Why You Should Believe in the Trinity,” by Robert W. Bowman. Trinitarian theologians explain that God is one Being, not three, and that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are “personal distinctions,” or hypostases, within that one Being. Further, they say that the three personal distinctions are not “parts” of God, for God is infinite Being, and infinite Being cannot be divided into “parts.”

Trinitarian apologist Robert M. Bowman, Jr., writes: “Another aspect of God’s oneness is the fact that there are no separations or divisions or partitions in God. The Trinitarian doctrine holds that God is a single infinite being, transcending the bounds of space and time, having no body either material or spiritual (accept the body that the Son assumed in becoming a man). Thus, the Trinitarian God has no parts. You cannot divide infinite being into components. The Athanasian Creed affirms that ‘God’ is not divided by the three persons when it states that the Trinitarian faith does not allow for ‘dividing the substance’ (using ‘substance’ to mean the essence or being of God). The three persons, consequently, are not three parts of God, but three personal distinctions within God, each of whom is fully God” (Why You Should Believe in the Trinity, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, MI, 1989, pp. 12,13). Understand it now? I don’t, do you?
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Someone will surely ask, “But don’t Trinitarians teach that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three distinct Persons?” Yes, they do. However, Trinitarians who “know their stuff” are careful to explain that the term “persons,” as it is used in Trinitarian doctrine, does not mean “persons” in the ordinary sense; it refers to the “personal distinctions” of the one Being known as “God.”

Bowman writes: “…the statement that this one God is ‘three persons’ is also one that has often been misunderstood. People often assume that ‘person’ is used to refer to a separate individual being, which would imply that three divine persons were three Gods. The belief in three Gods, called Tritheism, has always been condemned by Trinitarian Christians…If ‘person’ is used to mean a separate individual being, then in that sense Trinitarians frankly would confess to believe that God is one ‘person.’

“However, there is another sense of the word person that focuses not on separate existence but on relationship; Trinitarians believe that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three ‘persons’ in the sense that each is aware of the others, speaks to the others, and loves and honors the others. Thus, God may be described as ‘one person’ or as ‘three persons,’ depending on the meaning of ‘persons’” (ibid. pp. 13,14). Tilt! Are you convinced yet about the meaning of the Trinity? Is God, One God in three persons Yes or No? Is he three distinctions yes or no?

Interesting how this goes against what the Bible says. Jesus is the “express image of his person” (Heb 1:3). In Exodus we see God with a “face” a “hand” “back parts.” In Psalms, God has “eyes.” Isaiah says he has “ears,” this constitutes a person, see Ex 33:20-23; Psalm 34:15; Isaiah 59:1. Under the entry “Person,” The Concise Dictionary of the Christian Tradition has this to say: “A technical word when used of the Holy Trinity or of the Lord Jesus Christ. Translating hypostasis, it is used of the modes of being of the one God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit…” (Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, MI, 1989, p. 292).

However, Trinitarians are careful to point out that the expression “modes of being” does not mean that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are indistinct, as “modalism” (i.e., “Jesus only”) teaches. The three hypostases of the Godhead are distinct, Trinitarians assert, but they are one God, one divine Being. Moreover, “Each one of the three Persons (hypostases) of the Holy Trinity is the entire divinity” (A Companion to the Greek Orthodox Church, Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, New York, 1984, p. 158).

Thus, according to Trinitarianism, the one God, who is one infinite, indivisible Being, is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. These are not three Gods, but one God. They are “distinct, but not separate.” Trinitarians claim that the “triune” nature of God is a-logical (above logic, or above human comprehension), but not illogical (contrary to logic). Since God is not confined to the boundaries of time and space, they say, His very nature is incomprehensible-a-logical, but not illogical. Thus, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are distinct, but not separate—a concept incomprehensible to the finite human mind. They relate to each other, love each other, and have distinct functions, but they are indivisibly one.

Of course, the doctrine is illogical, as anyone should be able to see. In order to accept it as “gospel truth,” one must conclude that biblical descriptions of God the Father and Jesus Christ are mere metaphors—and potentially misleading ones at that!
For example, the Bible depicts Jesus Christ as sitting at the right hand of the Father. Even if this description is to some extent metaphorical, it certainly does not, by any stretch of the imagination, leave the impression that the Father and the Son are hypostases (“personal distinctions” or “modes of being”-or “consciousnesses,” as some have suggested) within one indivisible Being. Rather, it pictures two distinct Beings—one called “the Father,” the other called “the Son,” and one positioned side by side with the other.

The same picture of the Father and the Son as two distinct Beings is presented over and over in the New Testament. The Father sent the Son; the Father raised the Son from the state of death; the Son prayed to the Father; the Son said He was sent to do not His own will, but the will of the Father; the Son ascended to the Father; the Son acts as Mediator between man and the Father; the Son will return to this earth and ultimately deliver His Kingdom to the Father; the Son referred to the Father as “my Father” and “my God”; the Son was on earth while the Father was in heaven. None of these many clear, scriptural descriptions of the Son and His relationship to the Father remotely hint at the idea of two of three hypostases who are one indivisible Being!

Any honest, unbiased student of the Bible should admit (as do many New Testament scholars) that the writers of the New Testament never thought in Trinitarian terms. They clearly saw the Father and the Son as two divine Beings, not as hypostases within one Being. The Trinitarian interpretation requires that one read forced and unnatural meanings into passages that were written for people with ordinary abilities in comprehension and understanding.

No doubt, if the apostle Paul were here today he would say something like this to those among God’s people who have blindly accepted such a teaching: “Oh you foolish brethren! Who has bewitched you that you should believe such nonsense? Has not God given you the Spirit of truth whereby you can discern between truth and error?”

To those who claim that God cannot be understood, and is a mystery, one would quote the words God spoke through the Prophet Jeremiah: “But let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me...” (Jeremiah 9:24). God can be known and understood from his written word the Bible, without man’s interpretations, but letting the Bible interpret itself!
“And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.” (Exodus 3:14).
Jesus said you can understand who God is. He came to reveal the Father. God is not a Mystery, but knowable and you can know him, and as God said you should glorify God when you know it.

The Best place to start is the Beginning, in the book of beginnings, the book called Genesis. When God comes on the scene, the Bible says, “In the beginning GOD created the Heavens and the Earth” (v.1). Interesting, this word “God” in the Hebrew is “Elohim.” It’s a plural ending meaning more than one. Strong’s says it’s a “Plural of H433 [‘Eloah,’ meaning the Deity]; gods in the ordinary sense; but specifically used (in the plural thus, especially with the article) of the supreme God; occasionally applied by way of deference to magistrates; and sometimes as a superlative: - angels, X exceeding, God (gods) (-dess, -ly), X (very) great, judges, X mighty.” (Strong’s #430). Does the Old Testament show more than one person of the Godhead? More specifically, a duality of the Godhead?

In the beginning when Elohim does come on the scene he says, “Let US make Man in OUR image after OUR likeness” (Genesis 1:26). Here we see a God with the potential of being two beings talking one to another.

Later in Genesis we see more examples, “And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of US, to know good and evil:” (Genesis 3:22).

When God saw the people of the earth build a tower, “And the LORD said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which the y have imagined to do. “Go to, let US go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech.” (Gen 11:6-7).

During the time of Sodom and Gomorrah notice when the destruction came, “Then the LORD rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven;” (Gen 19:24). Notice that Yahweh rained down fire from Yahweh out of heaven. This allows again for a duality of the Godhead. The Word Yahweh means “Ever living one” or “The Eternal,” so both beings can be called “The Eternal.”

When God was about to send a prophet to Israel in Isaiah’s time, Isaiah said, “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.” (Isaiah 6:8).

In the book of Daniel, the vision of the Kingdom of God set up on earth. Daniel saw the Son of Man and the Ancient of Days, “I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: [Jesus is described in the same way in Revelation 1:14] his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire....I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him [son of man] near
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before him [Ancient of Days].” (Dan 7:9, 13). He we see two people NOT THREE in the Kingdom of God, one called the “Ancient of Days” which is the Father, and the “Son of Man” which is Jesus Christ, the Son. In the light of these scriptures, the God in the Old Testament allows for a duality of the God Head.

Later in the booklet we will in detail study the word Elohim, and how God can be one. In this section let’s just establish the fact that the Old Testament allows for the possibility of the duality of the God Head.

Who Was Jesus?

There have been many theories on who Jesus was and is. Was he just a man? Or was He God? Or was he God in the Human flesh, and is he God now?

The Bible makes it extremely clear to the pre-existent state of Jesus Christ. In John the first chapter it starts from the beginning before Creation, and two beings are revealed, on the one hand the Father and the other is the Word, which in verse 14 of that same chapter reveals that it was Jesus Christ.

“In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word WAS GOD” (1:1). Now the Jehovah’s Witnesses try to dance around this scripture, and play with the Greek words and say that the “Word was A god.” Now if this was true then they are polytheists (meaning belief in more than one God) rather than monotheists (meaning, belief in one God). But they deny that, they say they are monotheists. But you see this theory that Jesus was “a god” fails when put up against other biblical scriptures. In Isaiah, Jehovah God says, “Is there a God beside me? yea, there is no God; I know not any” (Isaiah 44:8). So I ask the Jehovah’s Witnesses, “Do you know something God doesn’t?”

They also believe that Jesus was an angel? But again when compared to other scriptures that theory fails as well. In the book of Hebrews, God is commanding the angels to worship Jesus. Also the FATHER IS CALLING THE SON, “GOD” AND CREATOR:

“And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But unto the Son he [The Father] saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, [Jesus] even thy God, [The Father] hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. And, [The Father to the Son] Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:
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“They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; “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. “But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?” (Heb 1:4-13). These passages clearly reveal that Jesus was NOT an angel and that the Father calls the Son “Lord” and “God” and the one who did the CREATING IN THE BEGINNING! This scripture leaves no doubt the Jesus is very God and the creator of the Heavens and the earth, in Genesis1:1.

The Logos Was God

Now what about their reconstruction of John 1:1? Should it be translated that the word “was a god”? No Greek scholar worth his salt would agree to this assessment. This is nothing new others have made attempts to reconstruct John 1:1 as well.

Turning to the English translations, including the Authorized Version and the Revised Version, Weymouth’s, The 10th Century New Testament, C. C. Torrey (Gospels), Ferrar Fenton, and the American Revised Standard Version, all render “The Logos was God”; and so also the Latin version of Bezae.

But Dr. James Moffatt translates- “The Logos was divine.” We have no doubt that so eminent a linguist had sufficient grounds to justify his departing from the standard versions. Again, it is also to be noted that Dr. Wm. Temple adopted the same rendering (Readings in St. John’s Gospel, p. 4) and makes the comment, “The term God is fully adjectival in the first clause-‘proston Theon’; it is predicative and not far from adjectival in the second: ‘Theos een ho Logos’. Thus from the outset we are to understand that The Word has its whole being within Deity, but that it does not exhaust the being of Deity.”

Again, Dr. Strachan (Fourth Gospel, p. gg, 3rd ed.) states that- “The closing words of verse 1 should be translated ‘the Logos was divine’”; and adds, “Here the word Theos has no article, thus giving it the significance of an adjective.”

Here we have three prominent authorities in agreement as to the value of the word “Theos” in a particular context. Though we cannot be specific as to Dr. Moffatt’s reason, we note that Dr. Temple renders “divine” on the ground that the absence of the article renders the noun Theos “predicative”, while Dr. Strachan for the same reason considers that the term “Theos” receives an adjectival character. Their whole argument is based around the First God (Theos) in the sentence has a definite article, and the second God (Theos) in that sentence does not that pertains to Christ. Jehovah’s witnesses make the same argument!

But, since this belief is solely on grammatical grounds, can these opinions stand? Goodwin’s Greek Grammar (1894, p. 208) gives the opinion that “a predicate noun seldom has the article” in classical Greek.
Dr. J. Hope Moulton (Grammar of N.T. Gk., 1:82) states that the use of the article in Hellenistic (N.T.) Greek in the main conforms with classical standards; and S. G. Green, that in the simple sentence the Subject takes the article, the Predicate omits it (op. cit., p. 178).

We now turn to Dr. A. T. Robertson (Grammar of Gk. N.T., 3rd ed., p. 767). This authority writes, “As a rule the predicate is without the article, even when the subject uses it; this is in strict accord with the ancient idiom.” He adds, “Wherever the subject has the article, and the predicate does not, the subject is then definite and distributed, the predicate, indefinite and undistributed.” In the opinion of this grammarian, “Theos” is the predicate, and, therefore, on grammatical grounds, it is beyond reasonable doubt that the translation is “The Logos was God.” So John meant what he wrote that the Word was TRULY GOD! You cannot have both words in the same sentence with the definite article is does not work that way in the classical Greek!

Then, what the Jehovah’s Witnesses also miss in that same chapter is that Jesus created all things. “All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made” (v.3). Now how can that be, when Jehovah God says that with his hands he created the heavens and by himself created, the earth? Notice: “Thus saith the LORD, thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am the LORD that maketh all things; that stretcheth forth the heavens alone; that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself;” (Isaiah 44:24).

“I have made the earth, and created man upon it: I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded” (Isaiah 45:12).

The Bible says that the Father created all things by Jesus Christ, “which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ:” (Ephesians 3:9). Yes it was Jesus Christ’s hands that created all things. The Father was involved also in the planning and the design but Jesus was the one who actually did the creating, so that makes Jesus JEHOVAH, the very God that the Jehovah’s witnesses claim to worship!

**No Man has seen the Father at Any Time**

It’s interesting what Jesus said about the Father in his earthly ministry. One of the most interesting is the statement he made that no one has seen the Father, “Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father” (John 6:46).

“And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape” (John 5:37; see also John 1:18). Jehovah’s Witnesses cannot deal with these scriptures. How can this be? If no one has seen his shape nor heard his voice at “any time,” who did Moses see? Samson’s parents? Isaiah and others? (Scriptures references, Ex 33:13-23; Judges 13:20-23; Isaiah 6:5).

The New Testament assures us that no one has seen the Father at any time, see, John 1:18. 1 John 4:12. So the question placed before the Jehovah’s Witnesses is this: WHO DID THESE PEOPLE SEE? If it was not the Father, then it must have been the Son! It was the Son, Jesus Christ that dealt with the Israelites. It was the Son who created the Heavens and the earth and Man. It was the Son That Gave the 10 Commandments to Israel, and it was the Son that the Patriarchs were
Who, What is God?

speaking with when the Covenants were formed. It was the Son that dealt with the prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel etc… JESUS WAS YAHWEH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT! Is there evidence of this in the Old Testament? Yes there is, and in the next section of the booklet this fact will be substantiated from the Bible.

**Jesus is Yahweh (Jehovah) of the Old Testament (The Spokesman)!**

As we have seen (above), the word, “Logos” means “Spokesman,” and the “Spokesman WAS GOD” (John 1:1).

Again, had John written in Aramaic, a language commonly used by the Jews of his time, he would have used the word Memra, a title in Aramaic equivalent of Logos, which was often viewed as a messenger, or spokesman, sent from God, see also Jewish Targumim (writings of the sages in exile). This concept is not foreign to the Bible. When God called Moses, and Moses was finding excuses why he was not the man for the job, God said to him, “Is not Aaron the Levite thy brother?...And he shall be thy spokesman unto the people: and he shall be, even he shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God” (Ex 4:14, 16). Aaron was the spokesman for Moses and Moses was the spokesman for God.

Vincent Word Studies says, “After the Babylonish captivity the Jewish doctors combined into one view the theophanies, prophetic revelations and manifestations of Jehovah generally, and united them in one single conception, that of a permanent agent of Jehovah in the sensible world, whom they designated by the name Memra (word, λόγος) of Jehovah. The learned Jews introduced the idea into the Targurns, or Aramaean paraphrases of the Old Testament, which were publicly read in the synagogues, substituting the name the word of Jehovah for that of Jehovah, each time that God manifested himself. Thus in Gen 39:21, they paraphrase, ‘The Memra was with Joseph in prison.’ In Psalm 110:1-7 Jehovah addresses the first verse to the Memra. The Memra is the angel that destroyed the first-born of Egypt, and it was the Memra that led the Israelites in the cloudy pillar.” (emphasis added).

Many as proven (above) statements are found in the Old Testament about The “word of God” that goes forth, creates, heals, judges, returns to God, and is often presented as having personal qualities. Of course, these many descriptions are merely ways of speaking of the expression of God’s will. However, once we see that God’s will was so often carried out through the agency of the Angel of the Lord, it is not difficult to see how the Word of the Lord and the Angel of the Lord came to be associated. The Angel was the personal Representative of God who acted as Intermediary between God and man.

The “Angel of the Lord” in the Old Testament could read “Messenger of the Lord,” as well. Now this Angel or Messenger is different from the other Angels because only this one makes the claim that he is God. Divine statements are made from Him that is not claimed by Michael, or Gabriel, only from this Messenger of God.

Now Jesus is the Spokesman, and that “Spokesman (logos) was God.” Jesus said also, that, “Before Abraham was I AM [Greek “ego emi”]. The same words are used in the Hebrew for “I AM THAT I AM,” (Ex 3:14). Jesus claimed this title for himself. Now notice the narrative in the
book of Exodus who claimed to be the great “I AM” to Moses: “And the angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed….And Moses said, I will now turn aside, and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt….And when the LORD [Yahweh] saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here am I” (Exodus 3:2–4). Notice how the “Angel” or “Messenger” of God claimed that he was God! And the word Messenger can also mean SPOKESMAN! Jesus was claiming to be that Spokesman!

There are other places in the Bible about the “Messenger of Lord.” At the time of the Exodus in the pillar cloud that led the Israelites out of Egypt, the Bible says that it was, “…the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them:” (Ex 14:19). Yet in that same pillar cloud the Bible says, “And it came to pass, that in the morning watch the LORD [Yahweh] looked unto the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians,” (v24). “And the LORD went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light; to go by day and night:…He took not away the pillar of the cloud by day, nor the pillar of fire by night, from before the people” (Ex 13:21–22). In this scripture we read again the Angel or Spokesman who is also God, Yahweh! This Spokesman is Jesus Christ!

That same Angel that led Israel in the wilderness is described this way, “Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. “Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him. “But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries. “For mine Angel shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites: and I will cut them off.” (Ex 23:20–23). Notice the Angel was to be obeyed, had the power to judge, pardon sins, and do God’s work in his name. This messenger has the same qualities that only belong to God; the messenger is the Spokesman that was God.

Now why does it sound like Yahweh is speaking of another person? If no man has seen or heard the Father, it seems here that Yahweh is speaking about a separate entity. If Yahweh who is speaking here is the Son, and he speaks of “his angel” that is the Son, why does it sound like two people? It was not uncommon in those days to speak of yourself in the third person. You find this style of writing throughout the Old & New Testament. “Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel. For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son.” (John 5:19–22) Jesus spoke of Himself in the third person. Yahweh is speaking of himself in the third person. As we have seen the Angel is God,
and here is God speaking of the Angel. No one has seen or heard the Father at anytime, so Yahweh obviously is speaking in the third person.

Now in one place in the Bible God was going to send a created Angel to lead Israel because of their sins and God did not want to dwell with them. The “Angel of the Covenant” or the “Angel of his presence” which is Christ, Yahweh himself, is not the same as the angel in Ex 32:34. In Exodus 34:2 he is called “an angel.” Because of their sin God did not want to dwell with Israel. Gill, writes, “behold, mine angel shall go before thee: and not I, as Jarchi interprets it: not the Angel of the covenant, and of his presence, as in Exo_23:20 but a created angel, which, though a favour, was a lessening of the mercy before promised and granted; and which gave the people a great deal of concern, though Moses by his supplications got the former blessing restored, Exo_33:2, “ (John Gill’s Exposition of the Entire Bible, emphasis added).

In the book of Judges at the birth of Samson, his parents had an encounter with “the angel [messenger] of the Lord.” “And Manoah said unto the angel of the LORD, What is thy name, that when thy sayings come to pass we may do thee honour?

“And the angel of the LORD said unto him, Why askest thou thus after my name, seeing it is secret?

“So Manoah took a kid with a meat offering, and offered it upon a rock unto the LORD: and the angel did wonderously; and Manoah and his wife looked on.

“For it came to pass, when the flame went up toward heaven from off the altar, that the angel of the LORD ascended in the flame of the altar. And Manoah and his wife looked on it, and fell on their faces to the ground...But the angel of the LORD did no more appear to Manoah and to his wife. Then Manoah knew that he was an angel of the LORD.

“And Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die, because we have seen God.” (Judges 13:17-22). Obviously the Angel of the Lord and the Lord in these passages are synonymous, and then they said that they saw God!

In Genesis we read that the angel of the Lord stopped Isaac from being killed by Abraham, “And the angel of the LORD called unto him out of heaven, and said, Abraham, Abraham: and he said, Here am I.

“And he said, Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me.

“And Abraham lifted up his eyes, and looked, and beheld behind him a ram caught in a thicket by his horns: and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son.

“And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovahjireh: as it is said to this day, In the mount of the LORD it shall be seen.

“And the angel of the LORD called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time,

“And said, By myself have I sworn, saith the LORD, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son:

“That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies;

“And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice.”” (Gen 22:11-18). Notice that this angel said that he was the one that will bless Abraham
and that Abraham obeyed his voice. No ordinary Angel would claim this. This angel had to be that spokesman that was God who blessed Abraham in Gen 12, 15, 17.

Speaking of God’s love for Israel, Isaiah wrote, “In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel [messenger] of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old.” (63:9). Of course it was Yahweh who redeemed them and saved them, so obviously the “angel of his presence” is God.

And Malachi wrote about the “Messenger of the Covenant,” “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger [Angel-same word] of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the LORD of hosts.” (Malachi 3:1).

Isaiah 9:6 Yahweh to be born

In Isaiah 9:6, the prophecy of the birth of Christ makes it plain that Jesus is Jehovah, “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.” These are the titles and names of Jehovah God. This child is called the “mighty God.” Jehovah is called the same thing, “the Mighty God, the LORD of hosts, is his name,” (Jer 32:18).

