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Is the Trinity Biblical?

After truthfully and prayerfully reading this whole booklet, there is only one outcome you can surely arrive at! Now the question is - which is more important to you - man's opinion - your 'churches' view, - or God and His truth?

The purpose of this booklet is to seek the Bible truth as to what the Holy Spirit is. Is it a literal third divine being of the Godhead as the trinity teaches, or is it the Spirit of God and Christ, ie. God's and Christ's own Spirit? Seeking the truth about what the Holy Spirit is can be very troubling for some people. So the one thing I ask is that you prayerfully read this message with an open mind, and let God and His Word be your guide to truth.

So what is the mainstream teaching concerning the Holy Spirit? The mainstream trinity teaching says the Holy Spirit is a third person of the Godhead and that the three are equal, co-eternal, co-existent Gods. Some believe that these three Gods are completely separate beings, whereas others believe that these three Gods are in fact one God, with three personalities. Explain that to a new believer!?? We often hear the phrase "God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit". By the words of the Athanasian Creed, upon which the Roman Catholic faith stands, it is "the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and yet there are not three Gods but one God." Some churches differ on some points from orthodoxy but regarding the basic premise being the one God is 'three gods in one', it's the same as the Athanasian Creed.

Consider these important points as we begin...

1 - There is not one mention of 3 beings in the Godhead in all the Old Testament, and the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of God, ie, God's own Spirit. The Bible does not even once use the term 'God the Spirit', but always the 'Spirit of God'.

NOTE: The word 'Elohiym' is often used by trinitarians, saying this word means plural, therefore this must be the trinity. But this is not so. Not only is the number 2 (God the Father and Jesus Christ) plural, 'us', the actual meaning of Elohiym is 'plural of majesty', ie 'a position of greatness'. And we can prove this from the Bible. When God spoke to Moses in Exodus 7:1, He said ...'I have made thee a god [Elohiym] to Pharaoh'. Was He telling Moses that He was going to make him 3 people to Pharaoh? No. God was telling Moses that He would make him 'great' before Pharaoh, 'like a god'. So this proves Elohiym does not mean 3.

2 - The New Testament tells us that ALL the disciples baptized in Jesus' name only.

3 - ALL of the apostles writings give praise and honor to two divine beings alone. God the Father and Jesus Christ the Son of God. To confirm this point even more, think about this. Why did the Father never speak to the Holy Spirit? Why did Jesus never speak to the Holy Spirit? Why did the Holy Spirit never speak to Jesus or the Father? Yet the Father spoke to His Son Jesus over and over all throughout the Bible, and Jesus spoke to His Father over and over all throughout the Bible. So how can the Holy Spirit be a literal co-equal being?

4 - In Revelation 5, John is given a vision of the throne of God, and he sees a 'Lamb, slain', which is Jesus. And this Lamb has 'seven eyes'... which are the seven Spirits of God, sent forth into all the earth. This is a reference to the Holy Spirit. And who HAS this Spirit? Another separate 'god' from the Father and His Son? No, it is Jesus Himself who has this Holy Spirit to send to the earth.
5 - Paul confirms in Galatians 4:6 that God sends the Spirit of His Son [Jesus] to earth, NOT another separate being.

6 - Look at this other vision given to the apostle John regarding the New Jerusalem on the NEW EARTH Revelation 21:22-23 ...'And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.'

How many divine beings do you see in the Godhead above? Two! Also, if you read Revelation 5:13, this also confirms that the whole universe gives praise and honour only to the Father and the Lamb (Jesus) for ever and ever! So do you want the truth? Then read on:-

Jude 1:4 For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

**** Important Point: The trinity teaching denies Jesus as the literal Son of God, because it teaches that Jesus is a self-existent, eternal God ALONGSIDE the Father, and not 'begotten' FROM the Father as a true Son. But please note, 1 John 2:22-23 says that he who 'denies the Father and SON' is antichrist. So this subject may be a lot more important than people think. *****

John 3:16 ...'For God so loved the world, that he GAVE his ONLY BEGOTTEN SON, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' God truly sent His own Son to die for our sins! What LOVE!

John 16:27-28 ...'For the Father himself loveth you, because you have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God. I came forth from the Father, AND am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.'

John 17:7-8 ...'Now they have known that all things whatsoever you have given me are of you. For I have given unto them the words which you gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from you, and they have believed that you did send me.'

Romans 8:3 ...'God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.'

Do you see this amazing truth about Jesus being the literal Son of God? This is real friends, and the truth is clear for all who have eyes to see. Notice the clear order that Jesus is giving. He came forth from the Father and THEN the Father sent Jesus HIS SON, to this earth. In other words Jesus didn’t become God’s Son at birth on this Earth, They are not play acting. He already was God’s Son begotten of God before creation as the bible clearly states that:

For it was in Him [Jesus Christ] that all things were created, in heaven and on earth, things seen and things unseen, whetherrones, dominions, rulers, or authorities; all things were created and exist through Him [by His service, intervention] and in and for Him. And He Himself existed before all things, and in Him all things consist (cohere, are held together). Colossians 1:16 Amplified

1 John 5:5 ...'Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?'
Proverbs 30:4 ...'Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended? who hath gathered the wind in his fists? who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? what is his name, AND what is his son's name, if thou canst tell?'

Here we are interested in what the Bible says, rather than what the majority believe, so we will use the WHOLE council of God as our authority on this doctrine of the trinity to find the truth. Let's start off with a basic fact find concerning the Holy Spirit:

Joh 17:3 And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.

Basic Logic: Looking at the original Hebrew and Greek words reveal clear truth in many instances which the English translation doesn't reveal. Take a look at this ... The Lord God' in the original Hebrew or Greek means 'GOD, DEITY'. Jesus Christ' in the original Greek means 'God is salvation' and 'THE ANOINTED ONE OF GOD', pointing to Jesus as the Son of God. So we have GOD and the SON OF GOD. Now look at the original meaning of 'Holy Spirit/Ghost'. In both the Hebrew and Greek it means 'BREATH, MIND, ESSENCE'.

So what does this mean? It means that in the original Hebrew and Greek, the scriptures clearly revealed that there are two literal divine beings - God the Father and Jesus Christ His Son. And the Spirit is the 'breath, mind and essence' OF SOMEONE. Not a literal being itself. And what is the Spirit the 'breath, mind and essence' of? It's the breath, mind and essence OF GOD and OF JESUS! This is confirmed further below.

Would you agree that the Godhead or so called 'trinity' doctrine is a 'pillar' of the church? It is one of the foundational teachings which you will find in the fundamental beliefs of churches around the world. Now a fundamental doctrine MUST be clearly supported by the Old Testament, otherwise there is no foundation to it. Let me give you an example. The doctrine of Jesus Christ as Saviour of the world. The doctrine of the sabbath, the law of God, the state of the dead, the truth about hell, and so on, are ALL clearly supported by the Old Testament. So what about the 'trinity'? The Old Testament is SILENT!! Not one verse in the Old Testament supports the trinity teaching!

Is the word "Trinity" found anywhere in the Bible? No, it's not. Is the phrase "God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit" in the Bible? No. So what does the Bible say?

THE FATHER: - 'God the Father' 13 times; 'The most high God' 11 times; 'The Highest' 6 times; 'The only true God' 1 time.

JESUS CHRIST: - 'Son of God' 48 times; 'only begotten' 6 times; God's 'Holy Child' 2 times; His 'firstborn' 4 times.

HOLY SPIRIT: - 'Spirit of God' 26 times; 'God's Spirit' 9 times; 'Thy Spirit' 4 times; His 'Spirit of your Father' 1 time.

TRINITARIAN: - 'God the Holy Spirit' 0 times; 'God the Son' 0 times; 'God in three persons' 0 times; 'trinity' or 'triune God' 0 times.

Above information taken from www.holy-trinity-of-god.com

So we have a huge problem with this trinity teaching in that it is not found anywhere in the Old Testament, and yet it is known as a 'pillar' of the Christian faith. I'm not just talking about the word 'trinity', I'm talking about the concept of there being three beings in the Godhead.
Nowhere in the Old Testament is this idea supported. Now as we mentioned above, some people use the verse in Genesis where God says "let us make man in our image." to support the trinity. But this is pure clutching at straws, because the 'us' in that verse does not mean three people. The word 'Elohiym' refers to a position of greatness, not the number 3. And anyway, since when did the word 'plural' HAVE to mean 3? Why not 4 or 5. Why not 100? Do we have 100 gods? No, we have to be Biblical and logical when looking at this. Elohiym refers to TWO people, God the Father and Jesus Christ His Son. That is the 'us'. And that is Biblical.

DID YOU KNOW? - The 3 horns (tribes) that the little horn (the Papacy) destroyed in Daniel 7 were the Heruli, Vandals and the Ostrogoths. And these 3 tribes supported Arianism. Do you know what Arianism is? It is a NON-trinitarian faith. So the Roman Catholic Church destroyed these 3 tribes who opposed the Catholic trinity and now the whole world 'wonders after the beast' and follows the Catholic trinity doctrine. Please Note: Many today say that Arius believed Jesus was a created being. But the problem is, the Roman Catholic Church destroyed practically all of Arius' writings, so we do not know for sure what Arius believed, other than he rejected the trinity teaching. A lot of history has been CHANGED by the Roman Church, so do not trust everything you read.

What is the Holy Spirit?

To truly find out what the Holy Spirit is, we need to use the Bible and the Bible alone, for this is the Word of God and God's Word is what we should base all of our beliefs on. So what does the Bible say about the Holy Spirit? Let's start off with the Old Testament. But before we do, let me make an important point. Any major doctrine we teach MUST be supported by the Old Testament. We cannot teach a doctrine that is only based on a couple of verses in the New Testament. So let us look at a selection of Old Testament verses:

Genesis 1:2 ...'And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.'

Genesis 41:38 ...'And Pharaoh said unto his servants, Can we find such a one as this is, a man in whom the Spirit of God is?'

1 Samuel 10:10 ...'And when they came thither to the hill, behold, a company of prophets met him; and the Spirit of God came upon him, and he prophesied among them.'

Psalm 51:11 ...'Cast me not away from Thy presence; and take not Thy Holy Spirit away from me.'

Isaiah 63:11-12 ...'Where is he that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherd of his flock? where is he that put His Holy Spirit WITHIN him? That led them by the right hand of Moses with his glorious arm, dividing the water before them, to make himself an everlasting name?'

***** Now if you search right throughout the Old Testament, you will not find one reference to a third being of the Godhead. What you will find are lots of references to God the Father and Jesus Christ whom He was to send to save us. ALL the references to the Holy Spirit are revealed as the Spirit of God. The Holy Spirit being God's own Spirit. But the New Testament and inspiration tells us that the Holy Spirit is also the Spirit of Christ. *****

Romans 8:9 ...'But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.'
1 Peter 1:11 ...'Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was IN them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.'

"The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God; it is also the Spirit of Christ. It is that divine, mysterious emanation through which they carry forward their great and infinite work." (Uriah Smith, GC Bulletin, March 18, 1891, pp. 146,147)

"Here we find that the Holy Spirit is both the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ." (E. J. Waggoner, Christ and His Righteousness, p. 23, 1890)

"We learn from this language that when we speak of the Spirit of God we are really speaking of his presence and power." (J. N. Loughborough, Review and Herald, September 20, 1898)

Notice what the apostle Paul says in 1 Corinthians 2:11 ...'For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is IN him? even so, the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.' ... So Paul is saying that JUST AS no man knows us apart from our OWN spirit INSIDE us, likewise no man knows God, but God's own Spirit which is ALSO in Him. Paul is saying it's the same concept. God's Holy Spirit is not another being, but God's own Spirit.

Did you know? The original Hebrew and Greek meaning for 'Spirit' with regards to the Holy Spirit means: 'Breath, Mind or Essence'? So the Holy Spirit would mean 'Holy breath' or 'Holy mind/essence'. Does that sound like a literal person, or does it sound more like the mind/essence of someone, as in the 'essence or mind' of God?

Let's back this up with what John the Baptist said in Mark 1:8 ...'I indeed have baptized you with water: but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.' Do you see? John said he baptized with water, which is a substance. But Jesus would baptize with the Holy Spirit, which again is a substance - a "substance" of God. It makes no sense to think that Jesus would baptize people with another person. But it does make sense that Jesus would baptize with the Spirit of God. In other words, with the mind or essence of God.

Now before we tackle the well-known New Testament verses that are used to support the trinity doctrine, let us take a look at how the apostles viewed the Godhead:

Romans 1:7-8 ...'Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ. First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all.'

1 Corinthians 1:3-4 ...'Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ.'

Ephesians 1:3 ...'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

Ephesians 6:23 ...'Peace be to the brethren, and love with faith, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.'

James 1:1 ...'James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ.'

2 Peter 1:2 ...'Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord.'
2 John 1:3 ...'Grace be with you, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love.'

'Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.' (1 Corinthians 1:3)

'Grace be to you and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ.' (Galatians 1:3)

'Grace be to you, and peace, from our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ.' (Ephesians 1:2)

'Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.' (Philippians 1:2)

'Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.' (Colossians 1:2)

'Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.' (1 Thessalonians 1:1)

1 John 1:3 That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.

The sample of verses above is an example of what is written right throughout the apostles writings in the Bible. Do you see who they are giving credit and worship to? They are giving credit to God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. They are not giving credit to any third person of the Godhead. Only two! Which supports the Old Testament teaching. And remember, we are to use the WHOLE council of God, not just a couple of verses.

So according to the trinity teaching, the Holy Spirit is a separate literal being of the Godhead, and is an equal, co-existent, co-eternal God alongside the Father and Son. And yet not one time in the greetings of Paul and the other apostles is the Holy Spirit uplifted or praised. Just God the Father and Jesus Christ His Son. WHY IS THAT? ..... 1 Corinthians 8:6 ...'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.' .... THAT's WHY.

Matthew and Luke talk about a certain event. Look at what they both say ... Luke 12:11-12 ...'take you no thought how or what thing you shall answer, or what you shall say: For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what you ought to say.' Now we will read the same account recorded by Matthew, but notice the words he used to describe the Holy Spirit. Matthew 10:19-20 ...'take no thought how or what you shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what you shall speak. For it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.' So Luke says the Holy Spirit would teach us, but Matthew reveals that 'Spirit' to simply be the Spirit of God the Father.

Now take a look at Jesus' own words ... John 14:10 ...'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.' You see? Jesus Christ and the Father. And it is THE FATHER that dwells in Jesus and in us. In other words, the Spirit of the Father that dwells in us.
Also, take a look at what Jesus said as He prayed to the Father ... John 17:21 ...'That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.' Where is this so called third person of the trinity? Jesus is clearly revealing the Godhead as the Father and Son, that's it! No third equal divine being, just the Father and Son. And they are one in spirit and mind, just like the believers are one in spirit and mind.

Romans 8:9 ...'But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.'

1 Peter 1:11 ...'Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.'

You see? It wasn't a third being of the Godhead that dwelt in God's people. It was the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ, which is the same Spirit, as they share the same One Spirit. See the following verses which confirms this:

Ephesian 4:4 ...'There is one body, and one Spirit, even as you are called in one hope of your calling.'

1 Corinthians 12:13 ...'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.'

Ephesian 2:18 ...'For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.'

**The Holy Spirit in the New Testament**

Let's take a look at some of the verses used to support this mainstream trinity doctrine, that there are three persons of the Godhead, the Holy Spirit being a separate divine being. You may be surprised at the simple Bible truth regarding this.

**VERSE USED - Matthew 28:19** ...'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'

Now if we were to take this verse on its own, then surely we could teach that there are three persons of the Godhead right? But we cannot do that, we have to use the whole council of God. And what does the vast majority of the Word of God teach? That the Holy Spirit is God's Spirit, and that there is only two persons of the Godhead, God the Father and Jesus Christ His Son. So there must be a problem with this Bible verse in Matthew 28. To confirm this, let us take a look at the apostles baptizing:

Acts 2:38 ...'Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ.'

Acts 8:16 ...'For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.'

Acts 8:36-38 ...'What doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him.'
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.'

Acts 22:16 ...'And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.'

Romans 6:3 ...'Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?'

These Bible verses clearly show two things. That there is either a problem with the verse in Matthew 28, or that the mainstream understanding of it is wrong, because the apostles clearly didn't baptize in the 'name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit'. If this verse in Matthew 28 is valid, then Jesus is simply saying we are baptized in the 'name' of the Father, Son and THEIR Spirit. And He is including their Spirit because it is through their Spirit that they work in us. (However later on in this message it will be shown how the Church of Rome added this verse to the Bible to support their Trinitarian Doctrine) For now let's look at another well known and used verse to support the trinity:

VERSE USED - John 14:16 ...'And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever.'

Now there is a simple Biblical truth that so many people miss with regards to this verse. They just take this one verse on its own and exclude the context of what Jesus was saying. Let's look at this verse in context:

John 14:16-17 ...'And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; 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. 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.'

Do you see this amazing truth? The Holy Spirit had not been sent at this point, and yet Jesus said .. You know Him for He dwelleth with you! Then Jesus said .. I will not leave you comfortless, I WILL COME TO YOU. Jesus was talking about HIMSELF. He was talking about His Spirit that He would send. Would you like more verses to confirm that?:

Galatians 4:6 ...'And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.'