“And it shall come to pass in that day, that the remnant of Israel, and such as are escaped of the house of Jacob, shall no more again stay upon him that smote them; but shall stay upon the LORD, the Holy One of Israel, in truth... The remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God.” (Isaiah 10:20-21).

“Wonderful” is also another title for Jehovah as well. In Judges 13:17-18, the angel of the Lord who is God says, “And Manoah said unto the angel of the LÖRD, What is thy name, that when thy sayings come to pass we may do thee honour?...And the angel of the LÖRD said unto him, Why askest thou thus after my name, seeing it is secret?” The word “secret” in the Margin is “Wonderful” see Strong’s “H6381; remarkable: - secret, wonderful.”

Yahweh to be pierced

In Zachariah’s prophecy, we read that the Messiah was to be much more than a son of David. God said, “And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn.” (12:10).

“The suffix in àìé (to me) refers to the speaker. This is Jehovah, according to Zec 12:1, the creator of the heaven and the earth” (Kiel & Delitzsche Commentary of the Old Testament, emphasis added). The one who was pierced was Messiah, the suffering servant of Isaiah 53, Jesus Christ. In the book of Revelation, the first chapter uses this scripture as well and applying it to Jesus Christ, see Rev 1:7.
Yahweh lands on the Mount of Olives

Just as Yahweh was pierced, Yahweh was also to come and land on the Mount of Olives at the time of the climactic battle of Armageddon, “Then shall the LORD go forth, and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle. “And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south.” (14:3-4). Interesting that when Jesus was caught up to Heaven that the angels said, “Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.

“Then returned they unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a Sabbath day’s journey.” (Acts 1:11-12). The very place where Jesus went up to Heaven is the place where he will touch down, The Mount of Olives. Jesus is Yahweh, and then “Yahweh shall be king over all the earth:” (Zechariah 14:9). Jesus will be “King of Kings and Lord of Lords” Rev 19:16, which by the way are titles of Yahweh, see Deut 10:17; Psalm 136:3.

Isaiah 40-49

These chapters in Isaiah clearly demonstrate that Jesus is Jehovah. When comparing Old and New Testaments it becomes clear who Jesus is.

Yahweh calls himself the Redeemer of Israel; see Isaiah 41.14; 43:14; 44:6, 24. “Thus saith the LORD, your redeemer, the Holy One of Israel;” (Isaiah 43:14). Yet Jesus is called the Redeemer of Israel. “Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, And hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David;” (Luke 1:68-69).

Yahweh is called the ONLY Savior of Israel, “I, even I, am the LORD; and beside me there is no saviour.” (Isaiah 43:11). Also in Hosea as well, “Yet I am the LORD thy God from the land of Egypt, and thou shalt know no god but me: for there is no saviour beside me…I did know thee in the wilderness, in the land of great drought.” (Hosea 13:4-5).

The New Testament claims Jesus is the Saviour of Israel, “Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins... Of this man’s seed hath God according to his promise raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus:” (Acts 5:31; 13:23). And not Just Israel but the whole world (see 1 John 4:14). And salvation is only through Jesus Christ, see Acts 4:12.

Yahweh or Jehovah asks the question, “To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One...To whom will ye liken me, and make me equal, and compare me, that we may be like? (Isa 40:25; 46:5).

The New Testament says Jesus is equal with God, “Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.” (Phil 2:6).
Who, What is God?

Yahweh says we are justified by Him, “In the LORD [Yahweh] shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory.” (Isa 45:25).

New Testament we are justified by Jesus Christ, “But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ,...Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.” (Gal 2:17; Rom 5:9). Is there any doubt that Jesus is Jehovah God that came to save us, redeem us in the person of Jesus Christ!

**That Rock Was Christ**

Speaking of the ancient Israelites, the apostle Paul said: “And [they] did all eat the same spiritual meat; And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed [or accompanied] them: and that Rock was Christ” (1 Corinthians 10:3, 4).

The “spiritual meat” and “spiritual drink” Paul spoke of the manna that miraculously appeared (Exodus 16:15) and the water that miraculously came forth from a rock (Exodus 17:6; Numbers 20:11). The manna and the water were material substances. Paul called them “spiritual” food and drink because they were produced supernaturally. The term spiritual, then, does not refer to the nature of the food and drink, but to the Source of those substances.

However, the rock from which the water miraculously flowed was not supernaturally produced, as were the manna and water. Therefore, the term spiritual (in “spiritual Rock”) does not refer to the source of the “Rock,” but to the nature of the Rock. Paul was not speaking of the material rock from which the water flowed, but of the spiritual Rock that caused the water to come forth: And that Rock was Christ!

Paul was saying that Christ was literally with the Israelites during their trek through the wilderness. Further evidence that this is so is seen a few verses later, where Paul warns, “We must not put Christ to the test, as some of them did, and were destroyed by serpents” (verse 9, NRSV). (Some manuscripts read “Lord” instead of “Christ,” but early patristic testimony supports the view that “Christ” was in the original.) The Israelites of old could not have “put Christ to the test” had He not literally been there.

While the association of the supernatural “Rock” with the material rock was deliberate, Paul was not speaking of the material rock as a metaphorical reference to Christ. He knew that “Rock” was one of the divine titles for Yahweh (see Deuteronomy 32:4,15,18,30,31; Psalm 18:2,4,31; Isaiah 17:10), and that the Old Testament itself identifies the supernatural Source of the miracle.

Notice how the supernatural Source is associated with the material rock, but identified as being other than the material rock: “And the Lord said unto Moses ... Behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it...” (Exodus 17:5,6). This was the “spiritual Rock” Paul was speaking of when he said, “And that Rock was Christ.”
Who, What is God?

The one who stood upon the rock and caused water to miraculously come forth was God’s Spokesman-the divine Agent, or Representative-who spoke and acted on behalf of the Father, it was the Son-Yahweh!

The New Testament declares that no one has seen God at any time (John 1:18; 6:46; 1 John 4:12). Jesus said, “Ye have neither heard His voice at any time, nor seen His shape” (John 5:37).

Therefore, the divine Personage who was both seen and heard on many occasions during the Old Testament period was the Logos, or Spokesman, who acted on behalf of the Supreme Sovereign. He often appeared to the ancients, and was therefore God’s visible Representative. He acted as God’s “voice,” or means through which the will of the Supreme Sovereign was revealed just as a king’s representative voiced the will of the king.

The Word “Lord” in Old & New Testaments

Since Jesus Christ is Yahweh in the Old Testament, can we confirm in the New Testament as well that Jesus is Jehovah, or Yahweh? Most English Translations have “Lord” but that word really means YHWH, Yahweh, or Jehovah.

The use of the name “Lord” (Kyrios) is a valuable aid toward an understanding of the conditions, which led the early Church to the conclusion that Jesus is God Incarnate. In the Old Testament (Septuagint), “Kyrios” is used as a translation of the Hebrew “Adonai” (Gen. 18:3, 27, etc.), i.e. GOD. It also frequently appears in the New Testament as a name for God (Luke 2:9; Rom. 9:29; 11:34).

Dr. E. W. Bullinger has the following interesting facts concerning this term: “In the Old Testament (Septuagint) the designation Ho Kyrios, the Mighty One, Lord, Ruler, stands for God. But when it means God in the New Testament it answers to the divine Name Jehovah (Yahveh) in the Old Testament... Kyrios is used as a translation of the Hebrew Jehovah, the Name, Jehovah...” (Bullinger, Crit. Lex. and Concord. to English and Greek N.T., p. 4.66). Though Bullinger believes that this title is never applied to Christ, we will see in the bible that is does, and that the 1st century church believed that Jesus was Jehovah!

Again, the title “Kyrios Ho Theos” in the New Testament often stands for “The Lord (Thy) God” (cf. Matt. 4:10; Mark 12:30; Luke 1:32; Rev. 4:8; 19:6; 22:5), being the Greek translation (Septuagint) of the Old Testament Hebrew divine Names, “Jehovah-Elohim” (Deut. 6:4, 5, 10, 15, etc.).

When Thomas saw the resurrected Christ and felt the wounds on his hands and side, “Thomas answered and said unto him [Jesus], My Lord [“Kyrios”] and my God [Theos].” (John 20:28). These are the titles for Jehovah-Elohim in the Old Testament.

Stephen, at his martyrdom, commits himself to Jesus, Whom he addressed in the prayer, “Lord [Kyrios] Jesus, receive my Spirit” (Acts 7:59). This prayer, simple and earnest, and obviously devotional, contains, however, a dogmatic utterance of far-reaching importance. Besides being an offering of worship to Jesus, which, as we have seen, He would be likely to accept, Stephen’s
prayer addresses Jesus by the divine title “Lord”, and prays that He would do a service, which only God could be conceived as doing. It constitutes Jesus, like the Father, as the Father of all spirits of men. In referring to evidence for Christ’s Deity gained from New Testament statements, where “Kyrios” is applied to Christ, Dr. Temple says “I am convinced that, on some occasions, at least, the word ‘Lord’ (‘Kyrios’), as applied by Paul to Christ, is to be interpreted as meaning an identification with Jehovah” (op. cit., p.110, emphasis added).

And further, the same writer states, “In the Apocalypse the association of the heavenly Christ with the eternal and Almighty Father is so close that no doctrine short of the affirmation of His Deity can be said to express it; and in chapter 22:13, the Christ is represented as claiming in His own Person the most supremely distinctive title of Almighty God, which the Almighty had used of Himself in chapter 1:8” (op. cit., p. 111).

So then, the deific meaning, “which Hellenistic Jews placed upon ‘Kyrios’”, which they read for “The Lord” in the Septuagint was the same as that which their Hebrew-speaking contemporaries in Palestine put upon the divine name Jehovah (Yahweh).

Many passages in the New Testament substantiate this fact. For instance, when St. Paul urged the Christian to “confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord” (“Kyrios”) (Rom. 10:9), the Apostle means that as Saviour, Jesus is equal to the “Lord”, Jehovah, of the Old Testament. Again, what else could St. Peter mean in writing “Sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord” (1 Peter 3:15, R.V.), than that “Christ” was the New Testament meaning for the “Kyrios” in the Greek Old Testament. In fact, one Apostle, St. James (5:4-15) applies “Kyrios” in the same passage to both the Father and the Son individually. To what extent the use of “Kyrios” for Christ in this sense was equivalent to its Old Testament usage for God is further illustrated by the transference to Christ of the phrase “the day of the Lord” (Amos 5:18, etc.), which formerly always referred to God (1 Cor. 1:8; 5:5; 1 Thess. 5:2; 2 Peter 3:10). The name “Lord,” as applied to Christ, is called upon in many passages to bear the weight of that “Almightiness” which in the Old Testament belongs solely to God (Psa. 110:1; cf. Matt. 22:43; Rev. 4:8; 16:6, 14; 21:22, etc.).

Even in the early days of the Apostolic Church, Christ is described as “All-ruling” (Matt. 28:18); “Lord of all” (Acts 10:36); “Almighty” (Rev. 1:8). Many years later St. Paul describes Him as “Lord of both the dead and the living” (Rom. 14:9), who “is able to subject all things unto Himself” (Phil. 3:21), “our Lord Jesus Christ ... Who is the Blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords” (I Tim. 6:15; cf. Deut. 10:17; Rev. 17:14).

Associated with “Kyrios” is the term “despotes”. The latter signifies one who exercises absolute and unlimited authority. It is used as a name for God in the Septuagint (e.g. Gen. 15:2; Josh. 5:15; etc.). “In the New Testament it occurs in 2 Peter 2:1 and Jude 4 as a designation of Christ. In the former passage Peter warns the Church of certain false teachers, who introduce destructive heresies, ‘denying even the Master, Who bought them.’ Since the ‘Master’ (Despotes) is described as One ‘Who bought them’, the reference probably being to the offering up of Christ, it is evident that this name, sometimes applied to God, is used of the Son of God by the Apostle. The passage in Jude directly applies the term to Christ ‘our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ’ (R.V.). Dr. Moffatt renders ‘Master’ in Peter’s passage, but ‘Liege’ in Jude’s passage. Upon these two passages, Archbishop Trench commented: ‘In the last two it is to Christ, but to Christ
as God, that the title is ascribed’ (New Testament Synonyms, p. 98). Both the above writings date about 35 years after the Resurrection, and show once more that Christian thought had made definite advance in attributing to the Man, Christ Jesus, *deific power and honour, designating Him by the same names which in Scripture had often been used of God.*” (The Deity of Jesus Christ, Rev Spence Little, p.66, emphasis added).

**Did Jesus Claim to be God? (God-Jesus in the Human Flesh)**

Now when Jesus was on earth and he was dwelling in the Human flesh. Was he still God? Before we answer the question as whether Jesus was God and Man at the same time, what were his claims for himself? Did Jesus as a man claim to be God?

Over and Over again Jesus Claimed that he was the “Son of God.” In many of his confessions in the Gospels he repeats, “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?” (John 10:36). What does this phrase “Son of God” actually mean?

“For the term ‘Son’ is herein used, not in a complimentary way but in a *biological* sense, and with simple application. It must, therefore, *signify identity of nature with the Divine Being known as the Father* (Christus f’eritas, p. 12 I.) though herein not referred name. ‘Son’ to a father implies in ordinary usage, consanguinity, and the same *order of being,* as the father” (The Deity of Jesus Christ, Spence Little, p.37, emphasis added). Here the phrase refers to the Son and the Father in a biological sense, as a relationship to one another as in not just of love one toward another but of KINSHIP, related to one another like a human father is related to his son, by flesh and blood.

Some Trinitarians accuse the Church of God of the same charge. We claim “God is a family,” yet they claim that that is not in the Bible, just like “God is a Trinity” is not in the Bible. But the scriptures state the fact that Jesus is of the same KIN as the Father. He would be directly related to him. In Micah 5, it shows the true lineage of the Son: “But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel: whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.” (v.2) “His goings forth” from the Strong’s shows that this means, “H4163 ‘motsa’ah motsaw-aw’ Feminine of H4161; *a family descent;* also a sewer (compare H6675): - draught house; going forth.” His actually family descent comes from “Everlasting.” Who is the “everlasting one” of the Bible? YAHWEH!

“And Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, and called there on the name of the LORD, the *everlasting* God” (Gen 21:33).

“Blessed be the LORD God of Israel from *everlasting,* and to everlasting. Amen, and Amen.” (Psalm 41:13).

“The LORD reigneth, he is clothed with majesty; the LORD is clothed with strength, wherewith he hath girded himself: the world also is stablished, that it cannot be moved. “Thy throne is established of old: *thou art from everlasting*” (Psalm 93:1-2).
Who, What is God?

“Art thou not from everlasting, O LORD my God, mine Holy One? we shall not die. O LORD, thou hast ordained them for judgment; and, O mighty God, thou hast established them for correction.” (Habakkuk 1:12). God comes from “everlasting” or “eternity” and this is where Jesus comes from. His family descent is from God. And only God is eternal, everything else had a beginning, but God almighty alone possesses eternity.

Another scripture that shows Jesus family relationship with God is in Zechariah 13, speaking of the Shepherd of Israel, it says, “Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the LORD of hosts;” (v.7). The phrase “my fellow,” again means, “‘My fellow,’ that is, ‘my associate.’ ‘My equal’ [DE WETTE]; a remarkable admission from a Rationalist). ‘My nearest kinsman’ [HENGSTENBERG].” (Jameison, Faucette and Brown Commentary). The Strong’s translates this as, “H5997 ‘amýyth a-w-meeth’ From a primitive root meaning to associate; companionship; hence (concretely) a comrade or kindred man: - another, fellow, neighbour.” Jesus is of the same Kin as the Father.

Now when we look at Kindred in the dictionary we find it explained in these terms: “‘Kin-Kindred, Related, Kindred—Family Relationship...Kind—Family Lineage...Race-Family, Tribe, people, belonging to the same stock” (Webster’s New College Dictionary pp.466, 704, emphasis added). So Jesus claim that he was literally in a biological sense of the word related to God, he meant it, that he was of the same FAMILY as God (explained later), and directly related to God in the same way human fathers are related to their sons. This is why the Jews wanted to stone him when he claimed to be the Son of God. “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” (John 10:33). So the claim that Trinitarians make that “God is a family” is not in the Bible is false. God himself said the Shepherd of Israel “is my fellow” my family member, God is a family, and it is in the Bible!

Other Claims

In John 8:24, Jesus applies to Himself the Jehovistic title “I am” (ego eimi). That the Jewish ecclesiastics correctly understood His personal use of this title to involve a claim to Deity is made clear by their sudden attempt to slay Him for committing what, “in their view,” was blasphemy. Barnes Notes writes, “I am - The expression I am, though in the present tense, is clearly designed to refer to a past time. Thus, in Psa 90:2, ‘From everlasting to everlasting thou art God.’... The expression, applied to God, denotes that he does not measure his existence in this manner, but that the word by which we express the present denotes his continued and unchanging existence. Hence, he assumes it as his name, ‘I AM,’ and ‘I AM that I AM,’ Exo 3:14. Compare Isa 44:6; Isa 47:8. There is a remarkable similarity between the expression employed by Jesus in this place and that used in Exodus to denote the name of God. The manner in which Jesus used it would strikingly suggest the application of the same language to God. The question here was about his pre-existence. The objection of the Jews was that he was not 50 years old, and could not, therefore, have seen Abraham. Jesus replied to that that he existed before Abraham. As in his human nature he was not yet 50 years old, and could not, as a man, have existed before Abraham, this declaration must be referred to another nature; and the passage proves that, while he was a man, he was also endowed with another nature existing before Abraham, and to which he applied the term (familiar to the Jews as expressive of the
existence of God) I AM; and this declaration corresponds to the affirmation of John, John 1:1, that he was in the beginning with God, and was God....” (Barnes, emphasis added).

The “I AM” in the New Testament is exactly the phrase of the “I AM THAT I AM” in the Old. Jesus was claiming to be the very one who spoke to Moses in the Burning bush, who was the Spokesman that was God! And the Jews to whom he was speaking to, knew it because again, “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” (John 8:59). They wouldn’t of stone him if he said, “I have been” as the Jehovah’s Witnesses claim in their faulty translation of the Bible. No, Jesus said “I AM” meaning he was the God of the Old Testament!

When the Priests went to Pilate to put Jesus to death, the legal consideration, “We have a law, and by that law He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God” (John 19:7). Evidently then, in stating “I am the Son of God”, Jesus was understood as claiming virtually to be God (cf. Matt. 14.33).

And further, when in answer to the High Priest’s question, “Art Thou the Christ (Messiah), the Son of the Blessed?” Jesus replied, “I am”, we are informed that the High Priest rent his clothes and said, “What further need have we of witnesses? Ye have heard the blasphemy” (Mark 14:61-64). Jesus claimed that at his Second coming, he would come in the “glory of the Father,” (see Matthew 16:27). And asked before he was taken to be killed, to glorify him with, “the glory which I had with thee before the world was” (John 17:5). Jesus was claiming to have the same Glory with the Father.

If this was not true he would have sinned because, “I am the LORD: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another,” (Isaiah 42:8). Jehovah’s Witnesses really should re-evaluate their doctrine on Christ. If they claim Christ was “a god” this scripture shows that Jesus then sinned by claiming the same Glory as the Father. If Jesus then sinned, then he could not be that perfect sacrifice that was “without sin” (Heb 9:28). But Jesus did not sinned he was claiming something that was true, that he was God, and that he did have the same Glory as the Father.

Another group of evidence contained in the Lord’s statements concerning His own Person claims for Himself some of the essential Attributes of Deity. Jesus asserted His Omnipresence, “Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them” (Matt. 18:20), and “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the age (gr.)” (Matt. 28:20). Undoubtedly, the New Testament writers supply testimony of the fulfillment of these deific promises, when they indicate that after His Ascension, His continuing Living Presence was more real to them than had been His bodily Presence before (cf. 2 Cor. 5:16, 17).

His Omnipotence is claimed in the declaration, “All authority has been given to Me in heaven and on earth” (Matt. 28:18) The above declaration is almost parallel with another text, “All things have been delivered unto Me of My Father” (Luke 10:22; Matt 11:27).

With these statements may be associated the incident which demonstrated His mastery over nature and His creative power, when He caused the small quantity of loaves and fishes to suffice the need of 5,000 men, beside women and children (Luke 9:10-17); also His astonishing
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exhibition of power in converting many gallons of water into good wine (John 2:7-9); and further, in other works exhibiting unrestricted command of the natural forces, such as stilling the storm (Mark 4:39), walking on a rough sea (Matt. 14:24-33) and the numerous healing works. His Omniscience is either openly declared by Jesus concerning Himself, or is plainly acknowledged, when attributed to Him. In one of His latest discourses addressed to His disciples, one of His hearers said, “Now know we that Thou knowest all things.... By this we believe that Thou earnest forth from God” (John 16:30), a statement which the Lord at least does not rebuke. The Fourth Gospel declares that Jesus “knew all men” (John 2:24-25), and again, that He “knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray Him” (John 6:64). Though the last two passages appear to be the opinions of the writer of the book, yet they must be accepted as authoritative, if we receive the Fourth Gospel as inspired of the Spirit.

Holiness is claimed by Jesus, “I do always the things that are pleasing to Him (God)” (John 8:29), and when made the challenge, “Which of you convicteth Me of sin?” (John 8:46). Twice is He addressed as “the Holy One of God” (John 6:69; Luke 4:34) a designation which He accepts, knowing that if it were untrue it were highly blasphemous (see R.V.).

Deific power, involving the offices of Messiah and Redeemer, is claimed when He announces His authority to forgive men’s sins. Jesus says to the sick of the palsy, “Son, thy sins are forgiven”, and He adds, when accused of blasphemy, by some who protest that only God can forgive sins, “The Son of Man has power on earth to forgive sins” (Matt. 9:1-8). After His Resurrection, Jesus declared to the disciples that “repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His Name to all the nations” (Luke 24:47). Forgiveness of sin is certainly one of the prerogatives of God and peculiar to Him. In claiming this authority, Jesus very definitely sets Himself forth as God (e.g. Matt. 9:2; Luke 7:48).

Connected with Christ’s authority to forgive sins is His designation as the Saviour. This claim is made by Jesus in a multitude of passages; it is of a truly God-like character (e.g. John 12:47; Matt. 1:21, 18:1 I; Luke 9:56, 19:10).

“I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins...I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and, as a cloud, thy sins: return unto me; for I have redeemed thee” (Isaiah 43:3; 44:22).

Frequently the Lord proclaims Himself as the Source of eternal life (John 6:26-58) and demands faith in Himself, as the only means of Salvation- “He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life” (John 3:36); “For God so loved the world, that He gave His only Begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (John 3:16). To a group of Jewish ecclesiastics, Jesus declared, “Except ye believe that I am, ye shall die in your sins” (John 8:24), which is a decidedly deific claim. The claim of Saviour-hood is stated in many phrases, by the use of varied metaphor and imagery too lengthy for quotation in detail. Without a doubt the whole of this testimony unitedly claims that in Jesus is the only Saviour ordained of God; and that belief in Him is really belief in God, for, as He stated, “He that believeth on Me, believeth not on Me, but on Him that sent Me” (John 12:44).
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Jesus when he was teaching to the Jews that he was the “bread of life” said to them, “It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me. “Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father.”(John 6:45-46). This quote is from Isaiah 54:13, “And all thy children shall be taught of the LORD [Yahweh],” Jesus was telling them that they were being taught by Yahweh himself, and Jesus was speaking of himself. He was teaching them about the Father, because he was “of God,” and those who learned of the Father were taught by Christ himself who was the teacher, who was God!

Christ’s acceptance and approval of Worship, offered to Him by the disciples, marks a momentous stage in their education. Whereas Jews held that God alone could hear and answer prayer, and receive man’s worship, Jesus repeatedly sets Himself forth as Revealer of God, and the Object of man’s worship. On the occasion of His rescue of Peter out of the lake, the disciples in the fishing boat “worshipped Him, saying, ‘Of a truth, Thou art the Son of God’” (Matt 14:33), which indicates that they reverenced Him as God. The disciples, being directed by Jesus to meet Him in Galilee after the Resurrection, “when they saw Him, they worshipped Him” (Matt. 28:17), the doubts of some concerning Him having been dissipated by His Rising. Again, whilst witnessing Christ’s Ascension to heaven, it is recorded that the disciples “worshipped Him” (Luke 24:52). Never once did Jesus rebuke such demonstration of worship, proper only to God, nor did He upbraid them, when they prayed to Him. In fact, Jesus several times invited their prayers, even urging that prayers be addressed in His name: “Whatsoever ye shall ask in My Name, that will I do” (John 14:13); “If ye shall ask anything of the Father, He will give it you in My Name” (John 16:23). The above selection of instances shows that certain actions on the part of the disciples were approved by Christ as proper and fitting; and thereby He conclusively ranked Himself with Deity.

Angels on the other hand stopped people from worshipping them. John attempted this and was rebuked for it, “Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellowservant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God.” (Rev 22:9, 16).

In conclusion did Jesus claim to be God, Jehovah? From the evidence in the Bible, yes he did! And further proof of that was the Resurrection.

Now some may Ask, “Why did Jesus choose to do it this way when he was on earth in claiming to be God?” Why not come right out and say it, “I AM GOD” Rev. Little puts it this way, “It is obvious that many opportunities were provided for Jesus, both by direct questions addressed to Him, and by the occurrence of favorable situations to declare His Deity, and yet the Lord makes no such definite statement. Dr. Temple thinks that to make such a claim would have brought Him under condemnation of His own saying, ‘If I honour Myself, My honour is nothing’ (John 8:54). Such a declaration would have given to mere intellectual apprehension precedence over spiritual realization. Dr. Temple thinks it is not easy to imagine the Lord standing before a group of devout Jews, and declaring, ‘I am God’ (op. Cit., p. 112). So challenging a claim could confuse the disciples’ thought, whose conception of God was shaped by the Old Testament. And the
same writer adds acutely, ‘It would need much more than a verbal claim to persuade them as Jews to ascribe to a man, divine honours’” (op. cit., p. 108).

“The statements by the Lord, as reviewed above, make it evident that the claim to Deity is ever present, yet it is so closely interwoven with strands of spiritual experience, that it did not clearly strike the understanding of the disciples until their spiritual experience had matured with their years.

“Touching upon the same question, Bishop Gore remarks (Belief in Christ, p. 68) that nothing could be further from the method of Jesus than to have startled and shocked the conscience of His hearers by proclaiming Himself to be God. But He had done something which, in the long run, would have made any other estimate of Him hardly possible” (The deity of Jesus Christ, p.26, emphasis added).

Jesus method was correct and effective. Through his works was proof that he was God. His claims were substantiated through his sayings deeds and resurrection. When all the evidence is weighed you can only come up with one conclusion, Jesus is Jehovah. Anyone can claim to be God! But, “Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him, How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly.

“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.

“But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you.

“My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me:” (John 10:24-27).

Now to answer the question, when Jesus was on earth as a man was he still God? Let’s go back into eternity and see what happened at the time when Jesus was about to become human. In heaven the apostle said that Jesus, “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus:

“Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:

“But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:

“And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.” (Philippians 2:5-8). The phrase “no reputation” should read “emptied himself.” From the “form of God” to the “form of a servant.” The Word was “made flesh” (John 1:14). He was still God, BUT IN A DIFFERENT FORM! IN THE FLESH, NOT IN THE SPIRIT!

Barnes Comments, “It is conceivable that he might have laid aside, for a time, the symbols or the manifestation of his glory, or that the outward expressions of his majesty in heaven might have been withdrawn. It is conceivable for a divine being to intermit the exercise of his almighty power, since it cannot be supposed that God is always exerting his power to the utmost. And in like manner there might be for a time a laying aside or intermitting of these manifestations or symbols, which were expressive of the divine glory and perfections.” (Barnes notes, emphasis added). Jesus laid aside his glory that he had before the world was. The glories of his full deity that no man can look at his face and live because of that glory. Jesus laid that all aside and was made flesh, “God was manifest in the flesh,” (1 Tim 3:16).
Yet he did not give up his divine nature. “... it cannot mean that he literally divested himself of his divine nature and perfections, for that was impossible. He could not cease to be omnipotent, and omnipresent, and most holy, and true, and good [which we have seen Jesus claimed he had]...this supposes no change in the divine nature, or in the essential glory of the divine perfections... The language before us fairly implies that he laid aside that which was expressive of his being divine that glory which is involved in the phrase ‘being in the form of God’ - and took upon himself another form and manifestation in the condition of a servant.” (Barnes Notes, emphasis added).

We have to make the distinction here between Deity and Divinity. “Divinity indicates the Divine Nature or quality...As applied to Christ...Divinity signifies that perfect divine essence, which filled to overflowing (John 3:34)” (The Deity of Jesus Christ, Little, p.17). That Divine Nature, the Nature of God, in contrast to Human nature, Jesus still possessed, ‘since the divine nature cannot change” (ibid, p.29), and so we have “divine and the human [natures] in Jesus” yet “without sin” (Heb 4:15).

Yes Jesus had both natures in him, and was “... touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.” (Heb 4:15). “For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham [Human nature]” (Heb 2:16). But Jesus overcame these temptations, “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne” (Rev 3:21). And because he overcame the fleshly temptations he became that perfect sacrifice, that holy life that could atone for sin, “For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.” (Lev 17:11). Since Jesus had a holy life without sin, his blood was holy to cleanse us of our sins and be the atoning sacrifice for us.

So what we have in Jesus is “God living a human life” (ibid, p.31, emphasis his), “freely consenting to inhabit the flesh (yet without sin), and to accept the limitations of humanity for a period, as an act of obedience to the Fathers will...” (ibid, p.28, emphasis added). Jesus was God in the human flesh yet limited in the flesh, not in his full glory with both divine and human natures until the resurrection where he received once again the privileges he set aside of full glory of the “form of God” once again in Spirit form!

**The Resurrected Jesus**

Jesus is now in heaven as our intercessor and high Priest to the Father. What are Jesus claims for himself and how did the apostles view the resurrected Christ?

**The Book of Acts**

When the Apostle Paul was converted and became blind, Ananias was assigned to get him and to baptize him. When he was speaking to Jesus, Ananias said, “Lord, I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem:...And here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on thy name.” (Acts 9:13-14). This expression “call on thy
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name,” is meant for only Jehovah himself. Notice in the Old Testament, “then began men to call upon the name of the LORD.” (Gen 4:26).

“and there he [Abraham] builded an altar unto the LORD, and called upon the name of the LORD.” (Gen 12:8).
“And Abraham planted a grove in Beersheba, and called there on the name of the LORD, the everlasting God.” (Gen 21:33).

People who “call on the name of the LORD shall be delivered: [saved]” (Joel 2:32). This phrase symbolized worshiping God and those who did were saved. The sacrifices as well were an act of atonement for sin which Jesus did with his death. So the Christians in the book of Acts were doing what the people in the Old Testament were doing, worshipping Yahweh, atoning for their sins through the sacrifice of Jesus, and worshipping Yahweh (Jesus) to be saved. Jesus and Yahweh are one and the same!

The Apostle Paul

How did the Apostle Paul view Christ? Did he believe that Jesus was anything less than God himself? Throughout his writings there can be no doubt that Paul believed that Jesus was God, and the creator of all things.

As we have noted above in some of the Pauline letters, the apostle Paul wrote that Jesus was in, The “Form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:” (Phil 2:6). He was equal with God and was God.

In 1 Timothy 3:16, he said, “And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.” The word “God” here is with the definite article, and obviously it is speaking of Christ.

Paul wrote, “For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved” (Romans 10:13). The casual reader may not notice that Paul, in speaking of Christ, was actually quoting from Joel 2:32: “And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the LORD (Hebrew: Yahweh) shall be delivered....” Surely Paul would have never applied this verse to Jesus Christ had he not believed in the divinity of Christ.

Paul leaves no doubt as to what he believed. He wrote: “That at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.” (Philippians 2:10). Standing alone, this verse strongly suggests that Jesus could be no less than fully divine. But once we consider the fact that Paul was quoting from Isaiah 45:23, the verse becomes much more than a mere “suggestion” of Christ’s divinity. In Isaiah 45:23, God Himself says, “That unto me every knee shall bow....” Paul’s use of this passage in reference to Jesus confirms his belief in the deity of Christ.
To the Ephesians, Paul declared that God “created all things by Jesus Christ” (Ephesians 3:9), thus affirming what John’s Gospel states: that the pre-existent Christ acted as God’s divine agent in the creation of the universe.

If doubts persist, then consider what Paul wrote to the Christians at Colossae. Speaking of Christ, he wrote: “Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature (or “all creation”- NASB): 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. And He is before all things, and by Him, all things consist” (Colossians 1:15-17).

Could anything be clearer? When this passage is considered alongside everything else Paul said about the deity of Christ, we can only conclude that any attempt to strip Christ of His divinity requires that the Scriptures be twisted beyond recognition-or rejected outright! But in spite of the evidence, some claim the above passage provides no proof that Jesus Christ is God. They say that the phrase “firstborn of all creation” shows that Christ was the first of all things (both heavenly and earthly) to be created. Not so! The title “firstborn” denotes pre-eminence, not “first to be created.” He has pre-eminence over all creation because He is Creator! That’s what Paul clearly said.

Paul further stated, “For in Him [Christ] dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily” (Colossians 2:9). The Greek word for “Godhead” is Theotes, rendered “the Deity” in the NASB, and refers to the divine nature, not “divine attributes.” Christ could not embody the fullness of the divine nature if His nature were different from His Father’s nature. Yet, some try to strip Him of His deity by stripping theotes of its full meaning. The New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures, for example, erroneously translates this word “divine quality.” (This is not surprising, for the same “translation” substitutes “a god” for Theos in John 1:1.).

Further proof that Jesus Christ is God is found in Titus 2:13. The NASB is correct in its translation of this verse: “looking for the blessed hope and the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior, Christ Jesus.”

“The KJV is technically correct here, by translating the word “and” [Greek - kai]. But, it does not account for the “Granville Sharp rule,” which applies to this verse. The Greek word kai usually means “and.” But, it can either mean “in addition to,” or in the case of the Granville Sharp rule, it is used to restate, or connect words. The Granville-Sharp rule is as follows;

“If two nouns of the same case are connected by a ‘kai’ [and] and the article is used with both nouns, they refer to different persons or things. If only the first noun has the article, the second noun refers to the same person or thing referred to in the first.” (Curtis Vaughn, and Virtus Gideon, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament, (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1979), p. 83, Emphasis added). Now, let’s apply this rule to Titus 2:13.

Here is the Greek text: “prosdecomenoi thn makarian elpida kai epifaneian thV doxhV tou megalou Qeou kai swthroV hmwn Cristou Ihsou.”
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Here is a word-for-word literal translation: “Expecting the blessed hope and appearing the glory the great God and savior of us Christ Jesus.”

The Granville sharp rule actually applies in this verse (1). It applies to the words “the great God and saviour.” Both “great God” and “savior” are nouns of the same case (masculine singular). The first noun “great God” has the definite article “the” and the second noun does not. This means that the Greek word “kai” [and] is being used to restate, and the second noun is referring to the same thing as the first noun. So, in effect, “savior” [who is Jesus Christ] IS “the great God.” This is a definitive statement on the deity of Christ which is lost if Granville Sharp is not applied.

Moreover, Paul said that the proclamation of God’s Word was committed to him “according to the commandment of God our Savior” (Titus 1:3). We read of Paul’s commission, and of the One who commissioned him, in Acts 9:15: “But the Lord [Jesus Christ] said unto him [Ananias], Go thy way: for he [Paul] is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel.” To Paul, “God our Savior” and Jesus Christ were one and the same.

In his first epistle to the Corinthians, Paul said that the ancient Israelites “drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ” (1 Corinthians 10:4). Paul was referring metaphorically to two occasions when water for the children of Israel miraculously came forth from a rock (Exodus 17:6; Numbers 20:11). According to rabbinic legend, both occasions involved the same rock, which (according to the legend) miraculously “followed” the Israelites in their wilderness wanderings. Paul said that the true supernatural Rock that went with Israel was Christ.

Doubtless, Paul’s description of Christ as the “Rock” that went with Israel was linked with his awareness of the many Old Testament passages that describe God as a “Rock” (Deuteronomy 32:4,15,18,30,31; Psalm 18:2,31,46; 28:1; 31:3; etc.).

Clearly, if Paul were here today he would fervently and without hesitation condemn all teachings that deny the pre-existence and divinity of Jesus Christ, and would boldly proclaim that Christ is both God and Savior, in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead, and by whom all things were created.

We find this same truth throughout the New Testament. Let’s now turn our attention to the book of Hebrews.

Book of Hebrews

The first chapter of the book of Hebrews proclaims the deity of Christ in no uncertain terms. We are told right away that Christ has been “appointed heir of all things, by whom also He [God the Father] made the worlds” (Hebrews 1:2). Here Christ is presented as Creator (or “Co-creator”). This agrees perfectly with John’s description of Christ as the Logos through whom all things were made.
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Verse 3 declares: “[Christ is] the brightness [or “reflection”] of His [the Father’s] glory, and the express image of His Person [or “exact imprint of God’s very being”-NRSV], 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” (verse 3). In the preceding verse, Christ is presented as Creator. Here, he is Sustainer. It is hardly believable that the Creator and Sustainer who reflects the Father’s glory and shares His nature (as the “exact imprint”) could be none other than God.

Further, if He were anything less than God, He would not be worthy of worship. He must be God, then, for verse 6 tells us He is worthy of worship: “And let all the angels of God worship Him.” This is a paraphrased quotation taken either from the end of Psalm 97:7 or from the end of Deuteronomy 32:43, which is missing from the Masoretic text (from which the KJV Old Testament was translated) but present in other ancient manuscripts, including the Septuagint. In either case, the “Him” the angels of God are to worship is God.

Verse 5 makes a clear statement that Jesus is not an Angel, “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?” He is the very Son of God, God himself! Verse 7 makes the distinction between the Son and the angels, he says, “And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.” This is what angels are, spirits and ministers a flame of fire, this is their office, their function, “The ‘object’ of the apostle in this passage is to show that the angels serve God in a ministerial capacity - as the winds do;” (Barnes Notes).

Now notice the difference between the angels and the Son of God, “But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.” (vv.8-9). Amazing, the Father calls the Son, “GOD”! He called the angels ministers to God, but he called the Son VERY GOD HIMSELF, this is the difference between the angels and the Son of God.

Now does this phrase, “therefore God, even thy God,” mean that Jesus is another God, or “a god,” as some say? They would quote two other scriptures that Jesus said, “my Father is greater than I.” (John 14:28), and “…I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.” (John 20:17). Does this mean that Jesus is not God as much as the Father is? As we have seen Jesus is “equal” to the Father. What do these mean?

Little writes, “If then, the Son in essence is all that the Father [is], how shall we understand the saying- ‘The Father is greater than I?’ This saying can refer only to the Father and the Son, in regard to their Divine offices respectively, and not to Divine Essence, for the Father, in holding seniority of office, gives direction to the Son-to which the Son responds with perfect obedience (e.g. John 6:38-40; 5:19, 30, ff.).” (Deity of Jesus Christ, p.32, emphasis added).

Stinson writes, “God is used in the sense of Supreme Sovereign and HEAD OF ALL, the term applies exclusively to the Father...[in] (John 20:17). Again the word ‘God’ is used in the sense of ‘Supreme Sovereign and ‘HEAD OF ALL.’ The Father is Jesus’ God—that is He is the HEAD OF ALL, including Christ” (God is Not a Trinity, p.12, emphasis added). It is on the basis of
authority that the Father is greater than Jesus. Just like my human Father is greater than I IN authority yet I am equal to my human father in every way.

Then the Father continues, “And [the Father to the Son], Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:” (v.10). That Father calls Jesus, the creator of the Heavens and the earth. The “Lord” who “laid the foundation of the earth” (Psalm 102:25) is the Messiah figure (Psalm 45) whom God “hath anointed ... with the oil of gladness.”

Here we see the Messiah presented as both God and the “righteous servant” of God (Isaiah 53:11). Many stumble on this point, wondering how the Messiah can be God if He is the servant of God. The seeming contradiction is resolved once we understand that the Second Person of the Godhead took upon Himself the form of a servant. Clearly Paul believed that Jesus was very God!

The Apostle John

Clearly in John’s Gospel we have examined that John did believe and Jesus did testify that he was God. He said he was the “I AM” in the Old Testament, and John said that the “Word was God.”

In his letters as well he made it clear that Jesus was God. In 1 John 5:20, here is a clear statement of John’s belief, “And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life.”

There has been some argument about this passage but the wording is clear. Barnes notes, writes, “There has been much difference of opinion in regard to this important passage; whether it refers to the Lord Jesus Christ...The question is of importance in its bearing on the doctrine of the divinity of the Saviour; for if it refers to him, it furnishes an unequivocal declaration that he is divine. The question is, whether John ‘meant’ that it should be referred to him?...the following considerations seem to me to make it morally certain that by the phrase ‘this is the true God,’ etc., he did refer to the Lord Jesus Christ....the grammatical construction favors it. Christ is the immediate antecedent of the pronoun ‘this’ - houtos. This would be regarded as the obvious and certain construction so far as the grammar is concerned, unless there were something in the thing affirmed which led us to seek some more remote and less obvious antecedent. No doubt would have been ever entertained on this point, if it had not been for the reluctance to admit that the Lord Jesus is the true God...this construction seems to be demanded by the adjunct which John has assigned to the phrase ‘the true God’ – ‘eternal life.’ This is an expression which John would be likely to apply to the Lord Jesus, considered as ‘life,’ and the ‘source of life,’ and not to God as such. ‘How familiar is this language with John, as applied to Christ! ’In him (i. e. Christ) was life, and the life was the light of people - giving life to the world - the bread of life - my words are spirit and life - I am the way, and the truth, and the life. This life (Christ) was manifested, and we have ‘seen it,’ and do testify to you, and declare the eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested to us” (Barnes Notes, emphasis added).
Who, What is God?

The JFB Commentary also make it clear, “This Jesus Christ (the last-named Person) is the true God” (identifying Him thus with the Father in His attribute, ‘the only true God,’ John 17:3, primarily attributed to the Father)."

This is also the same statement Jesus made in the 17th chapter of John, “And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.” Jesus said eternal life and the true God is with the Father and the Son. Jehovah’s Witnesses only quote part of that verse and stop at the Father as the true God, and do not quote the rest that says, “AND Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.” Jesus is the true God with the Father.

In the book of Revelation, the Person, nature, and redemptive work of Jesus Christ are beautifully portrayed in descriptive language and through a kaleidoscope of marvelous imagery. He is both the fierce “Lion of the tribe of Judah” and the lowly “Lamb” whose body bears the wound of a sacrificial offering. He is the royal “Root and Offspring of David,” the brightly glowing “Morning Star,” the magnificent “King of kings and Lord of lords.” He is the “Faithful Martyr,” the “Firstborn of the dead,” the “Ruler of the kings of the earth.”

And He is God! This truth is seen in Christ’s own use of the titles of divinity. John, through a visionary experience, was glimpsing the climactic Day of the Lord when he heard “a great voice, as of a trumpet, Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last...” (Revelation 1:10,11). When he turned to see the source of the voice, he beheld “one like unto the Son of man... His head and His hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and His eyes were as a flame of fire; And His feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and His voice as the sound of many waters” (verses 13-15).

When John “fell at His feet as dead,” the supernatural Being laid His right hand on John and said, “I am the first and the last: I am He that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore...” (vv.17,18).

Clearly, the One who identified Himself as “Alpha and Omega, the first and the last” was none other than Jesus Christ! The “alpha” is the first letter of the alphabet, the “omega” the last. Jesus Christ is the “Alpha and Omega,” which suggests that in Him is the beginning and the end of God’s revelation to man. This alone suggests pre-existence and divinity, but when we realize that Yahweh identified Himself as the “first and the last,” the truth of Christ’s divinity is inescapable.