2 Corinthians 3:17 ...'Now the Lord is that Spirit and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.'

Jesus was saying He would send His own Spirit, which is the same Spirit as the Spirit of the Father, because they are one in spirit and mind! Have a really good think on John 14:16-17. Prayerfully think about it and the truth will shine forth!

John 14:22-23 ...'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.'
Now many people look at John 14 and say. Well, Jesus was referring to another person, because He said 'he' regarding the comforter. And what they don't realize is that Jesus referred to HIMSELF as a 'third person' elsewhere. Take a look ... John 17:1-2 ...'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.' Do you see? Jesus spoke about HIMSELF in a 'third person'. So Jesus talking about the comforter as 'he' is no proof at all that the comforter would be another person.

NOTE: The Greek word for 'comforter' is 'parakletos', which means 'intercessor, advocate, comforter'. If you take a look at 1 John 2:1 it says that Jesus Christ is our 'advocate'. And the Greek word used for advocate in this verse is the same 'parakletos' used for comforter in the other verses regarding the Spirit. 1 Timothy 2:5 also confirms we only have ONE mediator (advocate) with the Father, and that is Jesus Christ. So what was to be 'sent' as a comforter for us? The Spirit of Christ.

Who does Revelation 1:13 say is walking amongst the candlesticks (churches)? A separate third being? No, it is Jesus Christ Himself!

VERSE USED - John 16:7-8 ...'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.'

Many people look at these verses and say. "you see! Jesus is talking about another person here, because Jesus says 'HIM' and 'HE' referring to the Holy Spirit." ... Well, did you know that Jesus also said 'he' and 'him' when referring to Himself? Take a look at the following prayer from Jesus to His Father in heaven in John 17...

John 17:1-3 ...'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.'

Do you see? Jesus is speaking of Himself in a 'third person'. So John 16:7-8 is no proof at all of a 'third person'. Jesus is just speaking of Himself and HIS Spirit that He is going to send. And why does Jesus need to go to heaven first before He can send the Holy Spirit? If the Holy Spirit is another 'God' of the Godhead, then he could just come anytime himself. But the simple truth is, Jesus had to go to heaven first before sending the Spirit, because it is Christ's OWN Spirit that He receives from the Father. Therefore the Spirit could not come until Jesus was in heaven with the Father.

Now take a look at this ... John 15:26 ...'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.' ... That word 'proceedeth' in the original Greek means to literally come out of someone. So the Spirit which Jesus was to send literally comes out of the Father. It is God's own Spirit!

VERSE USED - 1 John 5:7 ...'For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.'

This verse only appears in the King James Bible and a few others, whereas the majority of Bible versions have left this verse out. So there is a dispute as to whether this verse is actually a valid inspired verse or not. I personally do not have the knowledge of Bible
translation history to be able to say one way or another. But what I can confidently say, and it's very important that people grasp this truth, is if there are few verses that contradict the vast majority of scripture, then there MUST be something wrong with our basic understanding of the few verses.

***** Please refer was 1 John 5:7 added to the Bible later in this message to find out why 1 John 5:7 is disputed. *****

What did we learn earlier concerning the original meaning of the Spirit or Ghost? It means 'breath' or 'thought/mind'. So this verse is saying that the three which bear witness is God the Father, Jesus Christ the Son and the Holy Breath or Mind. So logic tells us it is talking about the breath or mind of God and Jesus Christ, because it makes no sense that there is a 'Holy Breath' or 'Holy Mind' existing in of itself.

Now even if this verse was valid, which is disputed, it still doesn't prove the existence of three divine beings in the Godhead, because as we have learned from the mass of other Bible verses, God the Father and Jesus Christ have a Spirit that they give us believers. And as Romans 8:16 confirms, the Spirit of God bears witness with our spirit. So 1 John 5:7 could simply mean that the Father, Son and THEIR Spirit bear witness. And that they are 'one in Spirit and mind', like we believers are 'one in spirit and mind'.

***** I cannot stress this enough. We must not create a doctrine from only a few verses that actually contradict the rest of scripture. *****

'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)

The Vision of John on Patmos

I would like to share another very important Bible verse with you. John on Patmos was given a revelation of Jesus Christ and of the Father. And in Revelation 21, John is given a vision of the New Jerusalem which will reside on the new earth. So this is a future vision of the new heaven and earth when this earth has passed away. Now take a look at what he sees:

Revelation 21:22-23 ...'And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.'

As you can clearly see, there is no third person of the Godhead in the New Jerusalem. Just God the Father and Jesus Christ 'the Lamb'. This confirms the clear Bible teaching that the Godhead consists of only God the Father and Jesus Christ His Son. Remember, we are to take the WHOLE council of God on any doctrine. Yes, if we take one or two verses on their own, we could believe that there are three persons in the Godhead. For instance, if we take a couple of verses on their own, the 'rapture' doctrine could seem true, or the doctrine of eternal hell fire for the lost could seem true. But we know that if the vast majority of the Bible contradicts the few verses, then there MUST be a misunderstanding of those few verses. And this applies to the false trinity doctrine.

God and Jesus Christ Given Names and Titles
If you look right throughout the Bible, you will see that God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ both have REAL NAMES. They both talk about each other in REAL PERSONAL WAYS. So if the Holy Spirit of God is a separate, divine, equal being of the Godhead, why doesn't it have a real personal name like the Father and Son? Think about it. What is the Spirit called? It's called THE Spirit or THE Holy Spirit. It's never given a name or title, it's just called THE Spirit, which isn't a name, it's just what it is. The word Holy isn't a name either, it's just describing what God's Spirit is, Holy. So if you think about this logically, with all the other Bible evidence, you can only come to one conclusion, that the Holy Spirit is not a separate person from God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ. It must be the Spirit of God, or God's Spirit.

Romans 8:10-16 ...'And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwellleth in you. Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.'

Do you see how the inspired Bible writers clearly revealed the Holy Spirit as being the Spirit of God and of Christ? It is God and Christ Jesus who dwells in us through THEIR SPIRIT, which is One Spirit that they share, not another divine being.

Now some say that because the Spirit can be grieved (Ephesians 4:30, Matthew 12:31) then it must have its own mind and be another separate deity of the Godhead. But again, this just goes against the vast Biblical evidence of what the Holy Spirit is. Think about it. How does God the Father and Jesus Christ prompt us and guide us? Through THEIR Holy Spirit. So if we turn away and reject the promptings of God's Spirit, then that is what we cannot be forgiven for. Look at the following interesting Bible verses:

Isaiah 40:13 ...'Who has directed the Spirit of the LORD, or being his counsellor has taught him?'

Romans 11:34 ...'For who has known the mind of the Lord? Or who has been his counsellor?'

Can you see how Paul is quoting directly from Isaiah, and clearly understood the Spirit of the Lord to be the Mind of the Lord? They are one and the same thing. **Which is why the original Hebrew and Greek words for 'Spirit' (ruwach and pneuma) right throughout the Bible points to the ESSENCE of a being, ie 'breath, thoughts, mind', rather than an actual being itself.**

So if you take the WHOLE council of God regarding this doctrine of the trinity, you will find out that it is a false teaching. What is the Holy Spirit? It is the Spirit of God and of Christ Jesus. It is not another divine being in the Godhead, as there are only two, God the Father and His Son Christ Jesus our Lord and Saviour, which is confirmed in Luke 10 by Christ Jesus Himself:

Luke 10:22 ...'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.'
Do you see any third divine being of the Godhead above? No, there is only two!

John 17:3 ...’And this is eternal life, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.’

The Origin of the Trinity Doctrine

It was about a century after Tertullian when Arianism began causing so many disputes that Constantine convened the first ecumenical Council in Church history to settle them. Arius was an elder in the Alexandrian church in the early fourth century that SUPPOSEDLY taught Christ was begotten, or created or established. Opposing the teachings of Arius was Athanasius, a deacon also from Alexandria. His view was an early form of Trinitarianism where the Father, Son and Holy Spirit were one but at the same time distinct from each other. His view was a further change to what Tertullian believed with the Holy Spirit not yet claimed to be a literal being. That came later.

***** Note that some historians claim the Catholic Church burnt what Arius wrote, altered records and falsely rumoured that he taught Christ was created in order to discredit him, which other historical facts give credibility to. We need to keep in mind the fact that the Catholic Church (Papery/Vatican) is known for changing history to their interpretation of events to hide the real truth more than 1 time. *****

Consider the following for instance:

The view of Athanasius was highly influenced by Origen who was a Greek philosopher and theologian who reinterpreted Christian doctrine through the philosophy of Neoplatonism. His work was later condemned as unorthodox. Origen taught the doctrine of Purgatory, transubstantiation, transmigration and reincarnation of the soul, the Holy Spirit was a feminine force, Jesus was only a created being, there would be no physical resurrection, the creation account in Genesis is a fictitious story and is known to have publicly castrated himself based on Matthew 19. Arius on the other hand was a pupil of Lucian of Antioch. Lucian was responsible for the work that gave us what is known as the Textus Receptus which was completed by Erasmus, and is what gave us the trusted New Testament of the KJV Bible. These and other facts reveal that Athanasius was influenced by Greek philosophy and that Arius probably taught Biblical truth despite what main stream history would have us believe.

***** (This is why we must be wise as the Bereans were and actively pray and search for the truth so as not to be deceived). *****

Some believe Constantine was the first Christian Roman Emperor but he was actually a sun worshiper who was baptized on his deathbed. During his reign he had his eldest son and his wife murdered. His belief at best was a blend of paganism and Christianity for political purposes, and so he neither cared nor really understood this dispute but was just eager to bring the controversy to a close and keep unity in his empire. When the bishops gathered at Nicea on May 20, 325 AD to resolve the crisis, very few shared Athanasius's view of Christ as most held a position midway between Athanasius and Arius. The religious debates lasted two months before the Council rejected the minority view of Arius, but having no alternative, Constantine approved the view of Athanasius, which was also a minority view. And so the Church was left supporting a belief held by only a minority of those attending. The Encyclopedia Britannica states: “Constantine himself presided, actively guiding the discussions, and personally proposed ... the crucial formula expressing
the relation of Christ to God in the creed issued by the council … Overawed by the emperor, the bishops, with two exceptions only, signed the creed, many of them much against their inclination.” — (1971 edition, Vol. 6, “Constantine,” p. 386)

Horrific religious persecution followed the decision made by Constantine who was essentially a pagan Emperor who imposed an invented creed never preached by Jesus. Constantine exiled those who refused to accept the creed as well as the bishops who signed the creed but refused to join in condemnation of Arius. He also ordered all copies of the Thalia to be burned, which was the book in which Arius expressed his teachings. But several years later Constantine became lenient toward those he condemned and exiled at the council and allowed them to return. In AD 335, they brought accusations against Athanasius and so now Constantine had Athanasius banished! This was not about Biblical truth. As a pagan sun worshipper, Constantine also enforced the first Sunday law just four years earlier and hence played a major role in bringing two pagan traditions into the Church. It was four hundred years after the cross when they formulated this creed that never existed before hand, and so the Apostles and the early Church could never have taught it either. See Encyclopedia Britannica and historical quotes.

Many of the Bishops who formulated the doctrine of the trinity were steeped in Greek and Platonic philosophy, which influenced their religious views. In fact the language they used in defining the trinity is taken directly from Platonic and Greek philosophy. The Platonic term trias, meaning three, was Latinized as trinitas, which gave us the English word trinity which is neither biblical nor Christian. As Bible scholars John McClintock and James Strong (wrote the famous Strong’s Concordance) explain, “Towards 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.” — (Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, 1891, Vol. 10, “Trinity,” p. 553)

So the trinity was not derived from scripture but was conceived in philosophy. Greek philosophers were greatly influenced by Plato (427-347 BC) who was considered the greatest of all Greek philosophers. Plato was ingrained with Trinitarian thought and knew that all the ancient religions had triad deities, and so he desired to come up with a better definition to define God above all the deities of Greek mythology. Plato's definition of God was, (1) The “first God,” who was the Supreme Being in the universe; (2) the “second God,” whom Plato described as the “soul of the universe”; and (3) the “third God,” defined as the “spirit.” The Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria (15 BC-AD 50) who followed Greek philosophy was influenced by Plato's version and saw God as, (1) Father, who created all things (Philo named him “the Demiurge”), (2) Mother, who was Knowledge the Maker possessed and (3) the Beloved Son was the world. Supposedly the union of demiurge and knowledge produced man's world. This esoteric type of thinking is what led to the birth and development of the trinity.

Notice how these quotes document a belief in a divine trinity in many regions and religions of the ancient world and that the origin of the conception is entirely pagan. Egyptologist Arthur Weigall summed up the influence of ancient beliefs on the adoption of the trinity doctrine by the Catholic Church in this excerpt from his book Paganism in Our Christianity.

And so the Council of Nicea did not end the controversy and the bishops went on teaching as they had before, and the Arian crisis continued for another sixty years. Athanasius was exiled
no fewer than five times and it was very difficult to make his creed stick. The ongoing disputes were violent and bloody at times. Noted historian Will Durant writes, “Probably more Christians were slaughtered by Christians in these two years (342-3) than by all the persecutions of Christians by pagans in the history of Rome.” — (The Story of Civilization, Vol. 4: The Age of Faith, 1950, p. 8). So Christians fought and slaughtered one another over their differing views of God!

So after Constantine's death in 337 AD, disputes continued. Constantine's son Constantius II favoured the Arians and set out to reverse the Nicene Creed. Constantius used his power to exile bishops adhering to the Nicene Creed and especially Athanasius who fled to Rome. The debates resulted in numerous councils. Among them the Council of Sardica in 343 AD, the Council of Sirmium in 358 AD and the double Council of Rimini and Seleucia in 359 AD, and no fewer than fourteen further creed formulas between 340 and 360 AD. After Constantius' death in 361 AD, his successor Julian, who was a devotee of Rome's pagan gods, declared that he would no longer favor one Church faction over another and allowed all exiled bishops to return, which resulted in further increasing dissension among Christians.

Disputes eventually became over the nature of the Holy Spirit. So 44 years after Constantine's death in 381 AD, Emperor Theodosius, baptized only a year earlier, convened the Council of Constantinople to resolve them. Theodosius favoured the Nicene Creed and so after he arrived in Constantinople he expelled the bishop Demophilus, and surrendered the Churches there to Gregory of Nazianzus who was the leader of a small Nicene community there and one of three men that became known as “the three Cappadocians.” These three men had an agenda at this council which was for the first time to push the idea of the Holy Spirit being a literal being. Gregory was recently appointed as archbishop of Constantinople, but due to illness, Nectarius, an elderly city senator had to take over the role of archbishop and presided over the council. And so Nectarius was baptized for the job and the Trinitarian view on the Holy Spirit was governed by someone with little or no knowledge of theology! What resulted became known as the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed where they now decided that the Holy Spirit was a literal being. Any who disagreed were in accordance with the edicts of the emperor and Church authorities branded heretics and dealt with accordingly. This final teaching on the nature of God is what became the trinity as generally understood today. It was not decided so much from Scripture but from Greek philosophy, much bloodshed and whoever had the most power.

So in short, when Babylon was conquered, most of the Babylonian Priests took their pagan teachings to Alexandria which resulted in the school of Alexandria. And so the Alexandrines incorporated Greek Pagan philosophical beliefs from Plato's teachings into Christianity (Neoplatonism), and interpreted much of the Bible allegorically. Lucian rejected this system entirely and propounded a system of literal interpretation that dominated the Eastern Church for a long period. Thus Origen taught the allegorical method of explanation of Scripture that Athanasius and the three Cappadocians learned from, which was influenced by Plato and strong pagan theological speculations, which gave us the trinity doctrine. ****

“The Alexandria catechetical school, which revered Clement of Alexandria and Origen, the greatest theologian 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 [pagan] theological speculations. Athanasius and the three Cappadocians [the men whose Trinitarian views were adopted by the Catholic Church at the Councils of Nicaea and
What is the Trinity Doctrine?

The word “trinity” and this doctrine cannot be found anywhere in the Bible. It was patched together by Catholic theologians hundreds of years after the death of the apostles and after the completion of Scripture. Instead, Trinitarianism is a mixture of Jewish, Greek and Roman philosophies that are loosely based on a handful of Bible verses snatched out of context or interpolated (added to) into the text.

***** Thus the doctrine of the trinity is a manmade doctrine that borrows heavily from pagan sources.*****

The doctrine of the trinity as taught by most Churches states that there are three co-equal (equal in every respect), co-eternal (the same age), omniscient (all knowing), omnipotent (all powerful) gods, who are not three gods, but one god. By the words of the Athanasian Creed it is, “the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and yet there are not three gods but one God.” The Athanasian Creed (Roman Catholic Creed) says that the one God is three divine personalities in one indivisible substance or essence. It is the one indivisible nature part which is a problem because it is maintained that this constitutes the one God being 1+1+1=One! That is, the Father is God, Jesus is God, the Holy Spirit is God, and yet there are not three gods but one God, and that is the trinity!

You do not have to be very smart to realise that this makes no sense at all. Therefore, those teaching this doctrine tag it with the word mystery, stating that you will never be able to understand it so just accept it. They may also say, just because it is Catholic it does not mean it is wrong. So in one way or another Satan has tricked people into believing this falsehood without checking it out for themselves. There is in fact not one Scripture in the Bible that states the Holy Spirit is God, not one! And you will later discover that there is also not one Scripture that says all three are one except the two scriptures that were added to (not in the original cannon) the bible at a later date.

Some Churches differ on some points from orthodoxy but regarding the basic premise being the one God is three gods in one, it is exactly the same as the Athanasian Creed. This is the creed upon which the Roman Catholic faith is built.

The trinity doctrine has to be taught alongside the Bible, because if you had never heard of it, you would never come up with it yourself from just reading the Bible. This is because it did not originate from Scripture but from paganism and Greek philosophy. Hence you will soon discover that Scripture has to be manipulated to try and convince others of this doctrine. It was after God confused the languages at Babel that the sun began to be worshipped in three stages as three gods. That is, the rising sun was god, the midday sun was god, the setting sun was god, and yet there were not three gods but one god! In other words, 1+1+1=One! This is the absolute origin of the three in one trinity doctrine. Knowing who we worship is the key to eternal life, so If God was truly a trinity, you can be sure there would be unmistakable Scriptures saying so.

What does the Bible Teach?

There is no mystery with the Biblical view of the Godhead which reveals there is but one true God the Father who is a literal Father, one Lord Jesus Christ being His literal Son,
and one Holy Spirit being the presence and power of God and and his Son, not a separate being with a separate consciousness. As one Christian author wrote. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, not a son by creation as were the angels, nor a son by adoption as is the forgiven sinner, but a Son begotten in the express image of the Father's person that is equal in authority and divine perfection.

Below Paul lists seven distinct things showing that they are all separate and that one is not the other. Hence the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are three separate and distinct things of which one is not and cannot be the other. Parentheses are added.

“There is one body, and one Spirit [Spirit of God and Christ], even as you are called in one hope of your calling; One Lord [Jesus Christ], one faith, one baptism, One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.” Ephesians 4:4-6

Implications of the Trinity

Ever since the death of Jesus, our adversary has tried to pervert what Christ accomplished in His incarnation (meaning in our Saviour's life and death). And since Satan can do nothing about what Christ actually did achieve, he does the next best thing which is to promote the belief that the divine Son of God did not actually die at Calvary. I have heard Pastors preach that God sent Himself to die on the cross since the trinity teaches all three are the one god.

But this leads to another problem because God cannot die. So it is claimed that Jesus had two natures, a divine nature and a human nature and only the human nature died. But to say that the divine Son of God could not die is as far from the teachings of the Bible as darkness is from light. So we would ask the Trinitarian to which of the two natures are we indebted to for redemption? The answer is the divine one who died and shed His blood for us.

***** It should be obvious that if only the human nature died, our Redeemer was only human and the divine Son of God took no part in the work of redemption for He could neither suffer nor die.*****

Satan also aims to pervert how much it cost God in sacrificing His Son. The Father supposedly never risked anything by giving up His Son, for they claim that Christ could not have possibly sinned. Therefore nothing was at stake. If only human nature suffered and died as the trinity doctrine teaches, then the divine Christ remained unscathed. And since God cannot die, Christ would never have been able to die under any circumstance. Yet Jesus said, “I am He that liveth, and was dead.” Revelation 1:18

Almost all Christians state that, “Jesus is the Son of God,” but there are different meanings attached to these words.

***** The sad reality is that most professed Christians do not believe Jesus to be the Son of God if they subscribe to their denominational statements of belief.*****

Jehovah's Witnesses say that Jesus is the Son of God, but when asked to explain, say that Jesus was the first angel that God created and was no different from Lucifer or the other angels. Roman Catholics say that Jesus is the Son of God, but when they are asked to explain say there is God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, and yet there are not three gods but one God. Others will explain that Jesus is a co-eternal companion of God whom God declared to be His Son even though He is not really His Son. And yet others will tell you
that Jesus became the Son of God when He was born in Bethlehem and was not the Son of God in any other sense. Every one of these explanations denies that Jesus is the Son of God in some way. (A very DANGEROUS ASSUMPTION) The trinity doctrine says there are:

3 beings who are co-eternal
3 beings who are all immortal
3 beings who are all powerful, all knowing etc.
3 beings who are worthy of worship and praise (although some say only the Father and Son are to be worshipped and praised.
3 beings each acting a different role.

So consider carefully:

If all three members of the Godhead are co-eternal, then there was “never” a time that they did not exist, and they all must be the same infinite age. If this is true, then the titles which they possess merely reflect the roles taken to act out the plan of redemption. They cannot then be taken in a literal sense. For example, the Son of God then is not really God's Son, He is the member of the Godhead playing the role of the Son. Yet Scripture teaches us over and over again that God gave His Son, but the trinity doctrine tells us that Jesus was not really God's Son, He was the member of the Godhead playing the role of the Son. The Trinitarian typically claims that Jesus was referred to as God's Son because of His birth in Bethlehem. But the Bible states that Jesus was brought forth before all things were created. So if Jesus has “always” existed then it is impossible for Him to be the Son of God. And if Christ is not a literal Son, then God cannot be a literal Father either.

*****So the trinity doctrine denies the Father and Son, which it also does by teaching the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit are the same one God. So this is a denial of both the Father and the Son in more ways than one which 1 John 2:22-23 states is antichrist.*****

Notice that John says nothing about denying the Holy Spirit. Thus more than 120 verses that state Jesus is the Son of God apparently do not really mean what they say at all. Do you know of any other doctrine that has to explain away so many clear Scriptures? If you accept the trinity doctrine, then Jesus cannot be the Son of God. And if you do not accept Jesus as being the Son of God then you cannot have eternal life! With these facts in mind, consider the following Scriptures very carefully and ask yourself does this affect your eternal life by denying who the Father and Son truly are. And considering the trinity doctrine is from Satan’s church (inspired by Satan himself), it is not hard to see what his plan is if your eyes are wide open.

“Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: but he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also.” 1 John 2:22-23

“And this is life eternal, that they might know you the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom you have sent.” John 17:3

“He that believeth on the Son has everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” John 3:36

“But these are written, that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you might have life through his name.” John 20:31
So most important of all is that this doctrine can be a salvation issue which is something I would have never imagined until I studied this topic in depth and realized all the implications.

The trinity doctrine destroys the personality of God, and his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

So please study this as if your salvation depends on it as it may. Understanding the identity of the Holy Spirit is essential, but as the above verses state, knowing exactly who the Father and Son are is the key to eternal life.

Considering what John says on antichrist, could it be that the way the antichrist denies the Father and Son is by introducing the trinity doctrine into Christianity, which destroys their true relationship by denying the personality of God and His Son? Remember that the antichrist according to the Scriptures is not a secular power but a religious one.

For Adventists: What teaching is antichrist? “Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. . . . He who denies the personality of God and of his Son Jesus Christ, is denying God and Christ.” — (E.G. White, RH, March 8, 1906)

And what doctrine denies the personality of God and His Son which is denying God and Christ? Her husband explains, “Here we might mention the Trinity, which does away [with] the personality of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ,” — (James White, RH, December 11, 1855)

Many believe that their faith is well grounded in the doctrine of the trinity, yet this teaching is the foundational teaching of the antichrist (The Vatican Papal Rome –see Understanding End Times Prophecy) which makes it impossible to build on the true rock: Christ the Son of the living God. “The mystery of the trinity is the central doctrine of the Catholic faith.” — (Handbook for Today's Catholic, p. 11). The antichrist power has built on the premise that Jesus is not the literal Son of God, thus denying the Father and Son relationship. God's true Church will build on the foundation that Peter declared in Matthew 16:13-18: “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God ... and upon this rock I will build my Church.”

To believe the trinity teaching is actually to be walking in the footsteps of the antichrist power.

Then there is the issue of the Holy Spirit which the Bible never tells us to “pray to” or “worship.” Why would God's Word neglect that if the Holy Spirit is a third God of a trinity? We are told to pray “for” the Spirit, but never “to” the Spirit. Yet as the trinity doctrine takes stronger hold on the Church, some are beginning to do just that contrary to the teachings of Scripture. And if you think that Satan is not leading Christians to pray to the Holy Spirit then watch this 35 second **YouTube video** clip. (Close the window to return to this page). Did you notice that he says “God the Spirit” which is a Catholic Trinitarian phrase and hence is never found in the Bible which uses the term “Spirit of God” which has a totally different meaning.

***** Question: Who would be the four highest beings in Heaven before the fall of man (before sin) if the Holy Spirit was a third co-equal being as per the trinity doctrine? It would be the Father, Son, Holy Spirit and Lucifer. Who is it that wants to be like the most High and be worshipped and prayed to as God? (Isaiah 14:12-14) What if the Holy Spirit was not a third literal being. Who would then be the third highest being? Lucifer!
So if the Holy Spirit is not a third literal being, a separate God, then who would be answering our prayers if we prayed to the “Spirit”? Who would be setting himself up as a third “God” worthy of praise and worship? Has Satan succeeded in accomplishing his goal of being included as Deity? If we now believe the Holy Spirit can be worshipped and prayed to just like the Father and the Son, where are we being led? If the Holy Spirit is not a third God then what spirit would we have as per our belief and who would we be giving our adoration to? The video referred to above called new gods explains how this could cost us our soul. *****

For Adventists: Before sin — “Among the inhabitants of heaven, Satan, next to Christ, was at one time most honored of God, and highest in power and glory.” — (E.G. White, ST, July 23, 1902)

Since the trinity doctrine claims Jesus is also the one God, an Adventist author from the 1800's wrote, “To believe that doctrine, when reading the scripture we must believe that God sent Himself into the world, died to reconcile the world to Himself, raised Himself from the dead, ascended to Himself in heaven, pleads before Himself in heaven to reconcile the world to Himself, and is the only mediator between man and Himself… We must believe also that in the garden God prayed to Himself, if it were possible, to let the cup pass from Himself, and a thousand other such absurdities.”

There are many things which are hard to understand in the Bible but you can be sure that God never expects us to believe impossibilities.

Over and over again you hear it said that the Gospel is so simple a child can understand it. And I agree. But how can that be the case with the teaching of the trinity? Not only do children not understand it, but our best theologians cannot even explain it. However, the thought that God sent His Son to this earth to die for you and me is easy to comprehend when we believe the simple Bible statement that Jesus is truly the Son of God! Not one of three mysterious beings making up “one God.”

**What is Satan's Counterfeit for the Godhead?**

Satan is the great deceiver and his greatest tool is deception. So Satan counterfeits all things of God to take people away from the truth and lead them into false worship thinking it is from God when it is from Satan. For example. Satan even counterfeits the ministry of Christ. Jesus began His 3.5 year ministry at His baptism when He came out of the water. The beast began its ministry when it came out of the water and ruled for 3.5 symbolic years. See prophecy tables.

God has true prophets while Satan has false prophets. (2 Peter 2:1, Matthew 24:24, 2 Corinthians 11:13-15) God has true teachers while Satan has an abundance of false teachers. Jesus is the light of the world and Satan appears as an angel of light. God has true apostles and Satan has false apostles. God gives the true gift of speaking in tongues which is known languages while Satan has false tongues (see Speaking in Tongues book) that you do not understand and false interpretations that you have no way of verifying. God has a special day of rest and worship which is a sign that it is God we worship, and Satan instituted a counterfeit day that came from sun and Satan worship (see Should Christians Keep the Sabbath book). And of course there is the true Godhead being the Father and Son. But what is Satan's counterfeit for the Godhead? It will be proven that the trinity doctrine also came from sun and Satan worship and the number 666!
So which is the counterfeit? The view which acknowledges there is a real Father and Son just as the Bible literally tells us over a hundred times. Or the three in one God they call a mystery which says they are not a real Father and Son and are just role playing which the Bible never even hints of. How many stop to think that Satan would create a doctrine that would destroy the personality of the Father and Son? Would that doctrine make sense or be absolute nonsense that is coming from our adversary? God is not the author of confusion or mystery doctrines, but Satan is. And not forgetting the implications of calling the Holy Spirit a third co-equal person of God. If you get this wrong you could inadvertently give your adoration to Satan, or even worse, your worship to Satan! This is the worst counterfeit of all that affects the true worship of God and His Son.

**How many Beings in the Godhead?**

There is no denying that there are three in the Godhead but since Scripture reveals the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and Son, then-

**How many literal beings are there?**

*Remember that the trinity doctrine teaches three “co-equal” beings.*

How many beings is our fellowship with? “truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.” 1 John 1:3

How many beings does one deny to be called antichrist? “He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: but he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also.” 1 John 2:22-23

How many beings were being denied by ungodly men and is this consistent with what John said above? “For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.” Jude 1:4

How many beings does John say we need to know to have eternal life? “And this is life eternal, that they might know you the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom you have sent.” John 17:3

How many beings can see the Father including Himself? “Not that anyone has seen the Father, except He [Jesus] who is from God; He has seen the Father.” John 6:46

How many beings can reveal the Father and Son? “No one knows who the Son is except the Father, and no one knows who the Father is except the Son and those to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.” Luke 10:22

How many beings can be hated? “He that hateth me hateth my Father also. If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin: but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father.” John 15:23-24

How many beings involved in our mediation? “For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” 1 Timothy 2:5

How many beings on and by the throne all throughout Revelation? “And cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb.” Revelation 7:10
How many beings involved in creation? “And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ.” Ephesians 3:9

How many beings do we honour? “That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which has sent him.” John 5:23

How many beings does Paul send greetings from in every letter he wrote? “Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.” Romans 1:7, 1 Corinthians 1:3, 2 Corinthians 1:2, Galatians 1:3, Ephesians 1:2, Philippians 1:2, Colossians 1:2, 1 Thessalonians 1:1, 2 Thessalonians 1:2, 1 Timothy 1:2, 2 Timothy 1:2, Titus 1:4, Philemon 1:3

So how many beings are in the Godhead? “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 Corinthians 8:6

The following two verses are used by Trinitarians to try and prove that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one God. But how many beings are described in both verses? Two! According to the trinity doctrine, the first verse should have said, “he who has seen me has seen the Father and the Holy Spirit.” And the second should have said, “I and my Father and the Holy Spirit are one.” But no, there are always only two beings revealed all throughout Scripture.

How many beings? “Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet have you not known me, Philip? he that has seen me has seen the Father; and how sayest you then, Show us the Father?” John 14:9

How many beings? “I and my Father are one.” John 10:30

For Adventists: How many beings are to be exalted? “The Father and the Son alone are to be exalted.” — (E.G. White, Yi, July 7, 1898)

How many beings know what the souls of men have cost? “God and Christ alone know what the souls of men have cost.” — (E.G. White, ST, January 13, 1909)

How many beings in the Counsels of God? “Christ the Word, the Only Begotten of God, was one with the eternal Father,—one in nature, in character, and in purpose,—the only being in all the universe that could enter into all the counsels and purposes of God.” — (E.G. White, GC, 493.1)

How many beings created? “The Father and the Son rested after Their work of Creation.” — (E.G. White, MS 25, p. 3, 1898)

The answer is two every time but according to the trinity doctrine which claims three co-equal beings, it should have been three and yet the Holy Spirit is excluded every time. And if the Holy Spirit was a third being then it would have been called “God the Spirit,” not the “Spirit of God.” Scripture speaks only of honoring and worshiping the Father and Son. Nowhere does it even hint that we are to worship the Holy Spirit. All these verses and more reveal the Holy Spirit is not a literal being. In fact some of these Scriptures prove that it is an outright impossibility for the Holy Spirit to be a literal third being which is a belief that originated and was enforced by death by Emperor Theodosius 348 years after the cross. So while there are three in the Godhead, there are only two literal beings. The Holy Spirit is the mind, power, character and personal presence of God.
For more than 3,000 years, Jews have repeated Deuteronomy 6:4. “Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord.” This sacred passage is called the Shema (pronounced shaw-mah and is named after the Hebrew for its first word) and has been held in high esteem and memorized by devout Jews for centuries. Trinitarians say if the Bible says there is only one God then all three must be one, and yet others say if there is only one God, then how can God be composed of three persons? If Christians could only accept the simple words of Scripture instead of reading into it and trying to make Scripture say something it does not say. This verse is simply saying that there is but one true God the Father of whom are all things!

When Moses said, “The Lord our God is one,” Israel was surrounded with polytheistic nations that worshiped many gods and were constantly involved in petty bickering and rivalry. In Deuteronomy chapter 6 we find Moses exhorts Israel to hear God and to keep His Commandments. And what was the most broken Commandment in Old Testament times? Idolatry! Polytheism is seen rampant all through the Old Testament and hence God constantly rebuking Israel for idolatry. They worshipped many false Gods including the sun and the moon as male and female deities. As a result, every devout Jew recites the Shema twice every day, and still do to this very day to keep up the great ancient national protest against the polytheisms and pantheisms of the heathen world. It is the great utterance of the national faith in One Jehovah!

***** What many fail to recognise is that to the Jews, there is only one God, and the Spirit of God is just that, not a separate being or God. The Jews were God's chosen people and God raised the Jewish nation as non-Trinitarian which has never changed. Trinitarians often try and use the language of the Jews to prove the trinity doctrine and yet the people that this language belongs to were never Trinitarians! So how clear is Scripture that there is but one God? *****

“Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: 32 The scribe said unto him, Well, Master, you have said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but he.” Mark 12:29, 32

“Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.” Romans 3:30

“You believest that there is one God; you doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble.” James 2:19

The following Scriptures also state that there is but one God. But does the Bible include Jesus as being the one God as the trinity doctrine claims, or is there but one God and also one Lord Jesus Christ which means they are separate beings?