In Isaiah 41:4, God says, “I am the LORD [Yahweh], the first, and with the last; I am He.” In Isaiah 48:12, Yahweh says, “I am the first, also am the last.” In the book of Revelation, “Alpha and Omega” is a title belonging to “the Almighty.” Notice: “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty” (Revelation 1:8; cf. 21:6,7).

In Revelation 22, Jesus identified Himself as both “Alpha and Omega” and “the Root and Offspring of David” (verses 13,16), thus confirming His identity as both God and Messiah, the servant of God. This is perfect harmony with the Gospel accounts, Paul’s epistles, and the book of Hebrews. With so much evidence, who can deny that Jesus Christ is both God and Messiah?
How Can God be “One”? 

Now of course we get to the Question, “How, if Jesus is God and the Father is God, how can they be one?”

God says that, “The LORD our God is one LORD:” (Deuteronomy 6:4). Jesus said in the New Testament, “I and My Father are ONE” (John 10:30). How can this be? Are they two or one God?

We must first understand what the word “One” means in the Bible, in both Testaments. The Strong’s view of this passage is based on the root word from which echad is derived, achad. This word means “to unify” or “go one way or other” (Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible, ref# 259). In other words, echad can also mean in unity or a group united as one.

In several verses echad clearly has the meaning of more than one person united as a group. In Genesis 11:6 God says of those building the tower of Babel, “Indeed the people are one [echad]…”

In Genesis 2:24 He says, “Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one [echad] flesh.” This does not mean an absolute one, but a Compound one. The Majority of the text in the bible that use the phrase “is one” usually means unity as oppose to an absolute one.

Joseph when he interpreted the dreams for Pharaoh said, “And Joseph said unto Pharaoh, The dream of Pharaoh is one [echad]: God hath showed Pharaoh what he is about to do... The seven good kine are seven years; and the seven good ears are seven years: the dream is one [echad].” (Gen 41:25-26). Though Pharaoh had two dreams they were one in a sense of a unit, and that they were ONE & THE SAME in meaning! Two dreams that were to be put together as one so you can get the whole interpretation.

The Hebrew word translated “one” include the number one, but also such associated meanings as “one and the same,” “as one man, together [unified],” “each, every,” “one after another” and “first [in sequence or importance]” (Brown, Driver and Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, 1951, p. 25). It can also be rendered “alone,” as the NRSV translates it here (William Holladay, A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, 1972, p. 9). The exact meaning is best determined by context. As we have noted above the proper context for Deuteronomy 6:4 is a unit, unity, a group, not an absolute one, but a compound or composite one.

Now some try to translate Deuteronomy 6:4 as “The LORD our God, the LORD is first,” “The LORD is our God, the LORD alone,” or “The LORD our God, the LORD is one!” —First, none limits God to a singular Being. And second as noted, echad means a compound one not an absolute one. And, in light of the scriptures we’ve seen and others, it is clear that God is a plurality of Beings—a plurality in unity. In other words, God the Father and Jesus the Son form a perfect union. What is that unity? What is it that makes these two being united? This will be explained as we go on.
Now also to understand the “oneness” of God we also must understand the word “God” as well. The Hebrew word is “Elohim.” This word is interesting because this word as well does not mean an absolute one either. The “im” at the end is a plural ending.

According to Smith, “The fanciful idea that it [the word Elohim] referred to the trinity [or plurality] of persons in the Godhead hardly finds now a supporter among scholars. It is either what grammarians call the plural of majesty, or it denotes the fullness of divine strength, the sum of the powers displayed by God” (William Smith, L.L.D., A Dictionary of the Bible, p. 220).

First of all, “… there is no clear evidence that the ‘plurality of majesty’ existed as a form of expression used by the Hebrews in biblical times. After the Bible was written, the time came when kings did begin to use the ‘plurality of majesty.’ But even then they only did so when speaking to someone else. They did not speak to themselves in this way. In Genesis 1:26, God was not speaking to anyone but himself, for he said ‘let us create,’ and only God can create. Man was not made in the image of angels but in the image of God” (Article on Holy Trinity vs. Modalism By: Roger Garza, emphasis added).

Secondly, If God had intended to emphasize His absolute oneness rather than His unity there are words that specifically connote singularity, such as “yachid”, “rak,” or “bilti.”

Thirdly, the word is plural, and at least allows for the possibility that the one God is more than one Person. Therefore, is there evidence in the Bible that shows a duality of the Godhead?

One such clue is found in the use of plural verbs. Unitarians argue that since Elohim (when used in reference to the one true God) is followed by a singular verb, the word cannot refer to a plurality of Persons. However, this argument overlooks the fact that Elohim is sometimes followed by a plural verb, thus indicating that the noun (Elohim) is to be understood in the plural sense. While such cases do not necessarily demand that “God” be understood as a plurality of Persons, the Hebrew construction does allow for the possibility.

Another, more powerful, clue is found in the use of plural pronouns. In Genesis 1:26, God (Elohim) says, “Let US make man in OUR image, after OUR likeness....” In Genesis 3:22, God (Elohim) says, “Behold, the man is become as one of US.” And in Genesis 11:7, God (Elohim) says, “Go to, let US go down....”

The fact that both singular and plural verbs and pronouns are used with the plural Elohim is not a contradiction, as some suppose; rather, it suggests (or allows for) plurality in unity—that is, one God but more than one Person. This “plurality in unity” is suggested in Isaiah 6:8, where God says, “Whom shall I [note the singular pronoun] send, and who will go for US [plural]? This verse allows for the possibility that one Person is speaking for Himself and on behalf of at least one other Person.

While Unitarians attempt to “explain” their way around the above verses, anyone should be able to see that the use of plurals certainly presents a strong case for the plurality of Persons in the Godhead.
Who, What is God?

With the understanding that the Hebrew term for “God” is plural, that the term is sometimes used with plural verbs and plural pronouns, and that the word for “one” in the Shema is often used as a compound “one,” we should have no difficulty in understanding that God is more than one person just as we have no difficulty in understanding that Adam (translated “man” in Genesis 1:26,27) is more than one person. There are 6 billion human beings on this earth and we are all HUMAN [singular].

Notice again the first part of Genesis 1:26: “And God said, Let US make man in our image, after our likeness....” In view of all that we have seen, the most logical explanation of this verse is that one divine Person was speaking to at least one other Person of like nature, because man was made in the image of God. So the one who said “let us make man” must have said it to the other person who was of the same Image and likeness as the speaker in Genesis, so he had to be God as well.

With this foundation, the New Testament becomes clear with Jesus and the Father.

**New Testament Meaning for “One.”**

Jesus said, “I and My Father are ONE” (John 10:30). This is the New Testament Shema that Jesus proclaimed, but does this “oness” mean an absolute one?

Barnes Notes says, “…the word translated ‘one’ is not in the masculine, but in the neuter gender. It expresses union,…Most of the Christian fathers understood them, however, as referring to the oneness [ONE & THE SAME] or unity of nature between the Father and the Son;”

Adam Clarke’s Commentary comments on that unity, “One [SAME] in nature, One [SAME] in all the attributes of Godhead, and One [SAME] in all the operations of those attributes: and so it is evident the Jews understood him. See John 17:11, John 17:22.” And says, “If Jesus Christ were not God, could he have said these words without being guilty of blasphemy?” No one can claim the same attributes as God unless he was God himself which Jesus was. They were one in all things, a perfect unity between Father and Son.

Other examples in the New Testament shows this oness as well.

Paul wrote the same thing about the church: “For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office:...So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another” (Romans 12:4-5).

“For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ.
“For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.
“For the body is not one member, but many.
“If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body?
“And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the
body?

“If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling?

“But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him.

“And if they were all one member, where were the body?

“But now are they many members, yet but one body” (1 Corinthians 12:12-20). One body, many members, showing that there is unity in the church that makes it ONE Church, not many.

This source truly shows the exact meaning to be, “echad,” “united.” The 

Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament says, the following information on the word echad: “...Adam and Eve are described as ‘one flesh’ (Gen 2:24), which includes more than sexual unity. In Gen 34:16 the men of Shechem suggest intermarriage with Jacob’s children in order to become ‘one [same race of] people.’...In Gen 11:1 the plural modifies ‘words’: ‘the whole earth used the same language and the same words.’ Apparently it refers to the same vocabulary, the same set of words spoken by everyone at the tower of Babel. The first ‘same’ in Gen 11:1 is singular, analogous to ‘the same laws’ of the Passover applying to native-born and foreigner (Ex 12:49; cf. Num 15:16), or to the ‘one law’ of sure death for approaching the Persian king without invitation (Est 4:11).” (by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L Archer Jr., Bruce K Waltke).

A second reference on echad states: “...5. one only of its kind, Job 23:13; Ezekiel 7:5, Canticles 6:9....7. As one man, i.e. together. Ezra 2:64, ‘the whole congregation together;’ Ezra 3:9; 6:20; Ecclesiastes 11:6, ‘both alike.’ Also i.q. ‘together, unitedly,’ Isaiah 65:25; in the same sense is said Judges 20:8; 1 Samuel 11:7” (.Gesenius, pp.28-29, emphasis added). To be “echad” is to be the “same,” as in race or kind as the men of Shechem wanted to be with the Israelites in Gen 34:16. To be alike in every way is to be the same Kind! In a human sense, a Human Father and Son, are echad, (one) alike in every way, the same kind, Human Kind, Flesh and blood. Can this apply to the Father and Son of the God Head! Let’s see!

Now that we understand God as a compound one and NOT an absolute one, the question comes down to “one what?” One “Elohim” or “Theos,” meaning “God,” but what does that mean, that we can understand exactly how God IS one? Once you understand the concept of the meaning of the word “God” in the Bible, you can understand what it means exactly How God is one!

God Created “Kinds”

If you have not noticed in the Bible, God at creation created “Kinds.” He said, “And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so.

“And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind: and God saw that it was good....And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that it was good.

“And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth.

“And the evening and the morning were the fifth day.
“And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so...And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good.” (Gen 1:11-12, 21-25). He we see different kinds of creatures, the cattlekind, the insectkind, the dogkind, the birdkind, the fishkind etc...

In the Hebrew Scriptures, the word Adam, usually translated “man,” means “mankind.” It is used both of individuals (irrespective of gender) and of mankind collectively. Both Adam (the first male) and Eve (the first female) were called Adam. Thus, we are correct in saying, “In the Garden was Eve, and Eve was with Adam, and Eve was Adam.” Eve was not the individual being known as “Adam” (her husband), but she was Adam in that she was of the Adam-kind. God said he, “called their name Adam, [‘Mankind,’’ see Strong’s (ref# 120)]” (Gen 5:2). Notice how God called “their” name plural, two people, Adam and Eve “Mankind.” (Adam).

The book of Genesis speaks of Adam and Eve, or Adam and “the woman.” Yet, the woman, Eve, was also Adam.

Adam, was the head (or father) of the human family (or Adam-kind), and just as the composite unity called Adam was composed of Adam and Eve, Adam and Eve were of the same substance. Speaking of the woman, Adam said, “This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh... Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and they shall be one [echad] flesh” (Genesis 2:23, 24). Through marriage, two persons come together as “one flesh.” This is composite unity of all of mankind. Though there are 6 billion of us, we are all ONE & THE SAME KIND, Human-KIND! The true meaning of echad as described (above).

In a sense, there is only one Adam. That is, man is one kind; there is only one family of beings known as man. When God made Adam (both male and female), it may be said that He made all of us, for we were all “in Adam,” as it were since we are all “one flesh,” and Paul said were are all “one blood” (Acts 17:26), one kind, the Adam-kind, or Human-Kind! This is the echad, we are all the same, we are all alike, all Mankind!

Adam, The First Man Father of all——->Eve (Adam, meaning the same Kind, Human or Mankind. This is the unity or “sameness” all “alike” that we share, we are all one flesh, or Kind)—->The whole Human race we are all ONE! One Kind, one Family!

So the name, or term “Adam,” was the head of all Mankind. Yet the same term (Adam) can be used in reference to the entire human race, or to an individual member of the Human race. In the same way can we see the same pattern for the term GOD (Elohim), to the Father as God, “who is above all, and through all, and in you all.” (Ephesians 4:6), and Jesus Christ as God in reference to Jesus being the same “Kind” as the Father, the God-Kind? Does the word “God” mean, the KIND OF BEING? Is this what it means when God says he is a compound “one,” of One Kind, one Family? The Bible shows proof that this is true! God is a family consisting of the Father and the Son, both one and the same [echad] Kind, the GOD-KIND! This is how God is one! And as we are all out of the same substance, “one flesh,” and “one blood.” Jesus and the Father are of the same substance, “Spirit,” The Holy Spirit. The Bible speaks of the Spirit of the Father, and
the Spirit of Christ, which is both the Holy Spirit, as we shall examine later in more detail. “God is a spirit” (John 4:24), The Lord [Jesus] is THAT SPIRIT” (2 Corinthians 3:17).

**The Family of God**

The apostle Paul wrote that to understand the Godhead we must look into creation, the Pattern of creation will show us how God is.

“Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them.

“For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:” (Romans 1:19-20). Now we have seen the pattern of Man. Adam, The Father and Head of All. Eve is Adam, meaning she is the same Kind as Adam, Mankind, this is the composite unity, of one flesh, we are all of flesh and blood etc…

Is God the same way? Do we see the same pattern? Absolutely!

The Father of course is God, and “Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all...head of Christ is God. [the Father]” (Ephesians 4:6; 1 Corinthians 11:3).

Now Christ, like Eve, is he “God” meaning the “Kind”, as Eve is “Adam,” meaning the “Kind”? Spiros Zodhiates an authority of the Greek New Testament, Commenting on John 1:18, that calls Jesus the “only begotten Son” or “Only begotten God” (NRSV), says, “John wants to emphasize that he came to dwell upon the face of this earth in the person of Jesus Christ [and] was the same nature of God Himself...The word monogeneses [Translated “only begotten” in John 1:18] actually is a compound of the word ‘monos,’ ‘alone,’ and the word ‘genos,’ ‘race, stock, family.’ Here we are told that He who came to reveal God-Jesus Christ- is of the same family, of the same stock, of the same race as God... There is ample evidence in the scriptures that the Godhead is a family…” (Was Jesus God? p.21, emphasis added). Of course he believes in the Trinity but it’s interesting that some Trinitarians say that God is a family.

Vine’s also says that this word in the Greek “genos” means: “a generation, KIND, stock…to signify by Race” (p.57, genos 1085, emphasis added). So clearly Jesus is the same race, stock KIND, FAMILY of the Father.

As we mentioned above “For the term ‘Son’ is herein used, not in a complimentary way but in a biological sense, and with simple application. It must, therefore, signify identity of nature with the Divine Being known as the Father (Christus f’eritas, p. 121) though herein not referred name. ‘Son’ to a father implies in ordinary usage, consanguinity, and the same order of being, as the father” (The Deity of Jesus Christ, Spence Little, p.37, emphasis added). Here the phrase refers to the Son and the Father in a biological sense, as a relationship to one another as in not just of love one toward another but of KINSHIP, related to one another like a human father is related to his son, by flesh and blood.

Again the Old Testament scriptures attest to this fact that Jesus would be of this same KIN as the Father. He would be directly related to him. As we observed in Micah 5, it shows the true lineage
of the Son: “But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.” (v.2) “His goings forth” from the Strong’s shows that this means, ‘H4163 ‘motsa’ah motsaw-aw’ Feminine of H4161; a family descent; also a sewer (compare H6675): - draught house; going forth.” His actually family descent comes from “Everlasting.” Who is the “everlasting” One of the Bible? YAHWEH.

Again, Zechariah 13, speaking of the Shepherd of Israel, it says, “Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the LORD of hosts:” (v.7). The phrase “my fellow,” again means, “My fellow,” that is, “my associate.” “My equal” [DE WETTE]; a remarkable admission from a Rationalist). “My nearest kinsman” [HENGSTENBERG], “(Jameison, Faucette and Brown Commentary). The Strong’s translates this as, “H5997 ‘amýyth aw-meeth’ From a primitive root meaning to associate; companionship; hence (concretely) a comrade or kindred man: - another, fellow, neighbour.” Jesus is of the same Kin as the Father.

Again the Kindred in the dictionary we find, “Dictionary explain these terms to mean? “Kin-Kindred, Related,” Kindred-...Family Relationship,” “Kind-...Family Lineage....” “Race-Family, Tribe, people, belonging to the same stock ” (Webster’s New College Dictionary pp.466, 704). So Jesus claim that he was literally in a biological sense of the word related to God, he meant it, that he was of the same FAMILY as God and directly related to God in the same way human fathers are related to their sons. Again, Critics who say that you cannot find God is a family in the bible have no basis for that argument according to the above evidence. How can anyone criticize that God is not a family. What does it means when the Bible calls them Father and Son? What is that? It’s a Family, the Family of God! So Jesus is the [echad] same KIND as the Father, but what KIND?

The God-KIND!

Remember as shown above about Adam and Eve, “In the Beginning was Eve, and Eve was with Adam [The Father of all, the Head], and Eve was Adam [The Kind of being, Mankind].”

As for Jesus, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God [The Father, the Head of all], and the Word was God [The Kind of Being, The GOD-KIND].” (John 1:1). Father and Son are both GOD, there are ONE KIND, ONE FAMILY, THE GOD-KIND! This is how God is one! They are “echad” “one,” the “same,” “alike” and in every way.

If we apply this to human terms it becomes simple. I have a son. My son and I we are two people, but we are ONE KIND, HUMANKIND. Two people both HUMAN [singular]. There are 6 billion human beings on this earth and we are all HUMAN [singular]. Do you see? Even though there are 6 billion of us we are one RACE, KING, FAMILY, the HUMAN FAMILY! It’s the same with God. Jesus and the Father are one Kind, the GOD-KIND! One family, THE GOD FAMILY! This is the composite one the bible is speaking of, the unity we have. All of us human beings are all of one flesh and blood, as the bible says, “And hath made of one blood all nations of men” (Acts 17:26), we are all one “echad” Kind. Jesus and the Father have that same Unity. They are of the same substance, the Holy Spirit. The same divine Nature, same attributes, this is
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how they are one, the Kinship, the FAMILY, the Kind, and the Father is the Head of all! This is what unites them as one!

Notice in the scriptures when the prophets in the bible describe God, the Father and Jesus, the Son, the descriptions are identical. As descriptions of Human beings are identical, so is the description of the Father and the Son, in their Spiritual state. Humans consist of flesh, blood, lungs, brain, skin, hands and feet. This is a description of a human being. Notice the description of the Father, and then the Son, “I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days [The Father] did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool!” (Daniel 7:9).

Now, the Son, “And in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire; And his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters” (Rev 1:13-15). The descriptions are identical because they are the same kind, just like humans are the same kind!

No God But One

God repeatedly told Israel that there is no God but one. He said, “See now that I, even I, am He, and there is no god with [besides] me” (Deuteronomy 32:39); “I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God” (Isaiah 44:6); “I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside me” (Isaiah 45:5).

These are a few of the many scriptures revealing that there is no God but one. Theologians from various schools of thought have attempted to reconcile this truth with the New Testament teaching that Christ is God. Modalists attempt to explain it by asserting that God is one Person who manifests Himself through three modes-Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Trinitarians attempt to resolve the difficulty by explaining that the one God is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit-three personal distinctions within one indivisible Being. Unitarians say that since the New Testament teaches that the one God is the Father of Jesus, Jesus is not God.

Modalism is problematic in that it sees no distinction between the Father and the Son-a clear departure from both scriptural revelation and natural understanding. Unitarianism has an element of logic, but spiritualizes away the many scriptures on the divinity of Christ. The problems of Trinitarianism are manifold, as we have seen.

We of the British-Israel Church of God, hold that the problem can be resolved by considering two important facts.

First, in each of the above scriptures, the divine Spokesman is speaking on behalf of the Supreme Sovereign, who is the Spokesman’s God. As far as functional priority is concerned, the Supreme Sovereign is the “One God and Father of all [including Christ]” (Ephesians 4:6), the “only true
God” (John 17:3), the “one God” (1 Corinthians 8:6; 1 Timothy 2:5) who is the Father of Jesus Christ.

Second, in each case God is contrasting Himself with pagan “gods.” When He says “There is no God besides me,” He is simply saying that none of the “gods” of the pagans are equal to Him; not one is truly God. The so-called “gods” do not belong to the same category as Yahweh. They are not eternal. They are not self-existent. They cannot bless, heal, reveal truth, or create.

God is not saying that there is only one divine Person, or Being. He is saying that there is only one true Source of blessings, healing, truth, and creation. The pagan nations believed in many sources, many “gods,” who could be appeased through various means, including bizarre rituals and sacrifices. Different pagan gods were associated with different blessings. Some were thought of as agricultural gods, some as fertility gods, and some as healing gods, and so on. The gods were often associated with the elements- earth, water, fire, wind, and were sometimes perceived as being in competition with each other.

The divine Spokesman does not belong to the same category as the pagan deities. He is not in competition with the Supreme Sovereign, and will not receive worship apart from Him. When He, speaking on behalf of the Supreme Sovereign, says, “There is no God besides me,” He (the Spokesman) is certainly to be included with the Supreme Sovereign as the one Source of creation and all true blessings, for all true blessings come from God (the Father) through Jesus Christ (the Son). For the Son is the same kind as the Father, the God Kind!

**Creation reveals the Duality of the Godhead**

As the Apostle Paul wrote in the Book of Romans that to understand the God Head we must look at Creation. It’s interesting that when you look at creation we see a duality in all of it. How many sexes are there? Three? No, Two! Male and Female.

There is the Sun and the Moon, Night and the Day. We have two eyes, feet, hands, ears. There is the left and the right side of things. Up and Down. North and South Poles. East and West. Even in the Bible we see duality in Prophecy. Everything is dual, just like the God Head is dual of the Father and the Son.