“There is one body, and one Spirit, even as you are called in one hope of your calling; One Lord [Jesus], one faith, one baptism, One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.” Ephesians 4:4-6

“For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” 1 Timothy 2:5

“And this is life eternal, that they might know you the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom you have sent.” John 17:3
“For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.” Jude 1:4

“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 Corinthians 8:6

So Paul, John and Jude state that the Father is the only true God while excluding Jesus Christ revealing that He is not the Father and separate from the one true God the Father.

So the only contradiction would be a belief in the trinity.

For Adventists: “The divine nature in the person of Christ was not transformed in human nature and the human nature of the Son of man was not changed into the divine nature, but they were mysteriously blended in the Saviour of men. He was not the Father but in him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily,” — (Ellen G. White, Lt8a-1890, July 7, 1890)

Not only do we have several Scriptures that reveal Jesus is NOT the one true God and is clearly SEPARATE, how does one say Jesus is the one God when NO MAN has seen God? “No man has seen God at any time. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us.” 1 John 4:12. Only Christ has seen the only true God the Father. “Not that anyone has seen the Father, except He [Jesus] who is from God; He has seen the Father.” John 6:46.

And once again we find the Holy Spirit excluded which would have seen God if it was a literal being as claimed by the trinity doctrine.

Since the trinity is not found in the Bible as so many scholars and theologians admit, then those teaching it have to use the following steps to try and prove that it does saying it is implied. Firstly, it is said that the Bible says the Father is God, (True) and that Jesus is called God by His Father, (True) and that the Bible says the Holy Spirit is God, (Not True). More on this later in the document. Secondly, it is then said that since all three are called God, (Not True) and Deuteronomy 6:4 says there is one God, “therefore” all three must be one! Firstly, you will note that this is not a “Thus saith the Lord” and is the type of assumption that allows you to make Scripture say anything you desire. And to assume something as important as who the Father and Son are like this that Scripture does not actually say is outright foolishness. If God wanted us to believe He was a Trinity, He would tell us in clear plain words. Secondly, there is no Scripture that specifically states the Holy Spirit is God so once again this is erroneously assumed. So that would only make a Binity (2), not a Trinity. And thirdly, while the one true God calls His Son God, Paul, John and Jude in the Scriptures given above unmistakably exclude Christ from being the one God. So we are back to there being just the one true God the Father just as Deuteronomy 6:4 states, and just as the Jewish nation believed when they wrote these words, and as they still believe today. True Christianity originated from Judaism, not Catholic Paganism. You cannot argue the doctrine of the trinity from the Old Testament words of the Jews who wrote them when they never believed in it.

Most of the Bible was in fact written by the Jews who never believed the trinity doctrine and never could have. How do you teach the trinity doctrine from the Bible when it is a non-Trinitarian book? Not forgetting that Jesus was a Jew! Most try and explain this away by saying these Jews were non-Messianic as if that means they did not believe in the Messiah.
But that is incorrect as all these Jews believed in the Messiah. They just did not recognize the true Messiah when He came!

We also know the Bible is a non-Trinitarian book as the word Trinity did not exist until about 200 A.D. at which point the idea of the Holy Spirit as a third being and the 3 in 1 still did not exist. The fully developed trinity doctrine did not exist until 381 A.D. So it is impossible for any of the Bible authors to have written about something that did not exist in their lifetime.

In a discussion between Summerbell and Flood on Trinity, p. 38, in regards to the trinity he says, “it is certain that the Jewish church held to no such doctrine. Says Mr. Summerbell, “A friend of mine who was present in a New York synagogue, asked the Rabbi for an explanation of the word 'Elohim'. A Trinitarian clergyman who stood by, replied, 'Why, that has reference to the three persons in the Trinity,' when a Jew stepped forward and said he must not mention that word again, or they would have to compel him to leave the house; for it was not permitted to mention the name of any strange god in the synagogue.”

Strange god indeed. I worship the one true God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ. Not some one in three god that came from sun and Satan worship! “And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.” 1 John 1:3

Does Elohim Prove a Trinity?

Some claim that because the word most often used for God in the Hebrew Bible is Elohim (plural for El), then the one true God must be a trinity. But this is just another deception from those who have been deceived. The word Elohim is used for the true God, false gods, supernatural spirits (angels) and human leaders such as kings and judges. Thus the word Elohim can and is used to refer to a single person, and when it does, linguists call it a “plural intensive” or “plural of majesty” which denotes greatness. The Hebrew people pluralized nouns when they desired to express greatness or majesty as they did with God. So when Elohim is used of the one true God, it is called a “plural of majesty” which denotes the greatness of God.

Also, in the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible (the Septuagint, which Jesus and the apostles quoted) where Elohim refers to the true God, the word Theos is used which is not plural but singular. The same applies to the New Testament where Theos is the Greek equivalent to Elohim and once again it is not plural but singular. For an obvious example. Jesus quotes (Deuteronomy 6:4 in Mark 12:29). The word Theos for God in this verse is singular, not plural. If Elohim was really a plurality of the one true God, then the New Testament writers would have used the plural of Theos also when referring to God. Instead they used the singular form every single time. And yet the plural form is used eight times in the New Testament referring to men or false gods. (John 10:34-35; Acts 7:40, 14:11, 19:26; 1 Corinthians 8:5; Galatians 4:8). I trust that no one will say that God is a trinity in the Hebrew language while being one God in the Greek language.

Note the examples below. The Hebrew morphology codes [ncmpa] used with Elohim below are Noun Common, Masculine, Plural and Absolute, while the Greek morphology codes [NSM] used with Theos are Noun, Nominative, Singular and Masculine. Every occurrence of the word Theos for God is always singular in the Greek Old and New Testaments.

Genesis 1:1 Hebrew — “In the beginning, God [אֱלֹהֵיָם Elohiym 430 [ncmpa] p=Plural] created the heavens and the earth.”
Genesis 1:1 Greek — “In the beginning, God [θεος theos 2316 [N-NSM] s=Singular] made the heavens and the earth.”

And what about Moses, was he a trinity to Pharaoh? Obviously not. “And the LORD said unto Moses, See, I have made you a god [Elohim] to Pharaoh.” Exodus 7:1. Here Elohim refers to one person and so it is a “Plural of Majesty” and therefore denotes greatness. So this verse simply means that God would make Moses appear great in the eyes of Pharaoh. For example. “And the LORD gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians. Moreover the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh’s servants, and in the sight of the people.” Exodus 11:3. The word Elohim in the KJV Bible has also been translated to the words “great” and “mighty” due to its meaning.

Below are some dictionary definitions from scholars concerning the usage of Elohim as a “plural intensive,” or as many prefer, “plural of majesty” (a pluralis excellentice) or “plentitude of might.”

“Elohim is a plural form which is often used in Hebrew to denote plentitude of might.” — (Hertz, The Pentateuch & Haftorahs)

“The form of the word, Elohim, is plural. The Hebrews pluralized nouns to express greatness or majesty.” — (Flanders, Cresson; Introduction to the Bible)

“The Hebrew noun Elohim is plural but the verb is singular, a normal usage in the OT when reference is to the one true God. This use of the plural expresses intensification rather than number and has been called the plural of majesty, or of potentiality.” — (New International Version Study Bible, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985, p. 6)

“This word [elohim], which is generally viewed as the plural of eloah [Strong's #433], is found far more frequently in Scripture than either el or eloah for the true God. The plural ending is usually described as a plural of majesty and not intended as a true plural when used of God. This is seen in the fact that the noun elohim is consistently used with singular verb forms and with adjectives and pronouns in the singular.” — (Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, Vol 1, 1980, p. 44)

“The plural form of Elohim has given rise to much discussion. The fanciful idea that it referred to the trinity 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. Jehovah denotes specifically the one true God, whose people the Jews were, and who made them the guardians of his truth.” — (Smith's Bible Dictionary)

So why does the fanciful idea that Elohim refers to a trinity hardly find a supporter among scholars now? Because the truth is impossible to avoid and you would only end up looking foolish and deceived if you use this to try and prove a lie.

Below is the Brown-Driver-Briggs’ Hebrew Definitions for the word Elohim. When Elohim refers to one that is great, it is called plural intensive which is the singular meaning. But when the noun is actually plural, it translates to plural such as gods. And when the noun is actually singular, it translates to plural intensive - singular meaning such as God who is one but is also great. This is called “plural intensive” which is also called a “plural of majesty.” Highlighting is added.
BDB Definition:
1) (plural)
1a) rulers, judges
1b) divine ones
1c) angels
1d) gods
2) (plural intensive - singular meaning)
2a) god, goddess
2b) godlike one
2c) works or special possessions of God
2d) the (true) God
2e) God

So when you hear the argument that Elohim means God must be a trinity, then understand that there is either deliberate deception or total ignorance and such a person cannot be trusted.

As for Genesis 1:26, the pronouns are plural in the original Hebrew forcing it to be translated, “God said, let US make man in OUR image, after OUR likeness.” Trinitarians point out that Elohim is plural, and the pronouns are plural, so God must be more than one. Ephesians 3:9 says, “God, ... created all things by Jesus Christ:” God in this verse is obviously someone other than Jesus Christ, and Hebrews 1:2 says God created all things by His Son. So who is speaking in Genesis 1:26 and who is He speaking to? God the Father said to His Son, “let us make man in our image.” Christ is “the express image” of the Father, so therefore anyone created in the Father's image is also created in His Son's image.

From this example I hope you can begin to see clearly how the scriptures have to be manipulated (Eisegesis) to make a case for the Trinity doctrine.

The Jesus Only Oneness Doctrine

In the third century, Sabellius who was a Libyan priest living in Rome, taught that God is a single person with different titles known as modalism. The Church recognized Sabellius' ideas as contrary to Bible teaching and he was quickly excommunicated. Yet he still has adherents today in what is commonly known as the “Oneness” or “Jesus Only” doctrine. The Jesus only teaching claims that Jesus is not only the Son, but also the Father and the Holy Spirit. Isaiah 9:6 is quoted as an attempt to support this belief where the Messiah is called “The everlasting Father,” in many Bible translations.

Some ask how could Jesus be the Father but the answer lies in the correct Hebrew translation. Albert Barnes' Notes on the Bible explains, “The Chaldee renders this expression, 'The man abiding forever.' The Vulgate, 'The Father of the future age.' Lowth, 'The Father of the everlasting age.' Literally, it is the Father of eternity.”

Thus in the Hebrew text, the phrase is literally “the Father of Eternity,” and so Isaiah 9:6 is Not saying Christ is the Father but He is the Father of all time to come. Young's Literal Translation and the Darby Bible are two of very few that translated it correctly. “For a Child hath been born to us, A Son hath been given to us, And the princely power is on his shoulder, And He doth call his name Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace.” Isaiah 9:6 YLT and “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name is called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace.” Isaiah 9:6 Darby.
created all things and so in the same manner He is also the Father of creation (Hebrews 1:2; John 1:3; Colossians 1:16-17).

It is also interesting to note that the Greek Septuagint that Jesus and the apostles quoted from does not even contain this phrase. It says, “For a Child is born to us, and a Son is given to us, whose government is upon His shoulder; and His name is called the Messenger of great counsel; for I will bring peace upon the princes, and health to Him.” Isaiah 9:6

And while on this topic, the Bible physically separates the Father and the Son repeatedly. While Christ was on earth, He referred to, “My Father which is in heaven.” Matthew 10:32. He always directed His prayers heavenward to the Father and stated that the Father had His own individual will; “Father, if you be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done.” Luke 22:42. “And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? Which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” Mark 15:34. “Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.” Luke 23:46. Then after He died and rose again, He ascended to “the right hand of God.” Romans 8:34. Only God knows the hour of His son's return. “But of that day and that hour knows no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.” Mark 13:32.

John frequently addresses the Father and Son as separate entities. “Our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.” 1 John 1:3. As did Paul, “For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;” 1 Timothy 2:5 and “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 Corinthians 8:6. And Stephen, “But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up stedfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God,” Acts 7:55. These and others prove the Father has a separate presence.

In fact, Jesus said that He was not the Father more than 80 times. While always remaining one in purpose, Jesus and the Father are clearly separate and distinct persons. And on more than one occasion, the Father spoke to Jesus from heaven. “And suddenly a voice came from heaven, saying, 'This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.'” Matthew 3:17.

***** Either Jesus and the Father are two separate individual persons, or Jesus was an expert ventriloquist and a skitzophrenic. *****

Was Jesus Christ Created?

It is claimed that Arius who was a fourth century Alexandrian priest taught that prior to making anything else, God had a son who was begotten, or created or established. Some claim that back in the dawn of time, God the Father had some form of cosmic intimate relations with the Holy Spirit and Jesus was the product. They reason, “How else can you call Him the Son.” But these concepts are contrary to Scripture in which Jesus is revealed as the Creator and not a created being and has existed long before He created all things. (John 1:1-4)

The Bible states that Christ was not created but created all things. John 1:3 states, “All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made.” This verse has two direct statements being that Jesus pre-existed and created all things and that all things were made through Him, and without Him nothing was made that was made. Did you notice that John said that not only were all things made through Him but also that without Him nothing was made.
Paul also confirms what John wrote, “For by Him all things were created.” **He continues with even greater clarity to make sure that we understand what he means by all things.** “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.” Colossians 1:16

If Jesus created all things then He could not have been one of the created things. Paul adds the following just so there can be no mistake about this fact. “And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.” Colossians 1:17

**Does John 1:1 say Jesus is God?**

John 1:1 says, “(a) In the beginning was the Word, (b) and the Word was with [the] God, (c) and the Word was God.”

The Word was in the beginning, the beginning of what? It has to be the beginning of something. Was it the beginning of this world? Was it the beginning of the creation of the angels? Whichever beginning you place it at, it has to be the beginning of something. Many Trinitarians use this to say that Christ always was, and had no beginning. But that is not what the verse says. God had no beginning! Also the Word with has to mean something. The Word was “with” God. They cannot be the same being, or one could not be with the other. As John 1:2 NIV says, “He [Jesus] was with God in the beginning.”

The proper rendering of John 1:1 into English from the original Koine Greek text continues to be a source of vigorous debate among Bible translators, and especially the phrase the Word was God (c). The first verse of John's Gospel says that God's Son Christ Jesus, being referred to as the Word here, was with God in the beginning, (a+b). John 1:1b does not say that the Messiah is God but was with “the” God. **It is important to note that the word “the” exists in the Greek text but was left out by translators as they thought it read wrongly, but it is actually correct and has purpose.** Here is the original Greek text for (1b).

\[\text{καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν} \]

The phrase “the God” identifies the one true God the Father in this verse and so the word “the” is important. While Jesus is called God in this verse, there is a clear distinction between Him and “the” God whom He was with. The God whom Jesus was with is “the” God the Father. Jesus was not the same God He was with but rather Jesus was God in the sense of being divine just like His Father, as being the Son, He inherits the characteristics of His Father. The Father is God and so His Son is God by nature just as any human by inheritance possesses the very nature and form of humanity.

One can better understand John 1:1 by using the same grammatical structure but with different subjects such as Adam and Eve for example. “In the beginning was the woman, and the woman was with [the] human, and the woman was human.” Adam is “the human” and the woman is Eve, but Eve is also human by nature but Eve is not “the human” in identity. They are two separate persons. Look at this again with this perspective in mind. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with the Deity, and the Word was Deity.” The Word, the Son was with the supreme Deity the Father, and the Word was Deity in nature. But the Son was not “the” Deity, the Son was not “the” Father, yet the Son has the Father's divine nature by inheritance. The Word has the same God quality, the same divine nature and the same God-ness as His Father. Thus Jesus was with God in the beginning, but He is not “the” God the Father but God by inheritance and nature being the Son.
In Hebrews 1:1-9 we note that the speaker is God the Father and that He is addressing His Son and calling Him God. Verse 2 says that Christ was “appointed heir” of all things. An heir of course is someone who receives an inheritance from someone. In this case Christ the Son received an inheritance from His Father. But what did He receive? His name, His authority and His power! In other words, Jesus being the one and only begotten Son of the living God received by virtue of His birth all of the attributes that His Father possessed. Verse 4 says, “Being made so much better than the angels, as he has by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.” Verse 8 says that this more excellent name is the name “God,” which was given by the Father to His Son. “Unto the Son He [God] saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever.” And so this name “He has by inheritance.” It is not a name that was bestowed but a name that was inherited from His Father.

So Christ not only inherited His name but other things as well. Name means authority (Mark 11:9, John 5:43), and it also means character and nature (Exodus 33:18-19, Exodus 34:5-6). The name Adam means human for example. When people have children, they not only inherit the name of their parents but they also inherit the nature of the parents, which of course is human nature. In like manner Jesus inherited the same name as His Father, just as a child inherits the name of the parents, and He also inherits the nature of His Father, which is His divine nature. Christ also inherits His Father’s life. “For as the Father has life in himself; so has he given to the Son to have life in himself.” John 5:26. 

So Christ inherited not only the name of His Father, and the nature of His Father but also the very life of the Father. In other words, Christ inherited the very same attributes and nature as His Father. That is why Christ has a more excellent name than the angels. He has the divine nature of the Father as He comes from the Father and so is equal and fully divine as the Father.

Some seem to favour a belief in Trinitarianism because they feel Jesus should be exactly the same as His Father in every single way in order for Him to be called God. But do your offspring have to be exactly the same as you in age and authority etc. to be 100% human? I would hate to think that for my son to be fully human that he had to be like me in every way.

For Adventists: “Only one being in the universe besides the Father bears the name of God, and that is His Son, Jesus Christ.” — (James White, Coming King, p. 33)

“He was not the Father but in him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily,” — (E.G. White, Lt8a-1890, July 7, 1890)

Does Isaiah 43:11 or Hosea 13:4 Prove Jesus is God?

Since these two verses say that there is no saviour but God and verses like 1 John 4:14 say that Jesus is our Saviour, then the argument is that Jesus must be the one God. But this argument does not hold water and is clutching at straws.

Isaiah 43:11 “I, even I, am the LORD, and apart from me there is no saviour.”

Hosea 13:4 “But I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of Egypt. You shall acknowledge no God but me, no Saviour except me.”
The Hebrew word translated “saviour” in these verses is most commonly translated as “save,” “saved” and is also translated as “deliverer” and “delivered.” In Moses’ day God saved His people from the power of Egypt, and in Isaiah's day He saved them from the power of Assyria. There was no one else who could save and deliverer them from these powers and so they had no other saviour but God as the context clearly reveals.

Albert Barnes' Notes on the Bible explains Isaiah 43, “This chapter ... refers mainly to the promised deliverance from Babylon. The people of God are still contemplated by the prophet as suffering the evils of their long and painful captivity, and his object is to comfort them with the assurances of deliverance.”

And of course Hosea 13:4 refers to when God “saved” and “delivered” His people from the Egyptians.

***** So Jesus is our Saviour of course. But the context of God being the saviour of His people in these verses is about saving them from captivity from Babylon and Egypt. Not saving them from their sin as Christ has done for us. *****

Who is God?

Is God a person? Is He a thing or perhaps some invisible cosmic force? These are important questions to answer and should be easily answered by anyone who understands and knows God. Surprisingly, many Christians are stumped by these questions because they have been taught that God is some ghostly, mysterious vapour that pervades all nature.

Daniel was given a vision that helps us understand God. He wrote, “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: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire.” Daniel 7:9. Someone called “the Ancient of days,” who wears a white garment and has white hair takes a seat on a throne. Shortly thereafter the “Son of man,” (verse 13) comes before Him. The Ancient of days must be God, the Father. So according to the Bible our heavenly Father is a real Person.

John was given a vision of this same event and states, “And I saw in the right hand of him that sat on the throne a book written within and on the backside, sealed with seven seals.” Revelation 5:1. Shortly after John saw this, Jesus Christ approaches the throne and takes the book out of His Father's hand. So again we find that God is a real Person who sits on a throne and has a book in His right hand.

God must be a real Person for Jesus said, “Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.” Matthew 5:8. And Jesus warned, “Take heed that you despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.” Matthew 18:10.

***** We should expect that God is a real Person for we were created in His image and likeness (Genesis 1:26). When we get to heaven we will find that we resemble God. We will not find a three headed monster with six arms or any other strange thing like that. God's outward form is very much like our own. *****

And in Hebrews 1:3 we learn that Jesus Christ is the express image of God's Person. Therefore God must be a person and Jesus Christ is a real Person also.
Paul confirmed this when He wrote, “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.” Philippians 2:5-6. The Greek word that was translated “form” means, “the form by which a person or thing strikes the vision, external appearance.” (Thayer's Greek Lexicon). God has an external appearance and His Son Jesus Christ has the same type of appearance.

Revelation 2:7 and 22:1-2 say that the throne of God is in paradise where the tree of life is and that is where we find God and His Son. God the Person is not omnipresent but He is through His Spirit.

***** Beware of Pantheism which is the belief that the universe and nature is identical with divinity, which basically would make God everything around us. *****

Who is Jesus Christ?

Jesus “asked His disciples, saying, Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am? So they said, Some say John the Baptist, some Elijah, and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets. He said to them, But who do you say that I am? Simon Peter answered and said, You are the Christ, the Son of the living God. Jesus answered and said to him, Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jonah, for flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but My Father who is in heaven.” Matthew 16:13-17 NKJV

***** This passage says that the Father who is in Heaven, revealed to Peter, that Jesus who was on Earth, is none other than His Son. Jesus Christ being the Son of God is so important that John wrote at the close of his gospel, *****

“And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing you might have life through his name.” John 20:30-31

Right after Paul learned the gospel directly from Christ Himself, “straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God.” Acts 9:20. The apostle Peter, who lived with Jesus and heard His messages firsthand said, “And we believe and are sure that you are that Christ, the Son of the living God.” John 6:69. Christ's disciples also exclaimed, “we believe that you came forth from God.” John 16:30. Martha who was a close friend of Jesus and heard many of His teachings said to Him, “Yes, Lord: I believe that you are the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world.” John 11:27. Right after Phillip preached the gospel to the eunuch, “said, If you believe with all thine heart, you may. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.” Acts 8:37. Mark said who Jesus was in the first verse of his Gospel. “The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.” Mark 1:1. Even the demons knew, “they cried out, saying, What have we to do with you, Jesus, you Son of God?” Matthew 8:29.

***** So how did the demons know that Jesus was the Son of God? Because they had met Him before! These demons had once lived in Heaven. When Lucifer was cast out of Heaven he took a third of the angels with him. (Revelation 12:9) So they knew Jesus was the only Son of God! *****

Christ said, “For I say unto you, Among those that are born of women there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist:” Luke 7:28. John the Baptist testified, “And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God.” John 1:34
Of all the witnesses, the greatest is God the Father Himself. Twice He spoke from heaven saying, “This is my beloved Son,” Matthew 3:17; 17:5. Jesus proclaimed, “I am the Son of God.” John 10:36. He said that He is “the only begotten Son of God.” John 3:18. According to the Bible Jesus Christ was begotten, which literally means born, and before anything in the universe was created and long before God sent Him into the world. (John 3:16-17; 18:37; Colossians 1:15; Hebrews 1:1-9 and 1 John 4:9) The Bible does not tell us how Jesus was begotten but God wants us to know that He is His Son who He loves very much. Jesus said, “For as the Father has life in himself; so has he given to the Son to have life in himself.” John 5:26. According to His own testimony, Jesus is the only begotten Son of God and literally received life from His Father. He did not say that He was one of the three members of a trinity who took on the role of the Son of God. He said He was the Son of God!

This is what Paul explained in regards to Christ, “Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature.” Colossians 1:15 KJV. Note that the latter part of this verse in the KJV is a bit misleading and should have been translated as “He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation.” Colossians 1:15 NKJV. Some use this verse to say that Christ Himself was a created being. But such an interpretation is contradicted elsewhere in Scripture such as John 1:1-4 and Colossians 1:16-17. Thus we see that Paul is telling us that Christ was “Begotten First or Born Before all creation” because all of creation was by God through His Son Jesus Christ. “And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ.” Ephesians 3:9

For Adventists: “The dedication of the first-born had its origin in the earliest times. God had promised to give the First-born of heaven to save the sinner.” — (E.G. White, DA, p. 51)

Thayer's Greek Lexicon says, “Christ is called, firstborn of all creation, who came into being through God prior to the entire universe of created things.” Barnes New Testament Notes on Colossians 1:15 says, “the word firstborn - pro-tot-ok'-os - properly means the firstborn child of a father or mother.” Jamieson, Fausset and Brown Commentary says, “Begotten (literally, 'born') before every creature.” Matthew Henry's Commentary states “He was born or begotten before all the creation, before any creature was made;”

The Bible refers to Jesus Christ as “the image of God,” “the image of the invisible God,” and “the express image of his person.” (2 Corinthians 4:4; Colossians 1:15; Hebrews 1:3). An image is never the original but always a likeness or duplication of the original.

***** Christ is the Son of God and therefore the express image of His Father. It would be incorrect to say that the Father is the image of His Son because the Father is the original. In the same manner it would be incorrect to refer to Christ as the true or original God since He is the image of the true God. *****

Since the trinity doctrine teaches three co-eternal beings, then the Bible stating Jesus is the Son of God presents another serious problem for Trinitarians as it contradicts Scripture.

***** If Jesus is born of God as the Bible states more than a hundred times, then Jesus cannot be co-eternal with the Father and so this is yet another problem that Trinitarians have to explain away. *****

This is typically done by a play on words from the Thayer Dictionary definition of the Greek word for “begotten” which is “monogenēs.” It is claimed that “monogenēs” means Christ was
one of a kind rather than the intended meaning of the only begotten son of God. Strong's dictionary says, only born, that is, sole: - only (begotten, child). So it more accurately means only child. Here is every single use of “monogenēs” found in the entire Bible. “only begotten son” 4 times referring to Jesus and 1 time referring to Abraham's only son Isaac, “only begotten of the Father” 1 time, “only son of his mother” 1 time, “only daughter” 1 time and “only child” 1 time.

***** So there is not one single Scripture in the Bible that uses this Greek word that does not refer to an only son, daughter or child that was not begotten. And since the word “son” is prefixed by the word “begotten” more than once when referring to Christ, then it can only mean Jesus is born of God and explains why He is called the Son of God to state the obvious. We also have Paul's testimony in Colossians 1:15 which says Christ was the first born before anything was created. And the Greek word “prōtotokos” used in this verse cannot be abused as it means, first born (usually as noun, literally or figuratively): - firstbegotten (-born). There are also other Scriptures that show Jesus was born of God as you are about to see, not that there should be any doubt.*****

For Adventists: “Christ is “the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature; 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.” The first chapter of Colossians will wonderfully enlighten the mind as to the truth as it is in Jesus.” — (E.G. White, ST, Nov. 15, 1899)

The Bible refers to Christ as God's Son at least 120 times. Forty seven times using the phrase “Son of God.” Regarding the genuineness of Christ's Sonship, He is called “the only begotten” five times, “the firstborn” three times, “the firstbegotten” once and God's “holy child” twice. Four verses say He was “begotten” prior to His incarnation so this cannot be applied to His birth on Earth from Mary as some have chosen to believe. Four verses say that He “proceeded forth from,” “came out from” or “camest forth from” the Father. The evidence on this subject is overwhelming. Christ truly is the literal begotten Son of God who was brought forth from the Father before all creation. The example verses below with the help of the Thayer dictionary reveal that Jesus was born of the Father before the world was, then much later, He came into the world to redeem us as saviour.

Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon
G1831 - To come forth from physically, arise from, to be born of.
G2064 - To come from one place to another.

John 8:42 “Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, you would love me: for I proceeded forth [G1831] and came from God; neither came [G2064] I of myself, but he sent me.”

John 16:27-28 “For the Father himself loveth you, because you have loved me, and have believed that I came out [G1831] from God. 28 I came forth [G1831] from the Father, and am come [G2064] into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.”

John 17:7-8 “Now they have known that all things whatsoever you have given me are of you. 8 For I have given unto them the words which you gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out [G1831] from you, and they have believed that you did send me.”

Trinitarians also claim that Jesus cannot be divine if He was born of God which is just another tactic Satan uses to deter people from the truth.
Divinity does not mean that Christ must be as old as the Father, but simply that He has the attributes of Deity. In any case, the problem is actually the other way around. Jesus is fully divine because He “is” begotten of the Father and hence came from the Father and so He has the same divine nature as His Father. Everything that Christ consists of had no beginning, His divinity, His makeup, His substance had no beginning as it all came from the Father. If you trace Christ back you will have to go through the Father and you will never get to a beginning. But His personality as the Son began when He was brought forth by His Father. 

So if Jesus did not get His divine nature from His Father, then where did He get it from? That would mean that Jesus would have to be a God in His own right just like His Father and so we would have two true gods. This would also break the first Commandment where the one true God the Father says, “You shall have no other gods before me.” Exodus 20:3.

It does not say before us. If Jesus does not have the same divine nature as His Father because He is His Son, then we have a very serious problem.

Another way of trying to explain away the truth is to say that Jesus cannot be born of God because He has no mother. But this is an anthropomorphic thought. Why do Trinitarians try and put “human” limitations on God? He is God! Not human! Just because something does not seem reasonable or logical to us, or just because it does not make sense to us, it does not mean it is not truth. Our heavenly Father said, “For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. 9 For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.” Isaiah 55:8-9. I once heard a Pastor say that if Christ had a beginning that He must be created. Says what Scripture? That is his thought that imposes a limitation on what God can do. God can and did bring forth a Son without having to create Him. Scripture does not lie and those opposing the truth on Christ being begotten of the Father should know all things are possible with God. We must not put human limitations on how or what God can and cannot do based on our human finite knowledge over the omniscience and omnipotence of God.

Why do so many Christians try to explain away literally hundreds of clear words that state Jesus is the Son of God just to uphold a pagan doctrine that does not exist in the Bible? When Satan goes to this much effort you know it has to be extremely important.

**Did Christ Have a Beginning or Just His Personality?**

Consider the following. If we could travel at a septuagintacentillion \((10^{513})\) times the speed of light in any one direction, would we ever find the end of the universe, like perhaps a wall with a sign saying this is the end? And if so, what would be on the other side of that wall? And what existed before Christ created this universe and all things through His Father? Was it nothing? And how long did nothing exist for if that was the case? It would have to be forever! And what about God, when did He begin to exist and who created Him? The answer is that there was never a time He did not exist and hence could never have been created. He is God and has always been and so is without beginning! And what about the Son of God who was born of the same substance of God? The same applies. Since Christ is the same substance of His Father, then everything He consists of had no beginning. So His divinity had no beginning, His makeup; His nature had no beginning as it all came from the Father. So in principle, everything Christ is had no beginning. If you trace Christ back you will have to go through the Father and you will never get to a beginning.
But His personality as the Son of God began when He was brought forth by His Father. *****

This principle is brought out in Scripture many times. So in effect it was only the personality of Christ that had a beginning. These are the mysteries of God and things our mind cannot possibly comprehend.

For Adventists: “The Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of the Father, is truly God in infinity, but not in personality.” — (E.G. White, MS116, December 19, 1905). Waggoner explains in more detail. “Jesus is the only begotten Son of God. He was begotten, not created. He is of the substance of the Father, so that in his very nature he is God; and since this is so “it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell.” Col. 1:19 ... While both are of the same nature, the Father is first in point of time. He is also greater in that he had no beginning, while Christ's personality had a beginning.” — (E.J. Waggoner, ST, April 8, 1889)

Is the Father Greater than Jesus?

Paul in Philippians 2:5-6 states that Jesus is equal with the Father. The Greek word (theotes) for Godhead is found only in Colossians 2:9 and means the divine nature.

So the fullness of the divine nature of God dwells in Christ. So what does Jesus mean when He says my Father is greater than I considering Scripture also says that Jesus is equal with God? Do these first two verses contradict Philippians 2:6?

John 14:28 “You have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If you loved me, you would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I.”

1 Corinthians 11:3 “But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.”

Philippians 2:6 “Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.”

***** The word greater in John 14:28 refers to position and authority in the same way it does with a human father and son as well as a husband and wife. 1 Corinthians 11:3 states that the head of the woman is man. But does this mean the husband is a superior being to his wife? The answer is an obvious no. She is a human being just as the man is and so they are equal in nature. The husband is greater than his wife only by authority. The same applies to a father and son. The father is greater in authority because he was first being the father, and the same applies to our Heavenly Father and His Son. The Father is greater in position in that He was first, but not greater in nature or form as Philippians 2:6 states. *****

For Adventists: “The Father was greater than the Son in that he was first.” — (James White, RH, January 4, 1881). “While both are of the same nature, the Father is first in point of time. He is also greater in that he had no beginning, while Christ's personality had a beginning.” — (E.J. Waggoner, ST, April 8, 1889)

So we observe the same concept of being equal in nature but Christ submitted Himself to the Father as He was greater in that He was first being His Father. We find in these verses the principle of headship and submission established by God as displayed in both marriage and
the Godhead. These principles also reveal that God and Christ are a real Father and Son. As Waggoner, James White and Scripture reveals, Christ came after the Father being the Son.

Adam and Eve (man and woman) in fact is a small scale example of the Father and Son.

Consider 1 Corinthians 11:3 and the following on Biblical headship. “Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing.” Ephesians 5:22-24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biblical Headship</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>Wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor (man)</td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The divine pattern of Biblical headship defined by the Father and Son reveals important principles. For example, in the same way God is the head of Christ, the husband is the head of his wife, and in like manner, Christ is the head of the Church. And while Adam was made from the dust of the earth, Eve came out of Adam from a rib. There is no logical reason for God to do it this way other than to show us that one being can come out of another and still have the same nature. Thus the example is given of how Christ came out of the Father and has His same divine nature.

This also reveals why woman's ordination is wrong. For example, the trinity doctrine claims there are three co-equal beings and that any one of the three could have played the role of the Son and died for us. So the trinity doctrine allows for the changing of roles, and by its principle, any in the above table could change roles. Hence man and woman switching roles in the leadership of the Church is no less error than Christ being subject to the Church, or husbands submitting to their wives, or even for the Son of God being head of His Father. They all break the divine pattern laid down by God. Switching any of the above roles changes the order of authority established by God in the example of the Father and His Son. So the Trinitarian view does not follow the divine pattern and heavenly example and has many problems. For example, if the Holy Spirit was a third being, then where does it fit into God's divine pattern? 2 does not = 3 and neither does 3 = 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father &amp; Son</th>
<th>Adam &amp; Eve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Son is brought forth from the Father (John 8:42; Proverbs 8:22-30)</td>
<td>The Woman is brought forth from Man (Genesis 2:21-23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father is the head of Christ (1 Corinthians 11:3)</td>
<td>Man is the head of Woman (1 Corinthians 11:3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family named after the Father</td>
<td>Family named by Adam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son came out of the Father and so is the same substance of the Father by inheritance (Divine nature)</td>
<td>Eve came out of Adam and so is the same substance of Adam by inheritance (Human nature)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Son is called God by inheritance. Christ is called God but is not the God He came from. Eve is called Human by inheritance. Eve is human but she is not the Human that she came from.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal through relationship (one spirit)</th>
<th>Equal through relationship (one flesh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All things made through Christ (Ephesians 3:9)</td>
<td>All humans come through Eve (Genesis 3:20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father is head of heavenly family</td>
<td>Adam is head of earthly family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When was Jesus Born from the Father?