Some might try and argue that in creation we see three’s like space, time, and matter. Or gas, liquid, solid etc... But we must remember we must look at it in the eyes of the Apostles! As they saw it! They didn’t think of time space and matter etc... They saw it by creation in the BOOK OF GENESIS. God created them “male and female” (Gen 1:27). “And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night.” (Gen 1:16). “Light from Darkness” (Gen 1:4). “God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night.” (Gen 1:5). **There is a duality in creation, this is how we must look at it, the way the apostles did!**
Part Three: What is the Holy Spirit?

“And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.” (Luke 24:49).

“But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you:” (Acts 1:8)
Who, What is God?

Interesting how even some Trinitarian scholars even admit, not in so many words that you cannot find the Trinity in the Old Testament. Norman Geisler author of 30 books and Dean of Southern Evangelical Seminary in Charlotte writes that the “...doctrine of the trinity is NOT fully developed in the OT...” (When Critics ask, p.31, emphasis added). Though he feels that it is foreshadowed in many passages, we will observe the passages in the Old Testament to see if there is evidence of the Holy Spirit being a person and see what both Testaments show is the REAL definition of the Holy Spirit!

The Holy Spirit in the OT


Notice how the term is used in several passages:

Genesis 2:7: “And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath [ruach] of life....”

Psalm 33:6: “By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath [ruach] of His mouth.”

Exodus 15:10: “Thou didst blow with thy wind [ruach], the sea covered them: they sank as lead in the mighty waters.”

Joshua 3:11: “...our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more courage [ruach] in any man.”

Proverbs 16:2: “All the ways of a man are clean in his own eyes; ‘but the Lord weigheth the spirits [ruach, translated “motives” in the NASB].”

Ecclesiastes 10:4: “If the spirit [ruach, translated “temper” in the NASB] of the ruler rise up against thee, leave not thy place....”

Scripture speaks of the “spirit of jealousy” (Numbers 5:14), the “spirit of wisdom” (Exodus 28:3), “anguish of spirit” (Exodus 6:9), a “contrite spirit” (Psalm 34:18), a “right spirit” (Psalm 51:10), a “broken spirit” (Psalm 51:17), a “faithful spirit” (Proverbs 11:13), a “humble spirit” (Proverbs 16:19), a “wounded spirit” (Proverbs 18:14), the “spirit of judgment” (Isaiah 4:4), the “spirit of wisdom and understanding ... counsel and might ... knowledge and of the fear of the Lord” (Isaiah 2:2), the “spirit of Egypt” (Isaiah 19:3), and the “spirit of heaviness” (Isaiah 61:3). Each of these refers to a disposition or mind-set-the internal motivational forces that find expression in various forms of behavior.
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From the above we can see that the term *ruach* generally refers to the invisible forces, both internal and external, that affect us. It can refer to wind or breath, to an inner disposition or mind-set, to the life principle, or to any invisible force that animates, possesses, overwhelsms, or inspires. In view of this general definition, one would naturally conclude that the “Spirit of God” is a force or power that comes from God, not a person who is somehow distinct from other persons within the Being called “God.”

In fact, many scholars throughout the professing Christian world—including Trinitarian scholars—admit that the Old Testament does not present the Spirit of God as a person, or “personal distinction” within God, but as the power of God at work in the natural world.


Under the subheading “God’s Spirit Not Presented as a Person,” the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* states: “The OT clearly does not envisage God’s spirit as a person, neither in the strict philosophical sense, nor in the Semitic sense. God’s spirit is simply God’s power. If it is sometimes represented as being distinct from God, it is because the breath of Yahweh acts exteriorly.... Very rarely do the OT writers attribute to God’s spirit emotions or intellectual activity ....*When such expressions are used, they are mere figures of speech that are explained by the fact that ruach was regarded also as the seat of intellectual acts and feelings .... Neither is there found in the OT or in rabbinical literature the notion that God’s spirit is an intermediary being between God and the world. This activity is proper to the angels, although to them is ascribed some of the activity that elsewhere is ascribed to the spirit of God” *(Vol. XIII, McGraw-Hill, 1967, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., p. 564, emphasis added).*

In Creation we see the Spirit of God in Genesis One, where David said the earth was created by the “breath [ruach] of His mouth” (Psalm 33:6), and Jeremiah describes it as, “He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion.” *(Jer 10:12).*

The angel speaking though the prophet about how God’s will is going to be done, God says, “Not by [man’s] might, nor by [man’s] power, but by *my Spirit*, [God’s power] saith the LORD of hosts.” *(Zechariah 4:6).*

In the book of Isaiah, God compares the pouring out of His Spirit with the pouring out of water. He says: “For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry grounds: I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring” *(Isaiah 44:3).*

In the future, God will say, “Neither will I hide my face any more from them: for I have poured out my Spirit upon the house of Israel...” *(Ezekiel 39:29).*

Through the prophet Joel, God said: “And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my
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Spirit upon all flesh... And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my Spirit” (Joel 2:28, 29).

The Spirit is “poured out,” and that it is God who “pours” it out. If “God” is a trinity, then this description of God pouring out His Spirit is misleading, for it suggests that the Trinity (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) will pour out His Spirit, which makes no sense. Further, if the Spirit is a third Person within God, why does God use a description (i.e., “pour out”) that leaves the reader with the impression that the Spirit is not a Person?

If it is a “mere metaphor,” as some Trinitarians claim, then we must admit that it is a misleading Metaphor!

Of course, Trinitarians retort by saying that God Himself is described with metaphors. The problem with that argument is that no one ever doubted that God is a Person. To use a metaphor to describe something understood to be a person is one thing, but to use a metaphor to describe something that is not presented as a person is quite another!

The Spiritual Presence of God

The Bible speaks about the presence of God associated with his Spirit.

In Exodus we read when God was mad against the Israelites Moses was trying to gain God’s favour again. “And Moses said unto the LORD, See, thou sayest unto me, Bring up this people: and thou hast not let me know whom thou wilt send with me. Yet thou hast said, I know thee by name, and thou hast also found grace in my sight.

“Now therefore, I pray thee, if I have found grace in thy sight, show me now thy way, that I may know thee, that I may find grace in thy sight: and consider that this nation is thy people.

“And he said, My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest.

“And he said unto him, If thy presence go not with me, carry us not up hence.

“For wherein shall it be known here that I and thy people have found grace in thy sight? is it not in that thou goest with us? so shall we be separated, I and thy people, from all the people that are upon the face of the earth.

“And the LORD said unto Moses, I will do this thing also that thou hast spoken: for thou hast found grace in my sight, and I know thee by name.

“And he said, I beseech thee, show me thy glory.

“And he said, I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the LORD before thee; and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy.” (Exodus 33:12-19).

The Hebrew term for “presence” means “face” “In the Old Testament nearly always the rendition of panim, ‘face’” (International Standard Bible Encyclopedia under “presence”). Moses wanted to gain God’s favour, and if they had that favour, God’s face “presence” would go with them.

Notice what the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia says about the Hebrew idiom about the face of God, “If God ‘hides his face’ He withdraws His presence, His favour (Deuteronomy 32:20; Job 34:29; Psalms 13:1; Psalms 30:7; Psalms 143:7; Isaiah 54:8; Jeremiah 33:5; Ezekiel
Who, What is God?

39:23, Ezekiel 39:14; Micah 3:4). Such withdrawal of the presence of God is to be understood as a consequence of man’s personal disobedience, not as a wrathful denial of God’s favour (Isaiah 59:2). God is asked to ‘hide his face,’ i.e. to disregard or overlook (Psalms 51:9; compare Psalms 10:11). This is also the idea of the prayer: ‘Cast me not away from thy presence’ (literally, ‘face,’ Psalms 51:11), and of the promise: ‘The upright shall dwell in thy presence’ (literally, ‘face,’ Psalms 140:13)” (under “Face” emphasis added). In the context of Moses and God in Exodus 33, it is speaking of God’s favour. If God’s face “presence” was on them then God’s favour was with them.

But notice how David associates God’s presence, his favour with the Holy Spirit: “Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities. “Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me. “Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy spirit from me. “Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free spirit.” (Psalms 51:9 - 12). Again the context is favour with God. David seeks forgiveness from sin, and asked God not to take away his “face” his “presence” meaning his favour from him, by taking away his holy spirit! David wanted, “The LORD make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: ” (Numbers 6:25). When God’s face shines on us we are under his grace!

The reason the spirit of God is associated with his face, is for the simple reason that he face “shines.” In the New Testament it says of Christ, “and his countenance [Gr. “opsis” “Face”] was as the sun shineth in his strength.” (Rev 1:16). The literal sun is energy. The power that emanates from the face of God is also energy, power, the power the Bible calls the Holy Spirit!

Those who have the Holy Spirit are in God’s favour or grace, “…generally good will, acceptance, and the benefits flowing from these; in older usage it meant also the countenance, hence, appearance. Alternating in English Versions of the Bible with ‘grace,’ …the Revised Version (British and American) has ‘grace;’” (International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, under “favor” emphasis added). Here is one example of God’s favor, “Therefore will I cast you out of this land into a land that ye know not, neither ye nor your fathers; and there shall ye serve other gods day and night; where I will not show you favour [“graciouslyness” Strong’s, #2594]” (Jer 16:13).

Notice what the Bible says about the Holy Spirit: “And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications:” (Zechariah 12:10).

“Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden underfoot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?” (Heb 10:29). This is what David was saying to God in Psalm 51. Not to take his spirit away from him but to keep him under God’s grace. Even Moses in Exodus 33, God told him that his “presence” would go with him and said, “…and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy.” (Exodus 33:19). To have God’s Spirit is to be under God’s Grace. As Paul said about spirit begotten Christians, “for we [Paul had Holy Spirit as well as all Christians see Acts 9:17, 31] are not under the law, but under grace” (Rom 6:15).
Now what about Psalm 139:7? “Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence [“face”]?” The context of this verse and the whole Psalm is about the creation. “…If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there…If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;…marvellous are thy works;” (Psalm 139: 8-9, 13). God made all things with his Spirit which is his power, “He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion.” (Jer 10:12).

David is saying no matter where I go I see the works of God in all things. In heaven, in the earth God was there, and created it by his power. None of the patriarchs or prophets of the Old Testament ever thought of the Spirit of God as a Person who was somehow distinct from the One from which it proceeds. Nor did the learned rabbis or people who frequented the synagogues in the time of Jesus. The ordinary Jewish understanding was founded solidly on the Old Testament.

Why so much emphasis on the Old Testament? Why is it important to first gain a clear picture of the Jewish/Old Testament understanding of the Holy Spirit?

It is important for three reasons: First, the New Testament itself stresses the importance of the Old Testament Scriptures in deriving sound doctrine. Second, the early church was, at first, entirely Jewish! Third, the apostles and writers of the New Testament spoke of the Holy Spirit as something the early converts were already familiar with, not as some new revelation or “mystery” that had not been understood.

Speaking of the Old Testament, the apostle Paul said, “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness” (II Timothy 3:16). Many do not realize that a fair percentage of the New Testament is quotations from, allusions to, and paraphrases of passages from the Old Testament. Some scholars claim to have identified over two thousand quotations and allusions to Old Testament passages in the New Testament, with at least one who claims to have identified over four thousand. The Old Testament is the actual foundation of the New Testament, and since the Old Testament describes the Holy Spirit as the power of God and means through which the transcendent God is present with His people, not as a Person distinct from the One from which it proceeds, why should anyone assume that the writers of the New Testament held a different view of the Spirit of God? This question is especially significant when we consider the Jewish roots of the New Testament church.

**The Holy Spirit in New Testament**


As we have seen, the Old Testament shows that the spirit of God is the power of God, and the presence of God. Do we see the same in the New Testament? Absolutely!

Before his departure into heaven Jesus said to his disciples: “I send the promise of the Father upon you” (Luke 24:49). And what is this promise from the Father that was to come upon them?
Acts 2 reveals the answer: “And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. “And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting” (Acts 2:1-2). Notice the sound was “From heaven,” and it “filled all the house.”

What was causing this sound? What was happening? Notice verse 4: “And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost…” Yes the Holy Spirit. It says the Holy Ghost for the simple reason that the King James Translators Believed in Ghosts so they put into the translation the “The Holy Ghost,” but all new translations have the “Holy Spirit.” Was this the promise from the Father? Acts 1:4-5, 8 answers that question: “And, being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me. “For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence… But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you:”

Luke 24:49 says the same thing but here the description of the Holy Spirit is given, “And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high. ” Here is the clear definition of the Holy Spirit, just like the Old Testament, the Holy Spirit is the POWER FROM ON HIGH! Can it be any plainer!

Here again, When the angel Gabriel foretold the birth of Jesus, he said to Mary: “The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (Luke 1:35).

Notice that the “Holy Spirit” is equated with the “power of the Highest.” Here we find no departure from or addition to previous revelation. The Holy Spirit is the power of God. Mary, being Jewish and having a good understanding of Old Testament descriptions of the Spirit of God, surely understood “Holy Spirit” to mean “power of the Highest.”

When Jesus was accused of casting out demons “He casteth out devils through Beelzebub the chief of the devils” (Luke 11:15), Jesus answered, “And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges. “But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you” (vv.19-20).

In Matthew’s parallel account Jesus is quoted as saying: “But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you” (Matthew 12:28). The “spirit of God” is then the “finger of God;” It is God’s spiritual extension, another way of describing his presence and activity in the natural world by God reaching down and touching the lives of human beings: “Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy spirit from me.” (Psalm 51:11).

The Ten Commandments are written with the “finger of God” (Exodus 31:18). The Law was miraculously written with the spirit of God. In other words God reached down into the natural world and produced the Ten Commandments.
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The “finger of God” is another way of describing the power of God. When Jesus *healed the man of the demon* that he had, this is the power he used to heal people. Jesus used the finger, the spirit of God to heal: “and the *power of the Lord* was present to *heal them*” (Luke 5:17). So clearly the Spirit of God or finger of God is the power of God, the Holy Spirit.

Notice how the power of God is used in connection with the Holy Spirit:


“For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of *power*, and of love, and of a sound mind” (2 Tim 1:7).

“Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the *power of the Holy Ghost*” (Rom 15:13).

“But ye shall receive *power*, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you:” (Acts 1:8).

“But truly I am full of *power by the spirit of the LORD,*” (Micah 3:8).


“Through mighty signs and wonders, *by the power of the Spirit of God*; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ” (Rom 15:19). Like the Old Testament, the Holy Spirit is “poured” out on believers and they are “filled” with the spirit of God. Jesus was “full of the Holy Spirit” and was “led by the Spirit” when He went into the wilderness to be tested of the devil (Luke 4:1).

The angel who appeared to Zacharias and foretold the birth of John (the Baptist) said, “...and he [John] shall be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother’s womb” (verse 15). Elisabeth, John’s mother, was “filled with the Holy Spirit” when the babe leaped in her womb (verse 41), and Zacharias was “filled with the Holy Spirit, and prophesied” after John was born (verse 67).

After the Holy Spirit filled the disciples on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2:4), Peter declared, “...this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh...” (vv. 16,17; cf. Joel 2:28). What did “my Spirit” mean to Peter? What did it mean to those who heard him? What did it mean to Luke, who recorded this account? Obviously, neither Peter nor anyone in his Jewish audience thought of the Holy Spirit in Trinitarian terms.

No one with a good understanding of the Old Testament and Jewish concept of the Holy Spirit would read these scriptures and *naturally* conclude that the Spirit is a Person distinct from the One who sends it? And certainly neither Peter nor any of the many Jews who heard him proclaim the fulfillment of prophecy thought in such terms.
Another function of the Spirit of God is that it dwells with each and every individual. We have “communion [Greek “Koinonia” “sharing”] of the Holy Ghost,” (2 Corinthians 13:14). The Holy Spirit of God “beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God:” (Romans 8:16). This is the method by which the Holy Spirit dwells in us, in every individual as Paul says, “Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?” (1 Corinthians 3:16). This simply means that God the Father and Jesus the Son dwells in His spiritual temple, the church. He is with His people in Spirit.

Time and again the New Testament speaks of God and Christ being “with” or “in” the church. Christ promised His disciples that He would be with them always (Matthew 28:20). He promised, “Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them” (Matthew 18:20). Paul said that “Christ in you” is the “hope of glory” (Colossians 1:27).

John said, “If we love one another, God dwelleth in us... Hereby know we that we dwell in Him, and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit” (1 John 4:12, 13). God the Father and Jesus Christ dwells in us, how? Because He has given us his Spirit, his presence as David wrote, “Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy spirit from me.” (Psalm 51:11). God is capable of being “with” His people, who live within the natural world and are a part of it. He is with them in Spirit. Thus, the Holy Spirit is the spiritual presence and power of God at work in the natural world.

“If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father” (1 John 2:24); “God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him” (1 John 4:16); and, “He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son” (2 John 9). Notice the DUALITY of Father and Son, and they dwell in us of course by the Spirit of God! (1 John 4:12-13).

Paul wrote: “...for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people” (2 Corinthians 6:16). How does the transcendent God dwell in His people? “And hereby we know that He [God the Father] abideth in us, by the Spirit which He hath given us” (1 John 3:24). And if the Holy Spirit was a third person, how does a person dwell in each and every individual? Does he split himself into a billion pieces? No! You do not hear of the Father or the Son dwelling in us in this way. They dwell in us BY THE HOLY SPIRIT, THE POWER OF GOD!

Do you see how the spiritual indwelling of God, both Father and Son, is equated with “the Spirit which He hath given us”? The Holy Spirit is clearly presented as the spiritual extension, presence, and power of God, not as some “third Person” or hypostasis who is somehow at one with yet distinct from the Father and the Son.

**The Mind of God**

The apostle Paul gave a clear description of the Spirit of God and he did not believe it was a person, but God’s power and mind. In 1 Corinthians 2:16 he quotes an Old Testament passage,
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“For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ.” He quoted Isaiah 40:13, “Who hath directed the Spirit of the LORD, or being his counsellor hath taught him?” Notice, the Spirit of God is the mind of God. Just like man has a spirit within him. The “Spirit of God” is contrasted with the “spirit of man” (1 Corinthians 2:11). And Paul says, “we have the mind of Christ.” That’s the Holy Spirit that every believer has.

**Salutations of Paul**

In all the letters of the Apostle Paul, the salutations in the letters only mention the Father and the Son. Why is the Holy Spirit omitted?

Notice Romans 1:7: “To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints: Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.” Read all the epistles of Paul, the Holy Spirit is never listed with the Father and the Son. If the Holy Spirit is a person, wouldn’t Paul have feared of committing “Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit” by failing to mention him?

Here is Paul’s definition of God, “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.” (1 Corinth 8:6). The Holy Spirit? Not mentioned!

Paul declared, “I charge thee before God [the Father], and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels.” (1 Timothy 5:21) Paul called the heavenly agencies to witness this charge given to Timothy. Notice who Paul called as a witness for him. God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ are naturally the first ones to be mentioned, but Paul did not stop here. *He called all the angels of God to be his witnesses also.* Certainly if Paul knew of a third being who is coequal with the Father and His Son, then he would have mentioned him in this verse. Yet there is no hint of another being, which is plain evidence that Paul knew nothing about a third god.

If the Holy Spirit was part of a Trinity, why didn’t Stephen (Acts 7:55-56), when he was martyred, and he saw the heavens opened, why didn’t he see the Father on his throne, and Jesus Christ at his right hand, *and the Holy Spirit...*? He did not mention the Holy Spirit did he. *He said he just saw the Father and the Son!* Well, if there is a trinity, why didn’t he mention him? The Simple answer, God is not a trinity, but a family consisting of the Father and the Son.

Also in the book of Revelation, we see heaven opened, and the Father is on his throne, and the Lamb, the 24 elders, the Cherubim, all the angels praising God, *and the Holy Spirit...*? Not mentioned. If he is a person and equal to God, why don’t we see him in any of the visions, see Revelation 4 and 5.

Consistently we see a duality in the God head of Father and Son, and not of a trinity. Even Jesus himself spoke of this duality.

“Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. “Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works’ sake.” (John 14:10-11).
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Jesus said: “All things have been handed over to me by my Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him” (Matthew 11:27, NRSV). But what about the Holy Spirit? If the Spirit is the “third Person” of the Godhead, He knows the Father and the Son, and does not need to have them revealed to Him. Jesus constantly prayed to the Father. Over and over is talked about the Father and the Son as a duality of the Godhead, not a triune Godhead.

**Who’s Spirit?**

The Holy Spirit is described as the “Spirit of Christ” (1 Peter 1:11). Yet it is also called the “Spirit of your Father” (Matthew 10:20). Question, if the Holy Spirit is a person, and the Bible says that the Holy Spirit is the “Spirit of Christ” as well as the “Spirit of the Father,” how can this be a separate person? How do you share a person? Do they split him in half? How can this make sense? It doesn’t unless it is understood that Christ and the Father are both composed of the same Holy Spirit so it cannot be a person.

If the whole Christian community shares, and is filled with the Holy Spirit, how can this be a person? It can’t! But when you understand that the Holy Spirit is the power of God, then it becomes perfectly clear that the Father and the Son, and the whole Christian community share in the power of God.

**Analogies of the Spirit**

There are many spiritual analogies of the Holy Spirit. No one of these are said about the Father or the Son. It is said that the Holy Spirit is “poured out” and it “fills” the repentant believer, see Acts 2:17-18; Ezekiel 39:29; Ephesians 5:18; Luke 1:15; Acts 9:17. Can a person be poured out? Jesus compared the Holy Spirit as flowing “rivers of living water” (John 7:38-39). If the Holy Spirit is a person, how does a person flow like water?

The Spirit was given to Jesus without measure (John 3:34). Paul spoke of the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ (Phil 1:19). Is a person spoken of in terms of measure and supply? Are Jesus and the Father spoken of in these terms? No!

The Spirit is likened unto water (John 7:37-38), fire and wind (Acts 2:1-4), and oil (Matthew 25:1-13). Do you see what fire, water and wind all represent? POWER! This is the reason they are described in this way, for the Holy Spirit is the POWER OF GOD!