Some say Jesus is being continually born of God in the days of eternity based on Psalms 2:7 which says, “I will declare the decree: the LORD has said unto me, You are my Son; this day have I begotten you.” But it is prophesying of a future event and does not say that. Acts 13:33 explains, “God has fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he has raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, You are my Son, this day have I begotten you.” In the significant passage of Acts 13:16-41, Paul tells the story of our Lord and Saviour and how he came and died for our sins, but was raised from the dead by His Father in heaven and did not see corruption. Thus this passage declares it was fulfilled in the resurrection of Christ from the dead. He was born from the dead, and God who raised Him demonstrating that He was His Son. This is also supported by Revelation 1:5 “And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead,”

So when does the Bible say Christ was brought forth or born from the Father? Proverbs 8:23-26 says, “I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. 24 When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. 25 Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth: 26 While as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world.”

So Christ was brought forth from the Father before the Earth was created in the days of eternity. And of course if Christ was brought forth than this also confirms His personality has an origin. Note that the Hebrew word “Olam” used for everlasting in verse 23 in the KJV has several possible meanings and has been translated in many different ways according to context and what the translators believed to be correct. It can mean “the vanishing point”, “time out of mind - past or future”, “ancient time” and “beginning of the world” to name a few. Following below are some other translations that demonstrate this point.

Proverbs 8:23 CJB “I was appointed before the world, before the start, before the earth's beginnings.”
Proverbs 8:23 HCSB “I was formed before ancient times, from the beginning, before the earth began.”
Proverbs 8:23 NLT “I was appointed in ages past, at the very first, before the earth began.”
Proverbs 8:23 NLV “I was set apart long ago, from the beginning, before the earth was.”
Proverbs 8:23 RSV “Ages ago I was set up, from the beginning of the earth.”

Who does “wisdom” refer to in Proverbs 8 since some say this does not refer to Christ?
1 Corinthians 1:24, 30 “But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God. 30 But of him are you in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.”

For Adventists: “Through Solomon Christ declared: “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. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when
there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the
hills was I brought forth.” — (E.G. White, ST, August 29, 1900)

Some also have the wrong concept of the word beginning in Scripture. **God of course has no
beginning and the word beginning means the “origin” and source of something.** One
example from the Oxford dictionary for “beginning” is, “The background or origins of a
person or organization.” If Christ was co-eternal with the Father, than like His Father, He
would have no beginning. The Septuagint that Jesus quoted from says, “He established me in
the beginning, before time was, before He made the earth.” So all Bible translations of
Proverbs 8:23 in fact actually say **Christ has an origin (a beginning)!**

Solomon has used Hebrew parallelism in verse 23 which expresses a thought one way, and
then uses a complementary thought to express it another way. So the last two phrases of this
verse are saying the same thing as the first phrase but in a different way. This gives
tremendous clarity on when he is referring to and yet most still get it wrong. Bible writers did
not understand science as we do and measured time by the spheres in the sky that did not
exist until Christ created everything. So Christ was established in the beginning (Genesis 1:1)
before He made the earth, which was before time was since there was nothing to measure
time by yet. **Thus we know that the beginning was when the Earth was made where
there was nothing in existence to measure time by and hence was before time was.** And
so the phrases “from eternity”, “from everlasting”, “before time was”, “the days of
eternity”, “from the beginning” and “before the earth was” all mean the same thing.
Quite simply, before the earth and all things were created.

**Micah 5:2 also informs us that Christ has an origin and was brought forth a long time ago.** It
also uses the Hebrew word “Olam” as Proverbs 8:23 and has the same translation issue. The
phrase “goings forth” in the KJV implies an origin of course and why the NIV used the word
“origins.”

**Micah 5:2 KJV “But you, Bethlehem Ephratah, though you be little among the thousands of
Judah, yet out of you shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings
forth have been from of old, from everlasting.”**

**Micah 5:2 NIV “But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are small among the clans of
Judah, out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel, whose origins are from
of old, from ancient times.”**

Some have mistaken the words “Your throne, O God, is for ever and ever:” in Hebrews 1:8 to
mean His throne has always existed but it uses the same Greek words as Revelation 22:5 in
regards to for ever and ever and both refer to forward in time unless of course we have
always existed.

**The NIV is clearer as it says, “Your throne, O God, will last for ever and ever.”**

**The Alpha and Omega the Beginning and the End**

Some believe that the words Alpha and Omega found in Revelation 1:8, 11; 21:6 and 22:13
means that Christ is without beginning or end. But to begin with, a beginning is the origin of
something and an end is the termination of something. As stated previously, many Christians
have the wrong concept of the word beginning in Scripture. Remember that God had no
beginning and has always existed. The “Alpha” is the “first” letter of the Greek Alphabet and
hence is the “beginning” of the Alphabet, and “Omega” is the “last” letter of the Greek
Alphabet and hence is the “end” of the Alphabet. So these terms are simply referring to the beginning and to the end of something, but what? Let's not make any assumptions and just look at what Scripture does say and what the use of these words meant to the Jews.

**Note that every single verse with a reference to the Alpha and Omega without fail follows a reference to the second coming of Christ and the “end” of the world. This is obviously not a coincidence.** Also, the phrase “which is, and which was, and which is to come” in Revelation 1:8 means Christ exists now, has pre-existed in the past and exists in the future when He comes again. Christ created this world and brought about its beginning, and He will be there in its end at His second coming and will bring about its destruction. **Thus Christ is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end.**

**Note also that** Revelation 21:1-8 and 22:12-14 while speaking of the end immediately reveal that those who keep the Commandments get to eat of the tree of life, and that the sorcerers, whoremongers, murderers, idolaters and liars perish. **Note how Revelation 21:7 references Revelation 2:7, which in turn references Revelation 22:14 in regards to those who get to eat from the tree of life, which are those who keep the Commandments of God.**

So we find a reference to the end of this world and the second coming of Christ before the words in question while directly after these words are two more things that happen directly after the end. That is too much evidence to be coincidental. And since we are at the end of the Bible and dealing with the end, then that is why these verses only refer to the “end.” So if the “end” is referring to the end of this world then the “beginning” obviously refers to be the beginning of this world, which we find in the beginning of the Bible such as Genesis 1:1 and references to the first chapter of Genesis. So everything we have looked at so far reveals that these verses are referring to the second coming of Christ and the end of this world where the faithful who kept the Commandments of God get to eat from the tree of life while others perish.

**Look up for a confirmation Clarke's Commentary on Revelation 1:8** and note how these words were used and understood by the Jews. Did they see these words to mean that Christ has always existed and is God? The answer of course is a resounding NO!!!!!

**If this was the case, if the Jews did see Jesus as being God, this of course would also contradict Proverbs 8 that says Christ was brought forth and so would not be possible anyway.**

So as the Jews understood the meaning of these words, from the beginning and first book of the Bible to the end and last book of the Bible, Jesus encompasses all things. Thus the Jews who actually knew the meaning of these words disagree with the claim made by Trinitarians. The beginning and the end referred to in these passages is the beginning of this created world, while the end is the second coming of Christ and the end of this world, when a New Heaven and Earth are created. **Christ brought about the beginning of this world and He also brings about its end.** Barnes Commentary on Revelation 22:13 also confirms what Scripture reveals in this respect.

Considering these verses in Revelation that state the beginning and the end are referring to the creating and beginning of this world, consider now Genesis 1:1, Proverbs 8:23, John 1:1-3, Ephesians 3:9 and Hebrews 1:10.

*****Thus all references to the beginning in this context is consistent throughout Scripture and further supports the meaning of the words Alpha and Omega. *****
Before Abraham was I am

Another verse brought into question is John 8:58. Note that the words “I am” simply mean “I exist.” Some claim that Christ was declaring Himself to be God in John 8:58 because He used the words “I am.” This is erroneously based on the words “I am” being a reference to Exodus 3:14. From this they draw the conclusion that Christ was alluding to the divine name and thereby telling the Jews that He was God. Trinitarians further try and support their claim by saying this is why the Jews picked up stones to kill Him.

***** But this was due to many things Jesus said to them throughout John chapter 8 that slowly brought them to anger with the final straw being Jesus claiming seniority over Abraham who they said was their father. So Jesus claimed greater authority than the patriarch and hence was also claiming to be greater than them. *****

The phrase “I am” in John 8:58 comes from two Greek words “egō” and “eimi.” The Strong’s Definitions are:

“egō : “I” (only expressed when emphatic): - I, me.”
“eimi: I exist (used only when emphatic): - am, have been, X it is I, was.”

So “I exist”, “I have been” and “I was” are other possible translations which have all been used by various Bible translators for John 8:58 as well as elsewhere in the KJV. For example: ego eimi has been translated to “I was” in Luke 19:22 “You knewest that I was (ego eimi) an austere man,”

These words “I am” formed a phrase that was in very common use by Jews and Christians and in New Testament Scriptures in the first century.

*****It was not the name of any deity, be it the God of the Bible or any other god.*****

It was never understood by Jews or Christians as declaring one to be God. If it were understood that way, you can be certain that the Jews would have never applied it to themselves as they did so frequently! In the following examples Peter, Paul, Gabriel and Zacharias all said, “I am” (ego eimi). But none of them were claiming to be God.

Luke 1:18 “And Zacharias said unto the angel, Whereby shall I know this? for I am (ego eimi) an old man,” Luke 1:19 “And the angel answering said unto him, I am (ego eimi) Gabriel,” John 1:27 “He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe’s latchet I am (ego eimi) not worthy to unloose.” Acts 10:21 “Then Peter went down to the men which were sent unto him from Cornelius; and said, Behold, I am (ego eimi) he whom you seek.” Acts 21:39 “Paul said, I am (ego eimi) a man which am a Jew of Tarsus,” And the blind man also identifies himself by saying, I am. John 9:9 “Some said, This is he: others said, He is like him: but he said, I am (ego eimi) he.” None of the Jews saw this man as declaring himself to be God either.

Below are all the other verses where Jesus said ego eimi in the Gospels.

witness,” John 8:23 “I am from above,” and “I am not of this world,” John 10:7, 9 “I am the
doors,” John 10:11, 14 “I am the good shepherd,” John 11:25 “I am the resurrection,” John 14:6 “I am the way,” John 15:1, 5 “I am the true vine,” John 17:14, 16 “I am not of the
world,” John 18:37 “Thou sayest that I am a king.”

At the end of Christ's ministry when news of Him had spread far and wide, who did the
Jews understand Christ to be saying He was and what was the charge they brought
against Him?

Matthew 26:63 “the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure you by the living God,
that you tell us whether you be the Christ, the Son of God.” Matthew 27:43 “If you be
the Son of God, come down from the cross. 43 He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if
he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God.” Mark 14:61 “Again the high priest asked
him, and said unto him, Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? 62 And Jesus said, I am
[ego eimi]: ” Mark 15:39 “when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he so
cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God.” Luke 22:67, 70 “Are you the Christ? tell us. ... 70 Then said they all, Are you then the Son of God? And
he said unto them, You say that I am [ego eimi].” John 19:7 “The Jews answered him, We
have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.”

Twice in the verses above Jesus responded, “I am” (ego eimi) and yet He was not saying
He was God but confirming that He was the Son of God. The Jews clearly never
understood Jesus to be declaring Himself to be God.

The outrage would have been heard far and wide if He had. There is no record anywhere in
the entire New Testament of anyone even asking Him if He was God. So how could the Jews
have seen Him to be saying He was God in John 8:58?

It is also notable that the words “I AM THAT I AM” in Exodus 3:14 have been variously
understood for centuries. The Vulgate translates it as “I am who am.” The Septuagint to “I am
he who exists.” The Targum of Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum paraphrase the words as
“He who spake, and the world was; who spake, and all things existed.” The original words
literally signify, “I will be what I will be.”

A comparison of Exodus 3:14 and John 8:58 using the Greek Old Testament the Septuagint,
reveals that God said, “I am the being (ego eimi ho ohn),” and Jesus said, “Before Abraham
was, I am (prin abraam genesthai ego eimi).” So the divine name is actually “The being
(ho ohn)”, not “I am (ego eimi).” This is further proven by the end of Exodus 3:14 which
says “The being (ho ohn) has sent me to you.” It does not say “I am (ego eimi) has sent me to
you.” No matter how it is translated into English,

**** “ho ohn” is not the same as “ego eimi.” ****

So there is no connection between “I AM” in Exodus and “I am” in John.

In no way does John 8:58 equate Jesus to being God except by biased inference based on
weak translation and bad grammar.

Below are a few examples of how John 8:58 should have been translated. There are in fact
over forty translations that translated this correctly. See the meaning of I am in John 8:58 for
detailed information and more translations.
The absolute truth is that I was in existence before Abraham was ever born! — (The Living Bible)
“Jesus answered, before Abraham existed, I existed.” — (The Clarified New Testament)
“In truth I tell you,” replied Jesus, “before Abraham existed I was.” — (Twentieth Century New Testament)
“Jesus answered, “The truth is, I existed before Abraham was even born!”” — (New Living Translation)
“Jesus said to them, I am telling the truth: I was alive before Abraham was born!” — (International Bible Translators)

The truth is always there for those who are WILLING to receive it.

Who or What is the Holy Spirit?

Many think a spirit is a ghost in the form of some bodiless phantom that floats around. The American Heritage Dictionary says ghost means “The spirit of a dead person, especially one believed to appear in bodily likeness to living persons or to haunt former habitats.” But the Holy Spirit is certainly not a ghost as just described. Note that πνεῦμα ἁγίου (pneuma hagion) should have always been translated as “Holy Spirit” but sometimes they incorrectly translated it as “Holy Ghost.”

David wrote, “Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?” Psalm 139:7. Here David uses Hebrew parallelism to express himself. This expresses a thought one way, and then uses a complementary thought to express it another way. His first thought is, “Whither shall I go from thy spirit?” And the second which is equivalent to the first says, “whither shall I flee from thy presence?” So David is saying that God's Spirit is equivalent to God's presence.

Thus the Holy Spirit is best described as being God's presence and power.

The trinity doctrine however teaches that the Holy Spirit is another person because the Bible shows the Holy Spirit has mind, will and emotions. But this is unbiblical and faulty logic. The Holy Spirit has a personality because God has a personality. In giving us His Spirit God gives us Himself and so His Spirit has His mind, will and emotions the same as man.

The book of Job says, “there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.” Job 32:8. A spirit is the part of a person that can be grieved. Daniel explains, “I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body,” Daniel 7:15. A spirit is the part of a person that can perceive or understand things. In Mark's gospel we read, “And immediately when Jesus perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, he said unto them, Why reason you these things in your hearts?” Mark 2:8. A spirit is the part of a person that can be troubled. The king of Babylon had a dream and he told his wise men, “I have dreamed a dream, and my spirit was troubled to know the dream.” Daniel 2:3. So we find that our spirit is our mind, will and emotions.

This does not make our spirit another person.

What would you think if I said, “I know that we have met before, but have you met my spirit? I would like to introduce you to my spirit who is sitting over there on that chair.” You would obviously think I had a twisted concept of what my spirit is. It is not some other person that is
separate and distinct from me. My spirit is who I am and hence is my mind, will and emotions.

The Bible mentions several types of spirits. We find “evil spirit,” “dumb spirit,” “unclean spirit,” “foul spirit,” “humble spirit,” “excellent spirit,” “good spirit,” “broken spirit,” “wounded spirit,” “faithful spirit,” and “haughty spirit” etc. All these spirits are distinguishable by the adjective that describes them such as good, foul and humble etc. We know that God the Father has a spirit (Matthew 10:20) and His Spirit of course could be nothing other than Holy. **The word “Holy” is also an adjective be it in English or Greek. So “Holy Spirit” is not a name but a description of the Spirit of God.**

God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ have different names and titles in the Bible because they are Personal Beings.

If the Holy Spirit is a personal being co-equal with the Father and Son as the trinity doctrine teaches, then why doesn’t it have a personal name also? The “Spirit” is not a name, it is a description of what it is together with “Holy” which is just the adjective that describes God's Spirit. Other terms such as the “Spirit of God” is not a name either but once again a description of what it is. It is the Spirit of God! It is also called the “Spirit of your Father” which also is describing just what it is.

**So if the Holy Spirit was truly a personal being then why no personal name?**

The Bible also calls the Holy Spirit an “it” which is never done in reference to God or Christ. Romans 8:16 KJV says, “The Spirit itself beareth witness.” And Romans 8:26 KJV “the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us.” Why is it appropriate to call the Holy Spirit it but not appropriate to call the Father or Son it? This means the three cannot be co-equal as you never, ever, refer to an individual person as “it.” Not unless you were fooling around or being disrespectful.