Now the Bible says God is a “consuming Fire.” (Deut 4:24; Heb 12:29). Since the Holy Spirit is represented as fire, this shows that God is composed of the Holy Spirit, as humans are composed of flesh and blood. It is the substance into which God is composed of as well as Christ.

“God is a spirit” (John 4:24). He is composed of Spirit, the Holy Spirit. Jesus, “The Lord is that [the] Spirit” (2 Corinth 3:17). Jesus is composed of Spirit as well. He is “the Spirit” in the book of Revelation. What is he composed of? The Holy Spirit!
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With so much evidence against the Trinitarian conception of the Holy Spirit, why do so many evangelicals insist that belief in the trinity is essential to true Christianity? The answer to this question may be surprising to many.

First, Trinitarianism relies heavily upon the “authority” of the historic, visible church.

Second, the Trinitarian conception of the Holy Spirit as a distinct Person is based on a narrow interpretation of a few selected “proof texts.”

Let’s examine the most commonly cited of those selected texts.

**Who is the True Comforter? Jesus? Or the Holy Spirit?**

One of the scriptures Trinitarians often quote to support their doctrine is John 14:16-17, 26; 15:26; 16:7. Let’s examine the passages and see what it really says.

“And I will pray the Father” Jesus said to his disciples, “and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever…”

“Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you…”

“But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you…”

“But 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:…”

“Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.” Here Trinitarians say that “he,” the Holy Spirit as the Comforter, is a third person of a Trinity. Is the Comforter a person? A quick examination of this shows Him to be A PERSON, but a NOT a third person of a trinity!

The Bible says that Jesus Christ is the Comforter of the Church of God! Is this a contradiction in scripture?

First the word translated “Comforter” in the King James Version is the Greek Parakletos. Vine’s has this to say about the word:

“...lit., called to one’s side, i.e., to one’s aid, is primarily a verbal adjective, and suggests the capability or adaptability for giving aid. It was used in a court of justice to denote a legal assistant, counsel for the defense, an advocate; then, generally, one who pleads another’s cause, an intercessor, advocate, as in I John 2:1, of the Lord Jesus. In the widest sense, it signifies a succourer, comforter. Christ was this to His disciples, by the implication of His word ‘another
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(allos, another of the same sort, NOT heteros, different) Comforter,” when speaking of the Holy Spirit... He calls Him ‘the Comforter.’ ‘Comforter’ or ‘Consoler’ corresponds to the name ‘Menahem,’ given by the Hebrews to the Messiah” (W.E. Vine, An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words, Thomas Nelson Publishers, Nashville, p. 200, emphasis added). Notice that the description of the comforter is applied more to Jesus Christ, than to the Holy Spirit.

Another “Allos”

The word “another” is not a different comforter, which the Holy Spirit would be if he were a person, but “allos” same sort of comforter which they always had, Jesus Christ. “Allos expresses a numerical difference and denotes ‘another of the same sort;’ heteros expresses a qualitative difference and denotes ‘another of a different sort.’ Christ promised to send ‘another Comforter’ (allos, ‘another like Himself,’ not heteros), John 14:16. Paul says ‘I see a different (AV, "another") law,’ heteros, a law different from that of the spirit of life (not allos, ‘a law of the same sort’), Rom. 7:23.” (Vine's Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words, p.29, emphasis added).

Leon Morris explains it this way, “The the Greek there are two words for ‘other:’ allos means ‘another of the same kind,’ Thus if I ask for another book, using allos, I am seeking another copy of the volume in question. But if you bring me a copy of another book altogether I might complain that I did not say heteros...all Greek writers used the two words for ‘other’ strictly” (Spirit of the Living God p.36, emphasis added). The sense is it’s another copy of same book!

They had Jesus at the time in the flesh as their comforter, but, afterwards, after his resurrection they would have Jesus as Lord in the Spirit with power and glory, a resurrected Christ. First they had the comforter in the flesh, then afterwards another comforter-Jesus in the spirit.

That’s why Jesus said, “Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.” (John 16:7). And Jesus also said, “Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you” (John 14:28). Leon Morris is right when he says, “As Jesus is a person, the inference is that the spirit is also a person” (ibid, p.36). Of course he thinks it’s the Holy Spirit but examining the scriptures tells us something different.

Let’s look at the other scriptures that show Jesus as the Comforter of the Church of God, “My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we [the church and the disciples of Jesus] have an advocate [“comforter” Greek “Parakletos”] with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous:” (1 John 2:1). JESUS IS THE COMFORTER!

“For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour [boētheō or “help or “bring aid” Thayers] them that are tempted.” (Hebrews 2:18). Because Jesus has suffered being tempted, he comes to us in a different way than He ever did before, He can truly be called “another Comforter.”

Now why did Jesus called the Comforter “he”? Was he not speaking of someone else? It was not uncommon in Christ’s day to speak of oneself in the third person. You find this style throughout
the New Testament. Notice John 17:1-4, “These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee: “As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.

“And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.

“I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do.” Is Jesus speaking of another person or himself? The answer is obvious. When Jesus was speaking of another Comforter he was speaking of himself in his glorified state. Most forget what Jesus said about the statement he made when it comes to the Comforter, “And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; “Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.

“Will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you.” (John 14:16-18). Jesus himself said he will come to them and not leave them comfortless. The third person language is being applied here as in other places in the Bible. Also the italicized words around these scriptures make it sound more like the Holy Spirit is a person because the translators added these words for the simple fact that they were Trinitarians. One example, “But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you” (John 14:26).

Now the Comforter, as it says above, “dwelleth with you, and shall be in you” and “abide with you for ever;” It is “Christ in you, the hope of glory.” (Colossians 1:27).

John said, “And this is his commandment, That we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment.

“And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us…God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us.

“Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit” (1 John 3:23-24, 4:12-13). Christ the Comforter dwells in us BY THE SPIRIT! So if we keep in line with what the Bible says, the translators should of added the words this way, “But the Comforter, which is BY the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you” (John 14:26).

So let’s examine the scriptures about the Comforter understanding with all the scriptures who is the true Comforter.

“And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; [Jesus speaking in the third person like he always does and Jesus abides with his church forever, see Matthew 28:20;]

“Even” [“Even” is italicized added by the translators. Jesus dwells in us BY the Spirit so this word can read “BY”] the Spirit of truth; whom [The Comforter] the world cannot receive [Jesus-The world and his own did not know or receive Jesus, not the Holy Spirit, see John 1:9-12], because it [the world] seeth him not [The Comforter], neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he
“But the Comforter, which is [According to 1 John ‘BY’] the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.” (John 14:26). 1 John 2:20, 27, speaks of the “anointing” meaning the Holy Spirit, and it says that “it hath taught you,” John describes the Holy Spirit as “It” for the simple reason, the Holy Spirit is the mind of God, and God puts his words in our minds to reveal and teach us all things. The Comforter, Jesus teaches us through, or by the Holy Spirit.

“But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even ‘BY’ the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he [the Comforter] shall testify of me:” (John 15:26). Again, Jesus speaking in the third person as he always does, and he will come and dwell with us “BY the Spirit of Truth” which come from the Father.

“Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.

“And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment:

“Of sin, because they believe not on me;

“Of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more;

“Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.

“I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.

“Howbeit when he [the Comforter], [BY] the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.

“He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.

“All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you.

“A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father.” (John 16:7-16). Verse 13 is explained when “He” the Comforter, Jesus comes, BY “the Spirit of Truth,” this is how he dwells with his church, “He” the Comforter will guide, speak and show us all things by the Holy Spirit.

Jesus made a statement toward the end of His discourse sheds significant light on His description of the Comforter, and is usually ignored or overlooked by Trinitarians. That statement is found in John 16:25: “These things have I spoken unto you in proverbs: but the time cometh, when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall shew you plainly of the Father.” The word “proverbs” is “paroimias” This means “figurative language.” JFB Commentary says, “…in obscure language; as opposed to speaking ‘plainly’ in the next clause” (emphasis added).
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The International Bible Commentary by F.F. Bruce says, “Figuratively… the wording might well mean that He speaks of the parabolic method which he employed as a whole” (p.1257, emphasis theirs and mine).

The Ferrar Fenton Version of the Bible renders the passage, “All these things I have told you in figures of speech. The time has come however, when I will no longer speak to you figuratively, but plainly…”

Throughout His discourse (John 14-16), Jesus used “proverbs,” or figurative language, in teaching the disciples about His Father, His work of redemption. His going away and coming again to His disciples and the work they were to perform in His bodily absence.

The disciples did not know what Jesus meant when He told them that He was going away and that he would send a “Comforter,” or “Counselor,” to them. He used figurative language throughout the discourse the disciples still did not fully understand His meaning.

Though the disciples failed to grasp the full meaning of Jesus’ words, we need not be confused. A careful examination of Jesus’ own explanations of the figurative language He used leaves us with a clear understanding of what He meant when He spoke of the Comforter.

Immediately after His first reference to the Comforter, Jesus explained His meaning. Notice carefully: “I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you. Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also.
“At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you. He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot, Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world? Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.” (John 14:18-23).

Jesus’ promise to come to His disciples after His departure may be an allusion to His post-resurrection appearances, but the context-and especially the promise of Christ and His Father making their abode with the disciples-clearly indicates that He was also speaking of the fact that He and the Father would be with them in Spirit. Jesus’ description of the Comforter, then, was figurative language for the spiritual presence of God, both Father and Son as it is described in 1 John 3:24 and 1 John 4:13.

The use of such figurative language was not uncommon among the Jewish rabbis. In fact, in rabbinic writings after the time of Jesus, the Holy Spirit is described as Israel’s “defense counsel.” None of the rabbis thought of the Spirit as a distinct personality, but they spoke of it as if it were distinct from the One who sends it. While such descriptions appear after the time of Jesus, it is probable that they were derived from earlier sources. It is not surprising, then, that Jesus, whose methods of teaching were strikingly similar to those of other Jewish teachers,
described the Holy Spirit in similar terms. Again our assessment is correct rendering it “the Comforter, which is BY the Holy Ghost.”

“Thus Saith the Holy Spirit”?

Many argue that the Holy Spirit is a person just as Jesus and the Father are persons because of the numerous scriptures that say that the Holy Spirit “spoke” as these scriptures say: “Thus saith the Holy Ghost,” (Acts 21:11).

“…the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them” (Acts 13:2). Do these scriptures indicate that the Holy Spirit is a person? Absolutely not! When you put all the scriptures together we find that this is just a shortened version of the entire expression of the Holy Spirit speaking through the mouth of a prophet! Notice one example here, “Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers,” (Acts 28:25).

When you look at all of these scriptures the Holy Spirit spoke by a “prophet” see Acts 13:1; 21:10. Esaias or Isaiah is quoted to have given the prophecy by the Holy Spirit. The Nelson’s King James study Bible footnote to Acts 13 says, “The commissioning of Barnabas and Saul for this missionary Endeavour was the work of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit most likely spoke through one of the prophets since there were prophets in that group and that was the usual means of communicating the Spirit’s message” (1 Cor. 14”) (pp.1688-89, emphasis added).

Jamieson Fausset and Brown similarly state, “the Holy Ghost said—through some of the prophets mentioned in Acts 13:1.” So when the Holy Spirit “said” something it was always through a prophet.

The People’s New Testament as well says, “By an inspiration given to some one of these prophets.” (Emphasis added). Notice Acts 1:16, “Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus.” The spirit “move” (see 2 Peter 1:21) David, and he spoke.

2 Samuel 23:1-2 says clearly, “Now these be the last words of David. David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet psalmist of Israel, said,
“The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was in my tongue.” Clearly, God’s words, which come from the mind of God (Rom 11:34; Isa 40:13), which is the Holy Spirit, are put into the mind of the prophet, and the Spirit of God speaks by the prophet, not that the Holy Spirit is a person and speaks on his own. The Lord’s thoughts and revelations are spoken by the Prophet.

On the Day of Pentecost the Apostles were “filled” with the Holy Spirit. Paul said that “All scripture is given by inspiration of God,” (2 Tim 3:16). The prophet speaks because of Inspiration given to them by God because God “fills” them with his power, the power of God that inspires them. Many people get inspired. Inspiration is not limited to just people. Some are inspired by music, movies, the attitudes of people etc…. So this again has nothing to do with a third person of a trinity but the Christian filled with the Spirit.
Why the phrase, “The Holy Spirit said”? The Holy Spirit of God is spoken of as God’s “presence,” (Psalm 51:11; 139:7). Thus, when the Bible says, “the Holy Ghost said,” (Acts 13:2) it is God Himself speaking to people by means of His Holy Spirit. Even the Apostle Paul wrote, “For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit,” (1 Corinthians 5:3; Colossians 2:5). So even though Paul the person was not there, he was there in “spirit,” his influence was there. Just like God, the person, either Father or Son is not there, but his presence, his influence by the Holy Spirit is there present with the church.

What About Acts 10:19? “The Spirit” spoke to Peter? While Peter thought on the vision, the Spirit said unto him, “Behold, three men seek thee.” Peter also called him “Lord.” Not only does this passage tell us that the Spirit spoke, it tells us what the Spirit said. Does this suggest then, that the Spirit in this particular passage is a person? Absolutely! BUT NOT A THIRD PERSON OF A TRINITY!

When one reads the entire story, one finds that an ”angel of the lord” is involved. Now angels are “spirits” (Heb 1:7). The Angel appeared to Cornelius (Acts 10:3, 4). He told him to go to Peter. Now Peter says he heard a “voice” (v.13). This voice came from a “spirit” (v.19). This is repeated in Acts 11:7 and 12. Nowhere does it say it’s the Holy Spirit. This episode resembles many other episodes in the Bible of men speaking with angels. Like John the Baptist father, when the Angel told him he would have a son. This also took place during the hour of prayer like Peter (Acts 10:9, 30; Luke 1:10-11). So this ”spirit” that spoke to Peter, was the same Angel that arranged this whole meeting in the first place.

Now why is he called “Lord”? (Acts 10:4, 14). Barnes Commentary explains, “This is the expression of surprise and alarm. The word ‘Lord’ should have been translated ‘sir,’ since there is no evidence that this is an address to God, and still less that he regarded the personage present as the Lord. Compare the notes on Acts 9:5. It is such language as a man would naturally use who was suddenly surprised; who should witness a strange form appearing unexpectedly before him; and who should exclaim, Sir, what is the matter?” (Emphasis added).

**Intercessor, Jesus? Or the Holy Spirit?**

Who is the only Intercessor between God and Man? Jesus Christ, right? Yes, the Bible plainly says so,

“By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better Testament.

“And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death:

“But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood.

“Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them” (Heb 7:22-25).

What is an intercessor? “The act of intervening or mediating between differing parties; particularly the act of praying to God on behalf of another person” (Holman Bible Dictionary under article “Intercessor”). And there is only ONE Mediator between God and Men, Jesus: “For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;” (1 Tim 2:5). Only Jesus. And our intercessions go through Christ to the Father and the Bible Dictionary tells
us, “God accepts a believer’s prayers and praises through Christ’s intercession. His death secured removal of sin; His resurrection bestowed life on those who believe in Him; His ascension brought exaltation to power in heaven and on earth. Now He intercedes for us at God’s throne of grace. Hebrews 7:25 proclaims the complete deliverance that comes through salvation accomplished through Christ and notes that He is ever present in heaven to intercede for those who come to Him” (Ibid, emphasis added). So we can conclusively say that Christ is the only intercessor or Mediator between God and MEN! Then why does it say that the Holy Spirit intercedes for US as well?

“Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God” (Romans 8:26-27). Who is the “Spirit” in these verses?

Here is one clue. “And he that searcheth the hearts” is Jesus Christ: “I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts:” (Rev 2:23). The ‘He” that searches the hearts is the one called the “Spirit” that “makes intercession for us.” “The Lord is that [the] Spirit” (2 Corinthians 3:17). Jesus is “the Spirit saith unto the churches;” (Rev 2:7). Jesus is the only one who is mediator between God and Man, so this “Spirit” has to be Jesus.

Also in that same chapter just a few verses down Paul writes, “Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.” (Rom 8:34).

Now it says that he “knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit,” Of Course “The Lord is that [the] Spirit.” The mind of the Spirit is “the mind of Christ,” and the mind of the Father as we have learned is the Holy Spirit of God.

The apostle Paul quotes from Isaiah 40:13 “Who hath directed the Spirit of the LORD, or being his counsellor hath taught him?” (Isaiah 40:13). The Holy Spirit is God’s mind! Most likely it’s speaking of Jesus who knows the mind of the Father knows his will, therefore is able to make intercession for the saints of God.

Who was Jesus’ Father?

Millions of people who consider themselves Christians celebrate the birth of Christ. Most of these same people also believe in the trinity doctrine. They claim that their beliefs in the birth of Christ and the trinity are based on the Bible. Yet if we believe the biblical account of Christ’s birth, we simply CANNOT accept the trinity. Let’s understand why.

Son of the Holy Spirit?

The story of Jesus’ conception is told by two Gospel writers-Matthew and Luke. Those who believe in a trinity may use Matthew’s account to back up their theory. But let’s see what it says.
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“Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost” (Matthew 1:18).

Later an angel appeared to Joseph and said: “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” (v.20). Taken at face value, these verses seem to indicate that the Holy Spirit was a person responsible for Mary’s pregnancy. But can that be so?

Get all the Facts!

The Bible is written so that it takes a little digging to get all the facts about a subject.

“For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little:...But the word of the LORD was unto them precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little,...”(Isaiah 28:10, 13). Let’s see what Luke has to say about the same event.

The angel who came to Mary with the news of her impending conception said, “He [Jesus] shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David:” (Luke 1:32). Clearly, whoever the “Highest” is, that person will be Jesus Father!

“Highest” implies that there can be no one higher. That in itself shows that Jesus was the “Son of the Highest” being in the entire universe.

But, lest any should argue the point, Luke throws further light on the subject: “therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (v.35). If the Holy Spirit were an individual, and if, as a person, the Holy Spirit caused Mary to conceive, and then Jesus would have to be called the SON OF THE HOLY SPIRIT!

Spirit Is Power!

The truth is- and it would shock millions to know- that the Holy Spirit as we have proved IS NOT A PERSON! Rather, it is an agent by which God, the Father works. In the same verse in Luke, this is made plain: “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee:”-and what is the biblical definition of the Holy Spirit?-”the POWER OF THE HIGHEST” (Luke 1:35).

Again the word Highest is used. The Holy Spirit is an agency, a force, a power that is used BY THE HIGHEST-GOD THE FATHER-to achieve his purpose. God the Father used his power to impregnate Mary. Without that power, the supernatural conception could not have taken place. It follows therefore, that the biblical account tells us that Jesus was the son of the Highest-God himself-and that the conception was achieved by the power that emanates from God. The Holy Spirit we repeat is NOT a person!
To Whom Did Jesus Pray To?

Another question still remains about who Jesus Father is. Was it the Holy Spirit or the Father to whom Jesus prayed to? Jesus prayed to the Father. He said in our prayers we must pray “Our Father” in the famous Lord’s Prayer of Matthew 6. But wait! If Jesus prayed to the Father, BUT THE HOLY SPIRIT, if he is a person, begot Mary at conception, remember, “she was found with child of the Holy Ghost,” and “for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost” (vv.18, 20). Then the only conclusion we can come up with, on the basis that the Holy Spirit as a person is that Jesus PRAYED TO THE WRONG FATHER!

Of course when understood that the Holy Spirit is the power in which God the Father used to impregnate Mary, then it becomes clear that Jesus did not pray to the wrong Father, and the he is the son of the Highest-The Father, and that she was conceived by the Power of the Highest-The Holy Spirit.

The Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit

But, some may ask, “Why did Jesus command his disciples to baptize people in the name of the Father, and the Son, and of the Holy Spirit?” (Matthew 28:19).

First, in answering that question, we need to understand what Jesus didn’t say. He didn’t say baptize them in the personal names of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit. Or “into” the persons of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? Not at all!

But if a reader of the Bible notices all of the baptisms are performed “in the name [or “authority” of see Vine’s, “name” p.782] Jesus.” The Baptismal formula is only mentioned once, in Matthew 28:19. Why is that? Below is a comparison of their accounts in the Gospels & Acts (Matthew 28:19-20; Mark 16:15-18; Luke 24:47-49; Acts 1:4-8).

In the book of Acts we find the baptisms done “in the name of Jesus Christ.” When the apostle Peter gave his inspired sermon on the Day of Pentecost-the day the New Testament church was founded those who heard Peter’s message were “pricked in their heart” and asked “what shall we do?” (Acts 2:37). The inspired Apostle then answered, “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost” (verse 38), see also Acts 8:12-16; 10:48; 9:5-18 &22:16: 19:1-6. Notice, they received the gift of the Holy Spirit, not the PERSON of the Holy Spirit. The majority of scriptures reveal to baptize in the name of Jesus. Was this Baptismal formula part of the post-first century church doctrine?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Great Commission</th>
<th>Book Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 28:19 (only here)</td>
<td>“Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 16:15-17</td>
<td>“Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Luke 24:47

“And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.”

Acts 2:38

“Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.”

Acts 8:12

“But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.”

Acts 10:48

“And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.”

Acts 19:5

“When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.”

Early post-apostolic Christians administered water baptism by using the name of Jesus in the formula. According to Heick, “At first baptism was administered in the name of Jesus, but gradually in the name of the Triune God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.” (Heick, I, 53. See also J. F. Bethune- Baker, An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine (London: Methuen & Co., 1931), p. 25 n. 1 & p. 378 n. 1.). He concluded from a passage in the writings of Justin (which we will analyze shortly) that during the period from about A.D. 130 to 140 the Trinitarian baptismal formula gradually received acceptance (Heick, I, 87).

Hastings’ Dictionary of the Bible admits that one could draw the following conclusion from the historical evidence: “The original form of words was ‘into the name of Jesus Christ’ or ‘the Lord Jesus.’ Baptism into the name of the Trinity was a later development. After the one mention of it, Mt. 28:19, we do not find it again until Justin Martyr, and his formula is not identical with that in the Gospel.” (Baptism,” ADB, I, 241 emphasis added). Interesting that even though Justin was the one who started it, his formula does not match the one in the Bible but matches the later not the earlier baptismal formulas.