***** Modern translations which are done by Trinitarians have changed these words from it to Him or Himself to hide this fact to try and make the Spirit appear as another being. This is not honest. *****

The Greek word “pneuma” for Spirit also means mind. Strong's definition is, a current of air, that is, breath (blast) or a breeze; by analogy or figuratively a spirit, that is, (human) the rational soul, (by implication) vital principle, mental disposition, etc., or (superhuman) an angel, daemon, or (divine) God, Christ's spirit, the Holy spirit: - ghost, life, spirit (-ual, -ually), mind.

Now note below that Paul in Romans 11:34 is quoting Isaiah 40:13. So we know that Paul understood the Spirit of the Lord to also mean the mind of the Lord. And of course the mind of someone is not a different person to them any more than their spirit is and this also includes God as Paul reveals below. So again we find that your spirit is your mind, will and emotions for not only people but God also. The Greek word “pneuma” and equivalent Hebrew word “rûach” are also interchangeably translated as “spirit” or “mind” in various translations and “rûach” is translated as “mind” in the KJV Bible six times.

“Who has known the mind of the Lord? And who has been His counselor, to instruct Him?” Isaiah 40:13 CAB

“Who has directed the Spirit of the LORD, or being his counsellor has taught him?” Isaiah 40:13 KJV
“For who has known the mind of the Lord? Or who has been his counsellor?” Romans 11:34 KJV

****It was not in fact until 381 AD when a newly appointed and baptized archbishop, with little or “no” knowledge of theology, decided that the Spirit of God was a literal separate person. Anyone who disagreed was labelled a foolish madman and heretic and dealt with accordingly! So this Catholic belief flowed on through the dark ages and straight into the Protestant Churches at the Protestant Reformation without being questioned as did the trinity doctrine. Hence it was just assumed to be correct and so they instead justified it by saying that secular dictionaries state a person has mind, will and emotions and various Scriptures show the Holy Spirit does also, and therefore it must be a literal being.*****

But as we have already seen, this unbiblical logic would also mean my spirit within me is also a person, and separate from me.

Would you believe me if I said that a person's spirit is another literal being? After all a person's spirit can be troubled, Daniel 2:3 “...my spirit was troubled...” And a person's spirit can be grieved, Daniel 7:15 “Daniel was grieved in my spirit...” And a person's spirit can speak and pray, 1 Corinthians 14:14 “...my spirit prayeth...” And a person's spirit can rejoice, Luke 1:47 “my spirit has rejoiced...” And a person's spirit can be received by the Lord, Acts 7:59 “...Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.” A person's spirit can also serve, Romans 1:9 “...I serve with my spirit...” And a person's spirit can also rest, 2 Corinthians 2:13 “I had no rest in my spirit...” So we find a person's spirit has a mind, will and emotions. Therefore a person's spirit must be another literal being.

***** Right now you are probably thinking I have lost the plot, and yet this is exactly the same logic that is used to imply that the Holy Spirit is another literal being! *****

Some will respond, “But it is different with God's Spirit.” But not so. Not only does the Bible reveal it is not different but in fact says it is exactly the same with only one exception. Our Spirit is within us but God can send His Spirit anywhere. If the Bible does not say the Holy Spirit is a literal being, then let's not assume it to say something it does not say. So let's honour God and trust what His Word does say instead of assuming or believing our adversaries lies.

And as we have seen in Scripture, God and His Son and all living beings have a spirit which is what gives us all a unique personality with our own mind, will and emotions. So for the “Spirit of God” to be a “literal being” as it is erroneously believed today, then the “Spirit of God” would have to have its “own spirit” and one that is also distinct from the Father and Son. But then we are forced into the belief of the “spirit of the Spirit,” and if the Holy Spirit did not have a spirit of its own as per this belief, then it could not have a separate personality and hence its own mind, will and emotions anyway!

The Spirit of every living being has a personality because our spirit is in fact our personality! So the Holy Spirit has a personality because God has a personality. In giving us His Spirit God gives us Himself. It is not another being and it is not some impersonal force. It is the presence and power of God Himself. It is God's own Spirit having God's own personality. If I could give you my spirit, whose personality would you have? Mine! So God's Spirit has God's personality. The same applies to the fact that the Spirit is divine because God is a divine being. Remember that God is a spirit and yet He is a personal being. “God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.” John 4:24
For Adventists: The Holy Spirit is not some force or another being but God Himself. “In giving us His Spirit, God gives us Himself, making Himself a fountain of divine influences, to give health and life to the world.” — (E.G. White, 7T, p. 273, 1902). “God is a spirit; yet He is a personal being, for man was made in His image.” — (E.G. White, 8T, 263.1, 1904)

***** Notice how Paul compares the spirit of man with the Spirit of God putting the final nail in the coffin of this lie. And of course your thoughts come from your mind and hence are the result of your mind, will and emotions. *****

“For who among men knows the thoughts of a man except the man's spirit within him? In the same way no one knows the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God.” 1 Corinthians 2:11 NIV

Here the spirit of man is likened to the Spirit of God. Just as a man has a spirit, God also has a Spirit in the same manner, and His Spirit is the part of Him associated with His thoughts and emotions the same as a man. Ephesians 4:30 says the Holy Spirit is “the holy Spirit of God” and to grieve not His Spirit. So just as the spirit of man can be grieved so can God's. If I told you that I was grieving in my spirit, would you think my spirit was a separate person? Obviously not. And Paul stated it is no different with God and His Spirit in this respect. God's Spirit belongs to God, just as my spirit belongs to me. So as Paul said, the Spirit of God knows the thoughts of God because it is His Holy Spirit and hence has His mind, will and emotions just like man. And of course Paul also revealed in Romans 11:34 given above that the mind and spirit are correlated. He further shows this relationship in Ephesians 4:23 where he said “be renewed in the spirit of your mind.” This is Biblical exegesis but to say the Holy Spirit has mind, will and emotions so therefore must be a literal and separate person is an unbiblical assumption and eisegesis. Paul in 1 Corinthians 2:11 shows the difference is that man's spirit is within him but does not say this about God's Spirit as God can send His Spirit anywhere. There is also no Scripture that says the Holy Spirit is God.

Notice these examples of how “Holy Spirit” is used in the Bible. Matthew 3:16 “and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him;” And in the parallel verse of Luke 3:22 “And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him,” So these parallel verses show that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God.

And for an even clearer example. Luke 12:11-12 says, “take you no thought how or what thing you shall answer, or what you shall say: for the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what you ought to say.” Note the same account from Matthew and what he called the Holy Spirit. “take no thought how or what you shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what you shall speak. For it is not you that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.” Matthew 10:19-20.

***** Matthew called the Holy Spirit “the Spirit of your Father,” and so is not another being but God's Spirit, and why it is called the Spirit of God. It is not called God the Spirit. His Spirit of course is Holy and why it is also called the Holy Spirit. *****

This is why the Holy Spirit has all the characteristics of the Father because it is His Spirit. Whose Spirit was Jesus anointed with at His baptism? “And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him;” Matthew 3:16. By the power of whose Spirit did Jesus cast out demons? “But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you.” Matthew 12:28. The Apostles did many miracles by the power of whose Spirit just as Jesus did? “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.” Romans 15:19. This unmistakable verse says the Holy Spirit is God's Spirit. “Therefore he who rejects this does not reject man, but God who has also given us His Holy Spirit.” 1 Thessalonians 4:8. Whose Spirit is it that dwells in us? Is it another person or God Himself through His Spirit? “Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he has given us of his Spirit.” 1 John 4:13. There are more than twenty five verses that reveal this simple truth. Here is one more. “And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby you are sealed unto the day of redemption.” Ephesians 4:30

While the Bible uses the term “Spirit Of God,” it never uses the term “God the Spirit” as its meaning is different and totally incorrect. The rules of grammar tell us that the phrase “God the Spirit” means it is a Spirit that is a God, while the “Spirit Of God” means this is the Spirit that belongs to God. As you can see, they both have totally different meanings of which only one can be correct. But which one? It is not a difficult question. The one that is found in the Bible! The other came from the Catholic Church.

***** Phrases like “God the Spirit” or “God the Holy Spirit” are Catholic Trinitarian terms that resulted from Satan through man in 381 AD turning the Spirit of God into God the Spirit. Why? So Satan could step into his creation and receive worship as a deity just as he always desired. *****

Hence these Catholic terms are never found in Scripture because they are literally wrong.

So why does the Bible never use the phrase “God the Spirit?” Because God's Spirit is not a third God! It uses “Spirit Of God” because the Holy Spirit is God's own Spirit.

It is not a difficult concept and no sincere Christian should ever be caught using unbiblical terms like “God the Spirit” that are purposely never used by any Bible author ever! Terms such as “God's Spirit,” the “Spirit of God,” the “Spirit of Christ,” “My Spirit,” “His Spirit,” and the “Holy Spirit” are used to name just a few. Another observation is that the Scriptures never tell us to “pray to” or “worship” the Spirit. Why would the Bible neglect that if the Holy Spirit was a third God of a trinity? We are told to pray “for” the Spirit, but never “to” the Spirit.

***** And the same applies to Christ. Does the Bible call Jesus “God the Son” as Catholics and Trinitarians do or does the Bible call Christ the “Son of God”? *****

Scripture in fact always calls Jesus the “Son of God” and with good reason. Because that is what He is to state the obvious.

If you are using Catholic phrases like “God the Son” or “God the Spirit,” that never originated from Scripture, then you are following the Papal Church, not the inspired words of God.

Some also mention Genesis 1:2 which says “the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters” as if that gives support to the Holy Spirit being a literal being. But does it say a separate person called God the Spirit moved on the face of the waters or does it say God through His Spirit and hence His personal presence moved upon the face of the waters?

It is also worth noting that in the Old Testament that the phrase “Holy Spirit” is used 3 times, “Spirit of God” 14 times and “Spirit of the Lord” 26 times. All these phrases are synonymous
and not one of these 43 verses implies the Holy Spirit is God or an actual separate being but simply the Holy Spirit of God.

***** Jewish scholars examining the references to the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament Scriptures have never defined the Holy Spirit as anything but the presence and power of God. *****

Are the Father and Son One in Spirit?

Paul says in Ephesians 4:4 that there is “one Spirit.” But the Bible speaks about the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ which involves two divine beings. So how then is there only one Spirit? The answer is something the majority miss because most have been indoctrinated with the Catholic idea of the Holy Spirit as another being rather than God's own Spirit.

The Holy Spirit is the mind, power, character and personal presence of the very life of God that the Father sends through His Son to us. This is not a separate person of the Godhead who is being sent, it is the very life of God coming to us through Christ.

Everything Christ received He inherited from His Father including His very own life. “For as the Father has life in himself; so has he given to the Son to have life in himself.” John 5:26. But not only His life but Christ also received of His Fathers Spirit. Thus the Father and Son are one in Spirit, and that one Spirit proceeds from the Father and comes to us through His Son. This is why Paul equates the “Spirit of God” with the “Spirit of Christ” because it is the same one Spirit of God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ. “But you are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.” Romans 8:9

Referring to the Holy Spirit, Paul says that Christ is that Spirit. “Now the Lord [Jesus] is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.” 2 Corinthians 3:17. So when you receive the Spirit of God, you also receive the Spirit of His Son into your heart also. “God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.” Galatians 4:6. Thus through the Spirit both the Father and Son come and make their abode in you. “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 14:23. And being one in Spirit gives us access to the Father through Christ our mediator. Ephesians 2:18 “For through him [Christ] we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.” So it is by the Holy Spirit that Christ lives in us. Galatians 2:20 “I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.” And “I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ,” Philippians 1:19. “Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.” 1 Peter 1:11

Christ has always partaken of the Spirit of God since He was begotten of the Father before anything they created. When Jesus was incarnated on earth 2000 years ago, He was full of that same Holy Spirit of God from His conception, and throughout His earthly sojourn as the Son of Man. After His resurrection and ascension to Heaven, He sent “another comforter” to earth to empower His people till the end of time, which was Himself in Spirit form. Only the Father and the Son can be present outside of their bodies throughout the Universe. Their Holy Spirit is the way in which they are omnipresent while also being physically present in the Heavenly Sanctuary as we speak.
This is where the nascent Catholics made their mistakes when coming up with the incomprehensible doctrine of the trinity versus the plain word of God. In creating the trinity they philosophized when they should have left it alone as it is totally un-Scriptural.

“And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. 46 Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. 47 The first man is of the earth, earthly: the second man is the Lord from heaven.” 1 Corinthians 15:45-47

Here the Apostle Paul is talking about the two Adams. The first Adam was the first created man on earth who sinned by eating the forbidden fruit. The second (last) Adam is Christ who came to redeem us. Notice that Paul says that this One was made “a quickening spirit.” This is the other important thing about Christ. Not just His earthly human life, but also what happened after. In verse 46 Paul clarifies that the natural comes first and then the spiritual. This is exactly what happened with Jesus. He came to earth first as a man, ministered, ascended to Heaven, and then at Pentecost He came back in Spirit with mighty power! Both times was to instruct and sanctify His people, and that is the same purpose today. So the Holy Spirit of God the Father is now also the Spirit of Christ which point Paul confirms in verse 47. So “the Lord from Heaven” in verse 47 is the “quickening Spirit” of verse 45.

It cannot be any clearer. The Spirit of God and of Christ is “the third person of the Godhead” as a spiritual manifestation and hence another form. It is different to the way we think of the word “person” when applied to human beings which is a spirit in a body.

*****This is because these divine beings can do something we cannot. They can leave their bodies in one place (the Heavenly Sanctuary), and also be omnipresent in every place throughout the universe at the same time by their Holy Spirit. In this way they can also enter the hearts of a repentant believer.*****

*****The teachings of the Catholic trinity (three persons in one god) are now rampant in most Churches which destroy this wonderful truth of who the Holy Spirit really is by the introduction of a totally different third being which does not actually exist! And as if that were not bad enough, Satan receives the unwitting worship of millions upon millions of people through this serious deception that he has inspired man to create.*****

The Holy Spirit is the very life of God coming from the Father and shared by the Son. It is the personal presence of the Father and the Son given to us. Those who partake of this divine presence and power within, (the life of God), and allow Him to transform their characters into the likeness of His Son will someday personally meet this wondrous God of love.

How do Trinitarians Claim the Holy Spirit is God?

The trinity doctrine teaches the Father is God, Jesus is God and the Holy Spirit is God and yet there are not three gods but one God. So when the challenge first arose to prove the Holy Spirit is God, Trinitarians had to find something in Scripture to support this erroneous belief. The following is eisegesis and the best they could find. “But Peter said, Ananias, why has Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Spirit, and to keep back part of the price of the land? 4 Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine
own power? why have you conceived this thing in thine heart? you have not lied unto men, but unto God.” Acts 5:3-4. Since verse three says Ananias lied to the Holy Spirit and verse four says he had not lied to man but to God, it is claimed that the Holy Spirit is God. But this is eisegesis and red fire engine logic. That is, fire engines are red, my car is red, therefore my car is a fire engine!

*****Peter said to lie to the Spirit of God is to lie to God Himself because it is His Spirit. *****

My Spirit belongs to me in the same way as Paul revealed earlier. So if you lie to my spirit you have lied to me, not someone else! God's spirit revealed to Peter that Ananias had lied and so he had not lied to man but to God as it was God Himself through His spirit that revealed the lie. As Paul said, “no one knows the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God.” 1 Corinthians 2:11 NIV

For Adventists: Ananias lied to God's Spirit which was in Peter which is the same as lying to God because His Spirit is Himself. “In giving us His Spirit, God gives us Himself,” — (E.G. White, 7T, p. 273, 1902)

Does the Bible Prove the Holy Spirit Cannot be a Literal Being?

Since the trinity doctrine claims the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are literally three co-equal beings, then 1 John 1:3 should have said “truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit,” but not so. Why? Because the Holy Spirit is not a literal being but the Spirit of God. So our fellowship is only with the Father and Son who are literal beings. The same applies to 1 John 2:22-23. John says nothing about denying the Holy Spirit for the same reason.

Who did John say we need to know to have eternal life? “And this is life eternal, that they might know you the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom you have sent.” John 17:3. We need to “have” the Holy Spirit for eternal life but we do not need to “know” the Holy Spirit for eternal life. Why would we not need to know the Holy Spirit to have eternal life if it were a co-equal being? Because the Holy Spirit is not God the Spirit but the Spirit of God.

If the Holy Spirit was a literal co-equal being then it would have also seen the Father but once again scripture says no. “Not that anyone has seen the Father, except He [Jesus] who is from God; He has seen the Father.” John 6:46. How can the Holy Spirit be a literal being and yet never have seen the Father? Because it is not a literal being but God's own Spirit.

Luke wrote that no one knows who the Father and Son are except each other. This makes it literally impossible for the Holy Spirit to be a literal being who would have to be able to reveal the Father and Son if it was but not so. “All things have been committed to me by my Father. No one knows who the Son is except the Father, and no one knows who the Father is except the Son and those to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.” Luke 10:22
Paul wrote “there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” 1 Timothy 2:5. But how can Christ be our Mediator when He has returned to the Father? Because the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God and it is also the Spirit of Christ and why Jesus could say “lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” Matthew 28:20.