In addition to the sources we have cited, most other church historians agree that baptism in Jesus’ name was the older formula; further quotations are reproduced in a footnote below:


Hermas in the early second century wrote of baptism “in the name of the Lord” and in the “name of the Son of God.” He taught that baptism caused an essential change to take place in one’s life because of the use of the name, but stressed that the name was not a magical formula and could not be effective in the absence of Christian virtues. He wrote, “If you bear His name but possess
not His power, it will be in vain that you bear His name.” (quotes from Hermas, The Pastor [The Shepherd!], 1.3.7 & 3.9.16, ANF; 11,15 & 49.; Baptism (Early Christian),” ERE, 385; see Hermas, 3.9.1446, ANF; II, 48-49.; Hermas, 3.9.13, ANF II, 48.).

The Didache, another second century Christian document, speaks of baptism “into the name of the Lord” but also speaks of baptism “into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.” (The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, 7.1 & 9.5, ANF VII, 379 & 380. ). Some conclude that the Didache recognizes both formulas as valid. We must not overlook the possibility of Interpolations, for while scholars have variously dated the Didache from A.D. 120 to 200 the only existing Greek manuscript of it dates to 1056 (ANF VII, 372.). Moreover, it teaches other non biblical practices relative to baptism such as pouring as an alternative to immersion, fasting before baptism, and triple immersion.

Most scholars assert that Justin Martyr’s First Apology, written around A.D. 150, contains the oldest historical reference to the trine formula. Here is the key phrase, which describes baptized persons: “For, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing with water.” (Justin, First Apology, 61, ANF I,183.). We should note, however, that Justin did not recite the modern Trinitarian formula but explicitly included the name Jesus, probably in deference to older practice.

The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge (1957), I, 435: “The New Testament knows only baptism in the name of Jesus… which still occurs even in the second and third centuries.”(Emphasis added). Just because one man in A.D. 150, who did not believe in the full deity of Christ, referred to a baptismal formula similar to the modern Trinitarian one does not mean all or even most in his day had abandoned the older Jesus’ name formula. Evidence for general usage of the modern Trinitarian formula at this early date is not as decisive as some have indicated.

The early post-apostolic fathers, such as Ignatius, Clement of Rome, Polycarp, and Hermas, were certainly not Trinitarians, see David Bernard, The Oneness of God (Hazelwood, Mo.: Word Aflame Press, 1983), Chapters 9 and 10). They basically believed in one God and in Jesus as God manifested in flesh. It is hardly surprising, then, to find no reference in their writings to a Trinitarian baptismal formula!

Williston Walker, A History of the Christian Church (1947), page 58 writes: “The Trinitarian baptismal formula...was displacing the older baptism in the name of Christ.” (Emphasis added). This was a development of the old formula of baptizing in the name of Jesus, to the baptismal formula of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Canney’s Encyclopedia of Religions (1970), page 53: “Persons were baptized at first ‘in the name of Jesus Christ’ … or ‘in the name of the Lord Jesus’… Afterwards, with the development of the doctrine of the Trinity, they were baptized ‘in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.’” (Emphasis added). This took place of course “in the second century” (Britannica 11TH edition, Vol 3, Pg 365-366).
“Everywhere in the oldest sources it states that baptism took place in the name of Jesus Christ.” (Britannica, Vol 3, Pg 82, emphasis added).

These baptisms in Jesus name were still going on until the 3rd and 4th centuries, “Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th ed. (1920), II 365: “The Trinitarian formula and triune immersion were not uniformly used from the beginning… Baptism into the name of the Lord [was] the normal formula of the New Testament. In the 3rd century baptism in the name of Christ was still so widespread that Pope Stephen, in opposition to Cyprian of Carthage, declared it to be valid.” (Emphasis added). But did they get this baptismal formula from the Bible of Father, Son and Holy Spirit?

Edmund Schlink, The Doctrine of Baptism, page 28 writes: “The baptismal command in its Matthew 28:19 form cannot be the historical origin of Christian baptism. At the very least, it must be assumed that the text has been transmitted in a form expanded by the [Catholic] church.” (Emphasis added). When we look into, “textual criticism, literary criticism and historical criticism” we find, “its trustworthiness” comes into question, see The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.

The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, I, 275 writes: “It is often affirmed that the words in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost are not the ipsissima verba [exact words] of Jesus, but… a later liturgical addition.”

Also Wilhelm Bousset, Kyrios Christianity, page 295 states: “The testimony for the wide distribution of the simple baptismal formula [in the Name of Jesus] down into the second century is so overwhelming that even in Matthew 28:19, the Trinitarian formula was later inserted.” (Emphasis added). Historical and textual proof shows that the original text was “in my name” and not the Triune formula as we have today in our Bibles.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, II, page 263 admits to it: “The baptismal formula was changed from the name of Jesus Christ to the words Father, Son, and Holy Spirit by the Catholic Church in the second century.” (Emphasis added).

“…Matthew 28:19 is not the [original] ‘Great Commission of Jesus Christ.’… Acts 2:38, Luke 24:47, and 1 Corinthians 6:11 give us the ancient original words and teaching of Yeshua/Jesus! Is it not also strange that Matthew 28:19 is missing from the old manuscripts of Sinaiticus, Curetonianus and Bobiensis? “(A History of The Christian Church, p.95, emphasis added).

“The Demonstratio Evangelica” by Eusebius. Eusebius was the Church historian and Bishop of Caesarea. On page 152 Eusebius quotes the early book of Matthew that he had in his library in Caesarea. According to this eyewitness of an unaltered Book of Matthew that could have been the original book or the first copy of the original of Matthew. Eusebius informs us of Jesus’ actual words to his disciples in the original text of Matthew 28:19: “With one word and voice He said to His disciples: ‘Go, and make disciples of all nations in My Name, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.’ That ‘Name’ is Jesus.” (Emphasis added). I could go on and on with sources that show that this triune formula was not the original readings in Matthew but “in my name” like the rest of the New Testament.
Who, What is God?

But how did it get into the Text? (See Box Below on Textual Criticism):

**Brief Lesson on Textual Criticism:** Textual Criticism is “Determining, as best we can, the original text of the document” and has “its eyes fixed firmly and solely on the original text” (An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism, by Rich Elliott of Simon Greenleaf University). Basically it’s the study of manuscripts and determining what the originals say.

Under this discipline the Bible stands out like no other manuscript in the ancient world. F.F. Bruce One of the greatest New Testament scholars says of the Bible, “There is no body of ancient literature in the world which enjoys such a wealth of good textual attestation as does the Gospel and the New Testament” (The book and the Parchments, p.178). When we compare all of the manuscripts together we can get the originals sayings and quotes from the Bible as originally written, see General Into to the Bible by Geisler, p.404

**Old Testament Reliability**

*Before 900 A.D.* we had no copies of the Old Testament. *Until 1947,* and the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The scrolls were copies of the Hebrew scriptures that date as old as 125 B.C. The copies of these texts are exactly the copies we have today in our Bibles, and the Old Testament is the same today as it was in the days of Jesus Christ (For a detailed study of these Texts, and others, read the Books by Josh Mcdowell, Evidence That Demands a Verdict, and A Ready Defense, Norman Geisler, and William Nix, A General Introduction To the Bible and The Old Testament Documents, Are they Reliable and Relevant? by Walter C. Kaiser Jr).

**New Testament Reliability**

*Geisler* writes, “The overwhelming evidence for the reliability of the New Testament manuscripts over other books from the ancient world is summarized in the following comparisons”:

- **Author/ Book New Testament Date Written-A.D. 50-100**
- **Earliest copies- c..50A.D. Thiede’s work (fragments) c.114 (fragments) c. 200 books c. 250(most of N.T. c. 325)**
- **Time Gap+20 yrs, 100 yrs, 150 yrs, 225 yrs.**
- **No. of Copies-5,366 % Accuracy-99+**

(From Geisler and Nix, General Introduction To The Bible, p.408; Theide’s addition made by Peter Salemi from Theide’s Work Eyewitness to Jesus, emphasis added).

The accuracy of the bible is 99%, (see also Bruce Metzger, Chapters in the History of New Test Criticism says 99:5%).

There are errors in the bible, but those errors constitute LESS THAN 1% of the New Testament. And, most of these errors in the N.T are “copyist errors” (ibid, p.467).

But none of these affect the message of the Bible. To illustrate, note the following telegrams:

1) “Y#U HAVE WON TEN MILLION DOLLARS.”
2) “YO# HAVE WON TEN MILLION DOLLARS.”

Even if we receive only the first telegram we know what the exact message is in spite of error. The New Testament manuscripts have a much smaller percent of significant copyist errors than this telegram. Further, with over 5,300 manuscripts (compared to a few telegrams), the real message of the New Testament is no more affected than is the message of the telegram (see Norman Geisler Into, p.469).

“How are these variants counted?

“There is an ambiguity in saying that there are some 200,000 variants in the existing manuscripts of the New Testament because those represent only 10,000 places in the New Testament. If one single word is misspelled in
**3,000 different manuscripts, it is counted as 3,000 variants or readings.** Once this counting procedure is understood, and the mechanical (orthographic) variants have been eliminated, the remaining significant variants are surprisingly few in number. It should be remembered that the production of multiple copies of manuscripts by printing and photocopying are relatively recent developments in the production of books.” (ibid, p.468, emphasis added). So the copyist errors are easily eliminated and corrected.

How significant are these variants?

“There are only 10,000 places where these 200,000 variants occur...Westcott and Hort estimate only about one eighth of all variance have any weight, and most them [the one eighth] are merely mechanical matters such as spelling or style...Mathematically that would compute to a text that is 98.33% pure...” (ibid, p.474). So the Bible is accurate aside from the copyist errors that can easily be corrected.

Many people believe that the Catholic church corrupted the Bible to fit its own beliefs. But for this to occur it would be absolutely impossible. F.F. Peters writes, “[The] New Testament ...[was] the most frequently copied and widely circulated books of antiquity” (The Harvest of Hellenism, p.50). *It was impossible for one group to control the Bible, therefore if the Catholic Church attempted to do that, we would see the evidence in the manuscripts which WE DO NOT!*

So what of Matthew 28:19? How did this get into the text? Was it intentional to promote the trinity? Absolutely Not! “It looks, therefore, as though the words got into the text (perhaps from the margin) in the Church of North Africa [Alexandria]; and that the Syrian Churches did not have them in the MSS. at their disposal.” (Bullinger, *Word Studies on the HOLY SPIRIT*, pp.48,49).

Geisler & Nix explains: “Sometimes *marginal notes* were incorporated into the text under the *misapprehension that they were part of the text*. A. T Robertson suggests that this is the explanation of the angel’s disturbing the water (John 5:4).

The textual note at Romans 8:1 in the NKJV (which follows the KJV) indicates another illustration where the last portion of a verse was added to the text. *It may have been added as an explanatory note at first, and then it became part of the manuscript texts that were the basis of the Textus Receptus reading.* A comparison of the RV, ASV, RSV, NAB, NASB, and NIV renditions will show that they all adopt the shorter reading. An obvious example of a judgmental error by a sleepy scribe who added to a miniscule copy is found in 2 Corinthians 8:4-5, as the scribe interpolated into the text, ‘*it is found thus in many copies,*’ *as though it were part of Paul’s admonition to the Corinthians instead of a marginal annotation...*” (p.471, emphasis added). The text of Matthew 28:19 was a *marginal* note on the side put there by the copyists of Alexandria, **those who started the doctrine of the Trinity, and it eventually incorporated itself into the text.** It was not done intentionally as one writer shows: “Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort believed that these minor additions/alterations had either happened accidentally or *occurred when a fragment of commentary from the margin had been incorporated into the text*” (The Battle for the Book, David Marshall, p.74, emphasis added). Thank God for Textual Criticism so we can correct the small 1% copyist’s errors in the N.T. and get the true TEXT of the Bible!

As we have shown, this formula originated with Justin Martyr.

Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion, Vol. 2, Pg 389 says: “*Baptism was always in the name of Lord Jesus until the time of Justin Martyr when [the] Triune formula was used.*” Justin Martyr the famous Greek Philosopher who converted to Christianity. Where did he get this formula from if not from the Bible?

Aristides, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus of Antioch were some of these men defending Christianity. These men became known as the Greek Apologists and were greatly affected by the Greek philosophies. The philosophy of Philo, who was a Jewish philosopher in Alexandria, identified the Logos with the *platonic word of forms or archetypes.* From Philo’s
teachings, the Greek apologists set the Logos equal to Jesus Christ in order to frame an intellectually satisfying explanation of the relationship of Christ to God the Father.

It is during this period of the “Logos doctrine debate” that the first historical references to Trinitarian water baptism appear and the first divergency away from Jesus name baptism occurs. Is it wrong to say that these Greek apologists were influenced by Greek Philosophy? As we have proved Justin Martyr still wore his philosophical robe as a Christian and said of Plato, “Well done, Plato! Thou hast touched on the truth...O philosophy, hasten to produce many others [like Plato] also who declare the only true God to be God...”(Article, Justin Martyr & Plato).

Did Plato and Greek Paganism influence the Formula of Justin Martyr? “Not is it only in historical [not biblical] religions that we find God viewed as a Trinity. One recalls in particular the Neo-Platonic view of the Supreme or Ultimate Reality, which was suggested by Plato...” (Hastings Bible Dictionary, Vol. 12, p. 458, emphasis added).

McClintock and Strong make the connection a little clearer: “Toward the end of the 1st century, and during the 2nd, many learned men came over both from Judaism and paganism to Christianity [including Justin Martyr]. These brought with them into the Christian schools of theology their Platonic ideas and phraseology” (article “Trinity,” Vol. 10, p.553, emphasis added).

From the Baptismal formula by Justin Martyr, as we have noted (above) Tertullian called the formula of the Trinity as trinitas, and explained as “three persons in one substance,” which “Tertullian at the same time decidedly retained the ideas of Justin concerning the pre-existence and creation of the Son, and his subordination to his Father.” (Article, The historical development of the Doctrine of the Trinity. chap. 8, emphasis added).

In conclusion we find that not only was the Baptismal formula of Matthew 28:19 not in the Bible, but it was influenced by Greek philosophy and Paganism, The Matthew 28:19 text was in fact a marginal note that the copyists of Alexandria put there because they believed in Justin’s Triune formula for baptism, then it unintentionally got incorporated into the text. And from the first through the 4th centuries the majority of the church were baptizing in “Jesus name” until the Trinitarian formula took over!

What do Theologians Say...?

The Oxford Companion to the Bible’s opening words under the article “Trinity” enlightening: “Because the Trinity is such an important part of later Christian doctrine, it is striking that the term does not appear in the New Testament. Likewise, the developed concept of three coequal partners in the Godhead found in later creedal formulations cannot be clearly detected within the confines of the [New Testament] canon” (Bruce Metzger and Michael Coogan, editors, 1993, p. 782, emphasis added throughout these quotations).

The term later is a vital key in understanding why general Christian belief has been burdened with the Trinity doctrine. Post-first century theologians originally conceived the doctrine, and others added to and elaborated on it down through the centuries.
Notice this admission in the *New Bible Dictionary*: “The term ‘Trinity’ is not itself found in the Bible. It was first used by Tertullian at the close of the 2nd century, but received wide currency and formal elucidation only in the 4th and 5th centuries” (1996, “Trinity”).

The same dictionary explains that “the formal doctrine of the Trinity was the result of several inadequate attempts to explain who and what the Christian God really is . . . To deal with these problems the Church Fathers met in 325 at the Council of Nicaea to set out an orthodox biblical definition concerning the divine identity.” However, it wasn’t until 381, “at the Council of Constantinople, [that] the divinity of the Spirit was affirmed . . .”

Another theological source admits that there was “an impression of Binitarianism [that is, two in unity, the Father and Son] given by much second- and third-century thought . . . Pluralist thinkers . . . maintained the full co-presence of the two (later three) distinct entities within the Godhead . . .” (Alan Richardson, editor, *A Dictionary of Christian Theology*, 1969, p. 345, emphasis added).

We see, then, that the doctrine of the Trinity wasn’t formalized until long after the Bible was completed and the apostles were long dead in their graves. It took later theologians several centuries to sort out what they believed concerning the Holy Spirit. Regrettably, the Trinity doctrine has been a major barrier to clear comprehension of the biblical truth that God is a divine family. Continuing with the account in *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*: “While the New Testament writers say a great deal about God, Jesus, and the Spirit of each, no New Testament writer expounds on the relationship among the three in the detail that later Christian writers do” (p. 782).

**Other Arguments**

1) Some might ask, what about 1 John 5:7, as it appears in the King James Translation? Doesn’t this scripture support the trinity concept? Not at all!

Notice what the Wycliff Bible Commentary says about verse 7: “…*Not a single manuscript contains the Trinitarian addition, before* the 14th century, and the verse is never quoted in the controversies over the trinity in the first 450 years of the church era” (emphasis added).

Bullinger writes, “They were first seen in the margin of some Latin copies. Thence they have crept into the text.” (Companion Bible).

Scolfield notes, says, “It is generally agreed that (1John 5:7) *has no real authority*, and has been inserted.” (emphasis added).

Scholars clearly recognize that 1 John 5:7 is not part of the New Testament text. Yet it is still included by some fundamentalists as biblical proof for the Trinity doctrine.

Even the majority of the more recent New Testament translations do not contain the above words. They are not found in Moffatt, Phillips, the Revised Standard Version, Williams, or *The Living Bible*.
Who, What is God?

It is clear, then, that these words are not part of the inspired canon, but rather were added by a “recent hand.” The verses in 1John should read: “Jesus Christ, he it is who came by water, blood, and Spirit — not by the water alone, but by the water and the blood.

“The Spirit is the witness to this, for the Spirit is truth.

“The witnesses are three, the Spirit and the water and the blood, and the three of them are in accord.” (Moffatt Translation).

Three things bear record. But what do they bear record to? A Trinity?

The Spirit, the water and the blood bear record of the fact that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is living His life over again in us. John clarifies it in verses 11-12: “And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son…He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.”

But how do these three elements - the Spirit, the water, and the blood - specifically bear witness to this basic biblical truth?

“The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God:” (Romans 8:16). The Spirit of God dwells in us, and it is Christ living in us “Christ in you” (Col 1:27). Jesus dwells in the Christian by the spirit (1 John 3:24; 4:13), and the evidence is keeping God’s commandments. As Paul said, “nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me:” (Gal 2:20).

Water is representative of baptism, which bears witness of the burial of the old self and the beginning of a new life (Rom. 6:1-6).

The blood represents Christ’s death by crucifixion, which pays the penalty for our sins, reconciling us to God (Rom. 5:9, 10).

These three elements bear witness that Christ lives in the converted Christian!

Why was this verse left in? This verse was left in the bible as an example to people not to add to or take away from the Bible. Doing this is like altering the Declaration of Independence, everyone will know and will quickly be found out, and so left in as an example of what not to do! God said, “What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.” (Deut 12:32).

John warned, “For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book:

“And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.” (Rev 22:18-19). Though specifically speaking of the book of revelation, really it can apply to the whole Bible.
Deuteronomy again it says, “Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you.” (4:2).

2) Some argue that Jesus spoke of Blasphemy of the Holy Spirit. Does this indicate a person?

Let’s look at the two accounts and analyze them.

When Jesus was accused of casting out demons “He casteth out devils through Beelzebub the chief of the devils” (Luke 11:15), Jesus answered, “And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges. “But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you” (vv.19-20).

In Matthews parallel account Jesus is quoted as saying: “ But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you” (Matthew 12:28). The “spirit of God” is then the “finger of God;” It is God’s spiritual extension, another way of describing his activity in the natural world by God reaching down and touching the lives of human beings by his power.

The Ten Commandments are written with the “finger of God” (Exodus 31:18). The Law was miraculously written with the spirit of God. In other words God reached down into the natural world and produced the Ten Commandments.

The finger of God is another way of describing the power of God. When Jesus healed the man of the demon that he had, this is the power he used to heal people. Jesus used the finger, the spirit of God to heal: “and the power of the Lord was present to heal them” (Luke 5:17). So clearly the Spirit of God or finger of God is the power of God, the Holy Spirit. But can it be blasphemed?

First, what does blasphemy mean? “BLASPHEMY is a transliteration of a Greek word meaning literally “to speak harm.” In the biblical context, blasphemy is an attitude of disrespect that finds expression in an act directed against the character of God” (Holman, under “Blasphemy” emphasis added). So it is to speak harm of someone, or disrespect someone, but also SOMETHING as well we will see.

Jesus said: “Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men...And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.” (Matthew 12:31, 32). These two verses Trinitarians argue, show that if you blasphemy against the Son of man, and he is a person, then blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is further evidence that it is a person as well.

As mentioned above, Blasphemy or disrespect or speak harm of is not just limited to humans but to other things as well. Notice the word of God is God’s revealed truth and can be blasphemed (Titus 2:5). Can you speak harm, or disrespect the Bible, absolutely! Are words a person or a
being? No! So the object of blasphemy need not be a person. Second, why is blasphemy against the second person of the God Head forgivable while blasphemy against the third person is not? As shown above, the finger or spirit of God is the power of God (his activity) in the world. In context Jesus is reproving the Pharisees for attributing the power of God (i.e. his activity) to the devil. Matthew 12 hardly supports Trinitarianism.

3) Some argue that, “the communion [to “share in,” see note in the NRSV] of the Holy Ghost,” (2 Corinth 13:14), the word “communion” [Greek “Koinonia”] can mean “fellowship” as well, and this same word is used for the Father and the Son, “That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship [Greek “Koinonia”] with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.” (1 John 1:3). So the Holy Spirit can mean a person when applied.

Yes the word is the same. But this same word can be used for many other things as well as persons. Philippians 3:10 talks about how we fellowship in his sufferings. Are sufferings a person? No! We also “fellowship in the Gospel” Philippians 1:5. Is the Gospel a person? Now in the light of the Bible as the Holy Spirit as the power of God that dwells in us, we fellowship or share in the Holy Spirit which is the power of God.

4) Some people maintain that “the holy Spirit” and “the Spirit of God” are two different things. The Bible speaks of “The holy Spirit of God.” God the Father has a Spirit. “For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.” (Matthew 10:20) Jesus Christ has a Spirit. “For I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.” (Philippians 1:19) Does the Holy Spirit have a Spirit? Some say yes, while others say no. What saith the Scriptures? “The holy Spirit of God.” (Ephesians 4:30) The Bible nowhere mentions “the Spirit of the holy Spirit.” Why is that? Could it be that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God the Father and His only begotten Son?

As the Scriptures plainly state, the Father has a Spirit and His Son has a Spirit, yet there is “one Spirit.” Evidently the Father and His Son share the same Spirit while they are two separate individuals. This is true because they think alike; they have a kindred spirit. The Holy Spirit does not have a Spirit.

5) Some argue that, the Holy Spirit is grieved, therefore a person, “And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.” (Ephesians 4:30).

As we have seen the Holy Spirit is the mind of God which is also his heart. The Bible speaks of the heart in man “And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” (Genesis 6:5). The thoughts of his heart are the thoughts of his mind obviously. This all over the bible!

God’s mind his Holy Spirit can be grieved, as the Bible says, “And it repented the LORD that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart.” (Genesis 6:6). Grieving is an emotion that takes place in a man’s, and God’s spirit, the mind of God and man.
6) “In Mark 3:29,30, the Holy Spirit is contrasted with an ‘unclean spirit.’ Since an ‘unclean spirit’ is a personal entity, the Holy Spirit must be a Person.”

Again, in Luke’s parallel account, the Holy Spirit is described as “the finger of God.” Thus, Mark’s account, as Matthew’s and Luke’s, speaks of the source of Jesus’ power. The Pharisees said the source of Jesus’ power was an unclean spirit. Jesus said the source of His power was God. Whether that source was personal is not in question.

7) “The Holy Spirit cannot be defined as ‘the power of God,’ for then the expression ‘power of the Holy Spirit’ (as in Romans 15:13) would mean ‘power of Power,’ which makes no sense. Thus, the Holy Spirit must be a Person who has power.”

Scripture speaks of the “power of God” (Luke 9:43); yet, Jesus called God “Power” (Matthew 26:64). Does this mean that “power of God” means “power of Power”? This is nothing more than a play on words. Electricity is power; yet we speak of the “power of electricity.” Therefore, we may define the Holy Spirit as the “power of God,” and, without contradiction, speak of the power of the Holy Spirit. As previously noted, the Holy Spirit is equated with “the power of the Highest” in Luke 1:35. Jesus was speaking of the Holy Spirit when He said that His disciples would be “endued with power from on high” (Luke 24:49). Paul equated “the gift of God, which is in thee” (i.e., the Holy Spirit) with “the spirit of... power, and of love, and of a sound mind” (2 Timothy 1:6, 7).

8) “Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.” (1 Corinth 1:24). Some argue that this scripture shows that Jesus is the power of God, and since Jesus is a person, then the Holy Spirit must be a person since it is described as the power of God as well.

But in context of the chapter, Paul is saying that Jesus is the power of God for salvation. That Jesus is the means for salvation. Notice verse 18, “For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us who are saved it is the power of God.” This is how we are saved, by this power, through the crucified Christ.

“...that is, the doctrine of the cross; or the doctrine which proclaims salvation only through the atonement which the Lord Jesus Christ made on the cross, ...Christ appears to them as the power of God; or it is through him that the power of salvation is communicated to them.” (Barnes Notes). “the power of God to the salvation of all who believe” (JFB Commentary).

“They prove this doctrine to be divinely powerful, to enlighten and convert the soul, and to be a proof of God’s infinite wisdom, which has found out such an effectual way to glorify both his justice and mercy, and save, to the uttermost, all that come to him through Christ Jesus.” (Adam’s Clarke’s Commentary, emphasis added). So this means in context, the believer has to be converted and saved, and the doctrine of the cross is the power behind it. It has nothing to do with Christ being the Literal power of God the way the Holy Spirit is. This argument is taken totally out of context.

9) Jesus is the Father. Some churches that believe in the oness concept of God believe that Jesus, the Father, and the Holy Spirit is all one person. They quote Isaiah 9:6, “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder:
and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.” Is Jesus the Father according to this prophecy?

Barnes notes says, “Literally, it is the Father of eternity, ‘eby ad.’ The word rendered ‘everlasting,’ ad, properly denotes ‘eternity,’ and is used to express ‘forever;’ see Psa 9:6, Psa 9:19; Psa 19:10.” Jesus is God with the Father, and so he is, as well as the Father, the father of eternity because only they are eternal.

They also quote John 14:8-9: “Philip saith unto him, Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us.... Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father?” Notice Jesus said, “he that hath seen me hath seen the Father;” Jesus did not say he was the Father, but that he was the, “express image of his person,” (Heb 1:3). Jesus is the exact copy of the Father, so if you had seen Jesus, you have seen the Father.

Also, to whom did Jesus pray? To the Father! He didn’t speak to himself. He obviously was speaking of another person separate from him who he called the Father.

The Bible is very clear that the Father and His Son are two distinct individuals. The Father sent. The Son was sent. (1 John 4:14) The Father gave power and authority. The Son received power and authority. (Matthew 28:18; John 5:27) The Father gave His Son a work to do. The Son finished the work that the Father gave Him. (John 17:4) The Father gave a commandment. The Son obeyed the commandment. (John 12:49) The Father anointed the Son. The Son was anointed. (Luke 4:18) The Father highly exalted His Son. The Son was highly exalted. (Philippians 2:9) The Father gave a name. The Son received a name. (Hebrews 1:4) The Father is the head of Christ. The Son will always be subject to His Father. (1 Corinthians 11:3; 15:24-28). The Father is the most High God. The Son is the Son of the Most High God. (Mark 5:7) The Father is the God of our Lord Jesus Christ. (Ephesians 1:17).

10) Many Trinitarians believe that because the Holy Spirit is called “he” in some passages it indicates a person. Do personal gender pronouns indicate a person in the Bible? Let’s take a look. First as we have proved Jesus is the Comforter so to use “He” for these passages is fine it does not contradict in anyway what the Bible says. But again, do personal gender pronouns really matter? Does it prove a person when applied to the Holy Spirit even in other places in the Bible when it calls the Holy Spirit “He”?

For example, an angel said, “And this shall be a sign unto you: Ye shall find the babe [neuter] wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger [feminine].” (Luke 2:12) Here is an example of how the gender of nouns cannot be relied upon to determine the personality of nouns. The Greek word that was translated babe is a neuter noun even though the babe is a male person. In the same sentence the Greek word that was translated manger is a feminine noun even though a manger is an inanimate object. If there were any Greek pronouns in this verse referring to either the babe or the manger, the pronouns would be the same gender as the nouns they modify.

Many times in the Bible Jesus is referred to as a “Lamb.” The Greek word that was translated “Lamb” is a neuter noun even though we know Jesus is a male person. “These shall make war
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with the Lamb [αρνιου neuter], and the Lamb [αρνιον neuter] shall overcome them: for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings: and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful.” (Revelation 17:14). So it is evident that the gender of titles in Greek for an individual or a thing does not indicate that a person or thing is literally male, female, or neuter.

I would like to point something out here. Please notice the two different Greek pronouns that were translated “he” in John 16:12-14. In each case the pronoun is masculine. The Greek pronouns εκεινος and εαυτου, even when they are masculine, do not always indicate that the noun they modify is literally a male person. Oftentimes, εκεινος and εαυτου in the masculine gender refer to inanimate objects or ideas rather than personal beings.

Let us examine a few verses that will make this plain. We will start with the Greek word εκεινος when it is in the masculine gender.

“At that [εκεινω masculine] time [καιρω masculine] Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.” (Matthew 11:25) It is obvious that time is not a personal being, but rather, it is a created entity showing that εκεινος in the masculine form does not necessarily refer to an actual being.

“Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field; the which when a man hath found, he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that [εκεινον masculine] field [αγρον masculine].” (Matthew 13:44) Again, it is plain that field is an inanimate object, yet it is referred to using a masculine pronoun.

Here are a few more examples:

“And when the men of that [εκεινω masculine] place [τοπω masculine] had knowledge of him, they sent out into all that country round about, and brought unto him all that were diseased.” (Matthew 14:35).

“Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money [στατεηρα masculine]: that [εκεινω masculine] take, and give unto them for me and thee.” (Matthew 17:27).

Now let us look at some examples where the Greek pronoun εκεινος is found in the feminine gender when it refers to inanimate objects.

“In those [εκεινως feminine] days [ημερας feminine] came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judaea.” (Matthew 3:1) Obviously days are not individual persons, and an accurate English translation should never have “she” as a pronoun referring to “days.”
“And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that [εκεινη feminine] house [οικια feminine]; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock.” (Matthew 7:25) Again, house is obviously not a personal being, yet it is referred to by a feminine pronoun.

“If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin [αμαρτια feminine] unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it [εκεινης feminine].” (1 John 5:16) Obviously sin is not a personal being even though it is referred to by a feminine pronoun.

Now let’s look at the Greek pronoun εαυτου in the masculine gender, where it refers to an inanimate object.

“It is like a grain [κοκκω masculine] of mustard seed, which a man took, and cast into his garden; and it [εαυτου masculine] grew, and waxed a great tree; and the fowls of the air lodged in the branches of it.” (Luke 13:19).

Now let’s look at some examples of where the Greek pronoun εαυτου is used in the feminine gender and refers to inanimate objects.

“Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself [εαυτης feminine]. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.” (Matthew 6:34).

“And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself [εαυτης feminine] is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself [εαυτης feminine] shall not stand.” (Matthew 12:25).

Based on the evidence of the Scriptural usage of the Greek pronouns εκεινος and εαυτου, it is clear that the usage of these pronouns in the masculine gender referring to the Holy Spirit does not prove that the Holy Spirit is an individual being separate from the Father and His Son. It is clear that you cannot conclusively prove whether an object is a living, being based solely on the gender of a noun or pronoun used when referring to it. The attempt on the part of some Trinitarians to prove that the Holy Spirit is a personal being, based on the fact that the Greek pronouns εκεινος and εαυτου are found in the masculine gender in John 16:13, has been shown to be without foundation. In fact, in John chapter 14 where Jesus began His conversation about the Comforter, neuter pronouns are used rather than masculine pronouns.

Let’s examine that now. Jesus said “I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; Even the Spirit [πνευμα neuter] of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him [αυτο neuter] not, neither knoweth him [αυτο neuter]; but ye know him [αυτο neuter]; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you.” (John 14:16-18).

If we are to properly translate verse 17, based on the gender of the nouns and pronouns, we must translate it in this way: “Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth it not, neither knoweth it: but ye know it; for it dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.” (John 14:17).
The New American Bible translated this verse in the following way: “the Spirit of truth, which the world cannot accept, because it neither sees nor knows it. But you know it, because it remains with you, and will be in you.” (John 14:17 NAB)

And in the Rotherham Bible it reads like this: “The Spirit of truth,—which, the world, cannot receive, because it beholdeth it not, nor getteth to know it. But, ye, are getting to know it; because, with you, it abideth, and, in you, it is.” (John 14:17).

Some Greek-English Interlinear Bibles translate John 14:17 by using the pronoun “it” as well. In one Greek-English Interlinear Bible this verse was translated in this way with a footnote that read something like this: “The Greek word πνευμα which was translated Spirit in this verse is neuter and therefore we have used the pronoun ‘it’ rather than ‘he,’ even though we know the Holy Spirit is a person.” Notice how this source presupposes that the Holy Spirit is a person without any proof whatsoever.

Even in the King James Bible the Holy Spirit is referred to as “it” at least three times.

“And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him.” (John 1:32).

“The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.” (Romans 8:16).

“Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.” (Romans 8:26).

I will show a few examples where the Greek pronoun αυτος is used in the Bible in the neuter gender.

“But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it [αυτο neuter] new with you in my Father’s kingdom.” (Matthew 26:29).

“Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it [αυτο neuter], that it may bring forth more fruit.” (John 15:2).

“And he said unto them, Cast the net on the right side of the ship, and ye shall find. They cast therefore, and now they were not able to draw it [αυτο neuter] for the multitude of fishes.” (John 21:6).

“For I neither received it [αυτο neuter] of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.” (Galatians 1:12).

Now let’s look at a few examples where the Greek pronoun αυτος is used in the masculine gender and refers to inanimate objects rather than male individuals.
“Neither do men light a candle, and put it [αυτον masculine] under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house.” (Matthew 5:15).

“Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant man, seeking goodly pearls: Who, when he had found one pearl [μαργαριτην masculine] of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it [αυτον masculine].” (Matthew 13:45, 46).

“Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn [κοκκος masculine] of wheat fall into the ground and die, it [αυτος masculine] abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.” (John 12:24).

Now let’s look at a few examples where the Greek pronoun αυτος is used in the feminine gender and refers to inanimate objects rather than female individuals.

“And if thy right hand [χειρ feminine] offend thee, cut it [αυτην feminine] off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.” (Matthew 5:30).

“And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house [οικια feminine]; and it fell: and great was the fall of it [αυτης feminine].” (Matthew 7:27).

“Our fathers had the tabernacle [σκηνη feminine] of witness in the wilderness, as he had appointed, speaking unto Moses, that he should make it [αυτην feminine] according to the fashion that he had seen.” (Acts 7:44).

“And the twelve gates were twelve pearls; every several gate was of one pearl: and the street of the city [πολις feminine] was pure gold, as it were transparent glass. And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it [αυτη feminine] And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it [αυτης feminine]: for the glory of God did lighten it [αυτης feminine], and the Lamb is the light thereof.” (Revelation 21:21-23).

From the evidence we have examined, we have seen that the use of any pronoun in the masculine gender, referring to the Holy Spirit, does not indicate that the Holy Spirit is a separate being apart from the Father and His Son. You cannot determine whether an object is a personal being or an inanimate object based solely upon the gender of a noun or pronoun in the Greek. It is clear that whatever we are to learn about the personality of the Holy Spirit, we cannot rely on the gender of nouns and pronouns, but we must look elsewhere.

One last note, the word “holy” is an adjective in every case, whether in English or in Greek. The term “holy Spirit” is not a name, but a description of the presence or power of God which is Holy.

11) Another argument is from Acts 5:3, 9: “But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land?...Then Peter said unto her, [Ananias wife] How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?” Since they lied to the Holy Spirit, then the Holy Spirit must be a person.
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Peter also said in verse 4, “Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.”

To lie to God’s Spirit is to lie to God. That is because His Spirit is his presence on earth (Psalm 51:11), not another person. If I were to lie to your spirit, you would not suppose that I lied to someone other than yourself. Let us be just as reasonable with the Scriptures when they refer to God’s Spirit.

Notice 1 John 3:24; 4:13, “And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us…Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.” The very presence of God is there by his spirit. God is actually dwelling with his people by his spirit. It is God’s spiritual extension, another way of describing his presence and activity in the natural world by God reaching down and touching the lives of human beings:

God is capable of being “with” His people, who live within the natural world and are a part of it. He is with them in Spirit. Thus, the Holy Spirit is the spiritual presence and power of God at work in the natural world.

The Apostle Paul although was absent from the Corinthians was there in “spirit” “For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed.” (1 Corinth 5:3). So Jesus, absent in bodily form—as he appear to his disciples after he resurrected—is dwelling with his church by the spirit of God. So to lie to the spirit of God, since it is God’s presence, is to lie to God just the same.

12) Jehovah’s Witnesses argue that Jesus was, “the firstborn of every creature.” (Colossians 1:15). Therefore he was created.

First what they fail to quote is the beginning of that verse that says, “Who is [present tense] the image of the invisible God,” Jesus is God number One. Number two the word “firstborn” in the margins of many bibles as well as commentaries say this word should read, “First in rank” It’s a position of rank of what the first born receive, “That is, he sustains the elevated rank of the firstborn, or a high eminence over the creation, because by him ‘all things were created in heaven and in earth.’” (Barnes Notes).

“...or it may be understood of Christ, as the King, Lord, and Governor of all creatures; being God’s firstborn, he is heir of all things, the right of government belongs to him; he is higher than the kings of the earth, or the angels in heaven, the highest rank of creatures, being the Creator and upholder of all, as the following words show; so the Jews make the word ‘firstborn’ to be synonymous with the word ‘king,’ and explain it by, ‘a great one,’ and ‘a prince’; see Psa_89:27.” (John Gill’s Exposition of the Bible). It’s a position of rank and power that the first born receives and not as Gill writes, “not the first of the creation, or the first creature God made.”
13) Another argument that Jehovah’s Witnesses try to use to show that Jesus is not God is in the book of Revelation. Jesus says that he is, “the beginning of the creation of God;” (Rev 3:14). They use this scripture to say that Jesus was created.

But again, the word “Beginning,” actually means, “originator” of the Creation not a created being. JFB Commentary says, “not he whom God created first, but as in Col. 1:15-18 (see on Col. 1:15-18), the Beginner of all creation, its originating instrument. All creation would not be represented adoring Him, if He were but one of themselves. His being the Creator is a strong guarantee for His faithfulness as ‘the Witness and Amen.’”

“the first cause of the creation; the first Parent, producer, and efficient cause of every creature; the author of the old creation, who made all things out of nothing in the beginning of time;” (Gill Exposition of the Bible). Basically Jesus was saying that he was the one who created the Heavens and the Earth.

14) What about Proverbs 8:22-23?

“The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old...I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.” This passage about wisdom, “refer[s] to nothing less than the Eternal Son of God” (Scofield notes). All authorities can tell you that this means Jesus Christ. This passage however was used by “The Arians... as a proof of their doctrine of the filius non genitus, sed factus, i.e., of His existence before the world began indeed, but yet not from eternity, but originating in time;” (K&D Commentary on Old Test, emphasis added). The Lord “possessed” they said, means “created,” therefore Jesus was a created being and not eternal.

But the Jamieson, Fausset, Brown Critical Experimental Commentary says on page 439, “‘The Lord Possessed me’ viz, by the right of PATERNITY, as the same Hebrew word ‘gotten’ or ‘possessed,’ is used in Gen 4:1-‘I have gotten a man’-viz, by PARENTAGE. This is confirmed by vv.24-25, ‘I was brought forth’ or ‘begotten;’ and Psalm 2:7, ‘Thou art my son, This day have I begotten thee.’...Paternity is expressed by the same Hebrew word, Deut 32:6, ‘is not he thy father that hath bought thee?’ or rather ‘possessed thee’-viz by spiritual as well as created and national generation...The Word was with God already ‘possessed’ by the Father [by parentage, God was always his Father] from eternity, and did not then first begin to be ‘in the beginning’ (John 1:1; Gen 1:1) of creation. NAY, He was himself ‘the beginning of the Creation of God’ (Rev 3:14).

Indeed as there is no ‘in’ before ‘the beginning of his way,’ in the Hebrew it is most likely that the Son here is termed the ‘beginning of his way’ in the SAME SENSE as in Rev 3:14 and Col 1:15, the First-born of every creature’...-viz, not as if he were first created, but the BEGINNING OF ALL CREATION; ITS ORIGINATING INSTRUMENT, prior to it, and possessing superlative dignity above it...to be created BY HIM [the Son].”

15) Numbers 24:17? “...there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel...”
Some people try to interpret that “star” to mean “Angel,” see Rev 12:4. But there are many ways the bible interprets stars, not just for angels. Stars can also mean people as in the case of Joseph and his dreams. In Genesis 37 Joseph said, “And he dreamed yet another dream, and told it his brethren, and said, Behold, I have dreamed a dream more; and, behold, the sun and the moon and the eleven stars made obeisance to me.” Then the interpretation was, “…What is this dream that thou hast dreamed? Shall I and thy mother and thy brethren indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee to the earth?” (v.10). The sun and the moon meant Rebecca and Jacob, and the eleven stars meant his brothers. There are many more examples of this. So we must put it in the proper context of the interpretation the bible gives for Numbers 24. What does this particular ‘star” mean in the Numbers passage? Notice that the “Star” and the “Sceptre” are one and the same in the passage. These are parallel statements of the same person. This “Star” means a “Ruler,” shall come and “rise out of Israel.” As Micah writes, “But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel;” (5:2). Notice what the commentaries say: “i. e., the prince, represented in the succeeding words by the Star and Scepter. The star has among all nations served as a symbol of regal power and splendour: and the birth and future glory of great monarchs were believed by the ancients to be heralded by the appearance of stars or comets:” (Barnes Notes, emphasis added).

“This imagery, in the hieroglyphic language of the East, denotes some eminent ruler—primarily David; but secondarily and pre-eminently, the Messiah” (JFB Commentary, emphasis added). So there is no mistake that this particular passage in the context does not mean and angel but a ruler that will come out of Israel and have dominion on the earth. This one is Jesus Christ, the Messiah.

16) Trinitarians argue that God used the word Elohim. If God was dual then he would of used the word Elohaim, meaning, “….objects that naturally occur in pairs” (Gesenius Grammar book, p.244).

Elohim is also “Plural of H433; gods in the ordinary sense” (Strong’s 430). Elohim is left as more than one. It can mean 2, 3, 4, 5 etc…There is a reason why God chose Elohim and not Elohaim. If he chose Elohaim, then God would be locked into just two divine beings of the Godhead. But God wants a family. God wants to expand his family and add multiple sons and daughters in to the divine Elohim family. God is reproducing himself through man, by begettal, then birth, or born again into his family. This is why God chose Elohim, and not Elohaim. The Elohim family will expand into billions of divine beings and not limit God to only two.

God is not a mystery! God wants to reveal himself to you through the pages of your Bible all we have to do is blow the dust off the Bible and read. And may God give you the understanding of him so that you may glory in the knowledge of him. God is a family of the Father and the Son. They are one and the Same Kind, the God Kind!