*****If the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ we have no problem, but if the Holy Spirit was another being we would have two mediators between God and man which would then make Scripture a lie. Therefore, the Holy Spirit cannot be a literal being.*****

Ask yourself these simple questions. Why did the Father never speak to the Holy Spirit? Why did Jesus never speak to the Holy Spirit? Why did the Holy Spirit never speak to Jesus? Why did the Holy Spirit never speak to the Father? Yet the Father spoke to His Son over and over again all throughout the Bible, and Jesus spoke to His Father over and over again all throughout the Bible. So how can the Holy Spirit be a literal co-equal being?

And what an inexplicable oversight for Paul if the Spirit were indeed a literal being co-equal with the Father and Son because Paul excluded the Holy Spirit in every one of his greetings in every single letter he wrote!

“Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.” Romans 1:7
“Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.” 1 Corinthians 1:3
“Grace be to you and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.” 2 Corinthians 1:2
“Grace be to you and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ,” Galatians 1:3
“Grace be to you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.” Ephesians 1:2
“Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.” Philippians 1:2
“Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.” Colossians 1:2
“Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.” 1 Thessalonians 1:1
“Grace unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.” 2 Thessalonians 1:2
“Grace, mercy, and peace, from God our Father and Jesus Christ our Lord.” 1 Timothy 1:2
“Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.” 2 Timothy 1:2
“Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour.” Titus 1:4
“Grace to you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.” Philemon 1:3

The Holy Spirit cannot be a literal co-equal being if Paul excluded it. Not once in the greetings of Paul or the other apostles is the Holy Spirit uplifted or praised. It is always just God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ. Why is that? Because “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 Corinthians 8:6. That's why! So the Bible states the following: There are only two beings, our fellowship is not with the Holy Spirit, just the Father and Son, we only need to know the Father and Son for eternal life, the Holy Spirit has not seen the Father, only the Son, the Holy Spirit cannot reveal the Father and Son, only they can. Our
one mediator is the Holy Spirit of Christ and not the Holy Spirit as another being, the Holy Spirit is never spoken to by the Father and Son and they are never spoken to by the Holy Spirit, we are never told to pray to or worship the Holy Spirit and the Holy Spirit is never included in any salutations. And yet we are expected to believe that the Holy Spirit is a third co-equal being! Clearly that is just not possible and is a deception from Satan. There are many more Scriptures that reveal the same thing over and over.

*****The idea of the Holy Spirit being a literal being was an invention of man through Satan in 381 AD that Scripture reveals is serious error.*****

Who is the Comforter?

This is another area of great confusion as some believe that the Comforter is the Holy Spirit while others say it is Christ. Both can be considered correct providing you understand the Holy Spirit is not a literal being. A lot of confusion also comes from a misunderstanding of John 14:26 from the King James Bible which says, “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 note the words “*which is*” are italicized in the KJV because they were added by the translators and do not exist in the original Greek manuscripts. The Modern King James Bible reads, “But the Comforter, the Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in My name,” These two added words are missing in almost every translation including the NKJV Bible.

These added words along with the Comforter in John 14:16 being referred to as a “he” have mislead many into believing the Holy Spirit is a literal being. But this is ignorance on what is known as grammatical gender. The word “he” is not in the original Greek text and is added by the translators to make it readable in English. The only reason the pronoun “he” is used is because the grammatical gender for the word “Comforter” is “masculine” in the Greek and would remain masculine even if the Comforter was a female. Many fail to understand that it is grammatical gender and not sexual gender. In any case, the grammatical gender for the word “Spirit” is actually “neuter” in the Greek and not masculine. Not only that, but the grammatical gender for Holy “Spirit” can be masculine, feminine or neuter depending on which language it was written in, which alone reveals the error and misunderstanding. For instance, in Hebrew the Holy “Spirit” would be feminine. Languages derived from Latin such as Greek, Spanish, French etc. have a specific gender for every noun that does not change. So every object be it animate or inanimate is designated as masculine, feminine or neuter for each of these languages. But the gender is often unrelated to whether the item is actually masculine or feminine. See is the Holy Spirit a he or it for detail.

The Greek word for Comforter is “paraklētos” which Strong's dictionary says means, “intercessor, advocate, comforter.” The Thayer dictionary used these words, “one who pleads another's cause before a judge, a pleader, counsel for defense, legal assistant, an advocate.” So who is our advocate and comforter? Who is the only mediator between God and man? There can be no mistake or confusion as John says, “My little children, these things write I unto you, that you sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate [paraklētos] with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.” 1 John 2:1. Parentheses are added.

*****Note that the word for advocate here is exactly the same Greek word [paraklētos] used in John 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7 for Comforter but has been translated here as advocate. So John says our advocate and comforter is “Jesus Christ the righteous.” And
who does Timothy say our mediator and hence advocate is between God and man?****

“For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;” 1 Timothy 2:5

John 14:16 “he shall give you another Comforter [paraklētos], that he may abide with you for ever;”
John 14:26 “the Comforter [paraklētos], which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name;”
John 15:26 “when the Comforter [paraklētos] is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father.”
John 16:7 “for if I go not away, the Comforter [paraklētos] will not come unto you;”
1 John 2:1 “if any man sin, we have an advocate [paraklētos] with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous;”

John 14:16-23 below tells us five times who the Comforter is, but the moment Christ says “another Comforter,” most become blind to the fact He is referring to Himself despite His clear words that follow. The Greek word for another is “allos,” which means another of the exact same kind and hence means another as the same kind as Christ. Jesus was present with His disciples in physical form but after the cross He comes back in another form, that is, by His Spirit. If the Comforter was a different person then John would have used the word “heteros” meaning different. Most also fail to notice that Jesus often speaks of Himself in the third person as He has in this passage. See John 17:1-4 for another such example.

Note Vines dictionary and that the word Comforter to the Hebrew people meant Messiah. “<A-5,Noun,3875,parakletos> 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 1John 2:1, of the Lord Jesus. In the widest sense, it signifies a “succorer, comforter.” Christ was this to His disciples, by the implication of His word “another (allos, “another of the same sort,” not heteros, “different”) Comforter,” when speaking of the Holy Spirit, John 14:16. In John 14:26; John 15:26; John 16:7 He calls Him “the Comforter.” “Comforter” or “Consoler” corresponds to the name “Menahem,” given by the Hebrews to the Messiah.” — (W.E. Vine's M.A., Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words, 1940)

In this passage below (John 14:16-23) Jesus tells His disciples that the Comforter is someone that the world cannot receive (verse 17) because the world does not know Him, but they know Him because He is dwelling with them. So who is it that is dwelling with them? Jesus! And in verse 18 Jesus says that He will not leave them comfortless and that “He” will come to them. Thus Jesus states that it is Himself who will be their Comforter. In verse 22 Judas reveals who it is that the world cannot receive (verse 17), and that in a while the world will see Him no more (verse 19), as Jesus is returning to the Father shortly after His resurrection. Hence the Comforter is someone whom the world cannot receive because the world doesn't know Him but they do. So who do they know that will manifest Himself to them and not unto the world? The green highlighted text has the answer. The Comforter is referred to as the Spirit of truth in verse 17 which is the first time Christ reveals He is referring to Himself in this passage. Ten verses earlier Jesus says, “I am the truth” (verse 6) and by His Spirit He is the “Spirit of truth” (verse 17). John 14:6, 1 John 4:6. Who is more qualified to comfort us other
than someone who has lived and suffered as one of us and knows what it is like to be tempted?

John 14:6, “Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me. John 16-23 And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another [allos] Comforter [paraklētos], that he may abide with you for ever; 17 Even the Spirit of truth: whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knows him: but you know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. 18 I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you. 19 Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but you see me: because I live, you shall live also. 20 At that day you shall know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you. 21 He that has 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. 22 Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot, Lord, how is it that you will manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world? 23 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.” Parentheses are added.

In John 16:7 Jesus says, “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.”

****So how is it that the Comforter who was yet to be sent to them was dwelling with them in John 14? In John 7:39 we find “But this spoke he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.” If the Holy Spirit was another being as per the trinity doctrine, it would not be dependent on Christ returning to the Father and being glorified before it could be given. The Holy Spirit could not be given until Christ was glorified as this is how Christ returns as another, that is, by His Holy Spirit. Did you notice the underlined section of John 14:23 above? It says “we will come unto him and make our abode with him.” That is, both the Father and the Son through the Holy Spirit. This is not a separate person of the Godhead who is being sent, it is the very life of God coming to us through His Son Jesus Christ. How precious is it to have both the Father and Son? Those who do not understand this are missing out on such a blessing. And if you believe the Holy Spirit is another being, which was an invention of man from Satan, then what spirit would you have?*****

For Adventists: “By the Spirit the Father and the Son will come and make their abode with you.” — (E.G. White, BEcho, January 15, 1893)

That brings us back to John 14:26. Many believe that the Holy Spirit is the Comforter as a literal being separate from Christ because they misunderstand John 14:26 and who the Spirit truly is. The added words “which is” in the KJV tend to be misleading, and while these words can be used, this passage would be less likely misunderstood if the word “through” was used instead. This would be consistent with all other Scripture and without the seemingly apparent contradiction with the other verses that reveal that Christ is our Comforter, advocate and mediator. It would read without misunderstanding as,

“But the Comforter, through 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 in John 14:16-23 Jesus explains to His disciples that He will be soon be leaving them but He will not leave them comfortless and that He will come to them. Judas asks how Jesus is
going to come back to them but not to the world. They did not understand that He would come back to them by His Holy Spirit. And not only Him as Christ says but those who love Him and keep His Commandments will have both the Father and Himself make their abode in them by the Holy Spirit.

*****Thus Jesus returns to the Father but comes back again through the Holy Spirit as another of the same kind.*****

Christ explains this to them so that they will not be troubled or afraid, and so that when it happens they will believe. Below is the continuation of this passage and you will note that Christ once again says that He is the one coming back to them.

John 14:27-29 “Do not let your hearts be troubled and do not be afraid. 28 You heard me say, 'I am going away and I am coming back to you.'... 29 I have told you now before it happens, so that when it does happen you will believe.” Jesus not only said He is coming back but also said, “lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” Matthew 28:20. What wonderful words of Comfort. Jesus said, do not be troubled or afraid as though I am going away, I am going to come back to you and I am going to be with you even unto the end of the world. But how is Christ going to be with us and Comforting us unto the end of the world when He has ascended to His Father where He is going to remain? By coming back as another of the same kind. That is, through the Holy Spirit as our Comforter!

For Adventists: “Jesus was about to be removed from his disciples; but he assured them that although he should ascend to his Father, his Spirit and influence would be with them always, and with their successors even unto the end of the world.” — (E.G. White, 3SP, 238.1)

“Cumbered with humanity, Christ could not be in every place personally; therefore it was altogether for their advantage that He should leave them, go to His father, and send the Holy Spirit to be His successor on earth. The Holy Spirit is Himself divested of the personality of humanity and independent thereof. He would represent Himself as present in all places by His Holy Spirit, as the Omnipresent.” — (E.G. White, 14MR, 23.3, 1895)

“This refers to the omnipresence of the Spirit of Christ, called the Comforter.” — (E.G. White, 14MR, 179.2, 1891)

Note how many times many Christians miss Jesus saying that He will be our Comforter because they misunderstand what Jesus meant when he said another Comforter.

1. John 14:17 “Even the Spirit of truth [Jesus is the truth and by His Spirit He is the Spirit of truth]; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knows him: but you know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.”

2. John 14:18 “I [Jesus] will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you.”

3. John 14:22 “Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot, Lord, how is it that you [Jesus] will manifest thyself unto us [as the Comforter], and not unto the world?”

4. John 14:23 “If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we [Jesus and His Father] will come unto him, and make our abode with him.”

5. John 14:28 “You heard me say, I [Jesus] am going away and I am coming back to you [as the Comforter].”

*****Christ could not be in all places and with everyone at the same time in human form, but through the Spirit of God and of Christ, He could be with everyone as their
Comforter. So Christ comes as our Comforter through the Holy Spirit, which He sends to us, and when we receive the Holy Spirit, we are receiving both the Spirit of the Father, and through the spirit, His Son also. Romans 8:9-11.*****

Who do you worship?

Jesus included Himself when He said, “we know what we worship” John 4:22. He then explained who He worships. He said, “the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.” Jesus worships His Father along with all “true worshipers” John 4:23. Jesus worships His Father because His Father is His God.

Jesus said to Mary after His resurrection, “Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.” John 20:17. Jesus told His disciples that His God is the same God as their God. He also explained who this God is being the Father. He told the disciples that His Father is also our Father, and His God is also our God.

Many Churches are clearly confused. You often hear, “We thank you O Father for coming down and dying for our sins.” And then you hear people closing the prayer “in Jesus name.”

Does it make sense to pray to Jesus in His own name? He is our mediator, and He told us to pray to the Father in Jesus' name (Luke 11:2; John 16:23; Ephesians 5:20).

You also hear people pray to the Father and end with, “in your name.”

The Bible clearly says, “For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” 1 Timothy 2:5.

We are to pray to God, the Father, in the name of our Mediator Christ Jesus.

*****It would appear that people who confuse the Biblical distinctions and positions of the Father and Son do not know who they are worshiping and hence are not worshiping in spirit and in truth.*****

Early Church Error

Probably the most widely held Christian view of God is the trinity doctrine which has its origins in the Church of Rome and the council of Nicea and even as far back as Babylon and Sun Worship (This will be demonstrated further on in this and later chapters). This belief teaches that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God and yet there are not three gods but one God. But the question remains: Is this view found in Scripture?

The most commonly accessed Encyclopedia on the Internet is Wikipedia. So a “consensus of Modern exegetes” tell us that both the Old and New Testaments do not explicitly contain the doctrine of the trinity. It came into Christendom from another source outside of Scripture. The Encyclopedia Britannica basically says the same thing as the Wikipedia. Both tell us that the idea of the trinity came after Scripture and from sources outside of Scripture. The Oxford Companion to the Bible says it “cannot be clearly detected within the confines of the canon”? That is a nice way of saying that the Bible does not teach the doctrine of trinity. The Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia and the Encarta Encyclopedia says the doctrine of the trinity is not explicitly taught in the New Testament. Can we base our faith purely on
inference alone? If it is a fundamental doctrine in Christianity, it should surely have enough evidence to have become a doctrine! Another two from Encyclopaedia of Religion and the New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. If the Bible does not teach this doctrine then where did it come from? And last the International Standard Bible Dictionary. I will leave the reader to define the word “allusion.”

*****Getting to the source of the trinity doctrine. Let’s go to the authority which states that it is the source of the idea being the Roman Catholic Church and see if their definition has any Biblical basis. This Roman Catholic source is clear as to the origin of the trinity doctrine. Scripture does not present the idea of the trinity doctrine. It came after the canon of Scripture was closed and was developed in the 4th and 5th centuries.*****

The New Catholic Encyclopedia puts it this way. So do we have one God in three parts, or three gods in one? The Catholic Encyclopedia clears up the matter for us in a masterpiece of theological close reasoning.

“In the unity of the Godhead there are three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, these Three Persons being truly distinct one from another. Thus, in the words of the Athanasian Creed: ‘the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and yet there are not three Gods but one God.’”

*****The reality is that both the Trinity doctrine and Sunday worship have their origins in paganism and the Catholic Church. When the Protestant Reformation began, all the new Churches continued with Sunday worship and the Trinity doctrine in ignorance. There is a growing count of over 550 Sabbath keeping denominations now but most are still trapped in Trinitarianism. So we have two closely related counterfeit doctrines from Satan through the Catholic Church that originated in Babylon Sun Worship.*****

“As fundamental errors, we might class with this counterfeit sabbath other errors which Protestants have brought away from the Catholic church, such as sprinkling for baptism, the trinity, the consciousness of the dead and eternal life in misery.” — (James White, Review and Herald, September 12, 1854, p. 36)

The question was asked in the Catholic Catechism, “What is Sunday...” The answer was, “It is a day dedicated by the Apostles to the honor of the most holy Trinity.” — (Review and Herald, vol. 5, no. 24, p. 86).

An interesting statement considering “Sunday worship” and the “Trinity doctrine” both came from sun and Satan worship in Babylon, and they were both brought into Christendom by the Catholic Church whom God calls Babylon! Compare the two quotes below from the Catholic Church who say if you are going to follow the Bible than you should not be following either.

“Most Christians assume that Sunday is the biblically approved day of worship. The Catholic Church protests that it transferred Christian worship from the biblical Sabbath (Saturday) to Sunday, and that to try to argue that the change was made in the Bible is both dishonest and a denial of Catholic authority. If Protestantism wants to base its teachings only on the Bible, it should worship on Saturday.” — (Rome’s Challenge, www.immaculateheart.com/maryonline, December 2003)
“Our opponents sometimes claim that no belief should be held dogmatically which is not explicitly stated in scripture ... But the Protestant Churches have themselves accepted such dogmas, as the Trinity, for which there is no such precise authority in the Gospels,” — (Assumption of Mary, Life magazine, October 30, 1950, p. 51)

Names for the Godhead Compared

Below are some phrases found in Scripture for the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit compared to Trinitarian phrases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jesus Christ</th>
<th>The Holy Spirit</th>
<th>Trinitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The Almighty”</td>
<td>“Son of God” 48 times.</td>
<td>“Spirit of God” 26 times</td>
<td>“God the Holy Spirit” 0 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 times</td>
<td>“only begotten” 6 times</td>
<td>“God's Spirit” 9 times</td>
<td>“God the Spirit” 0 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“God the Father”</td>
<td>13 times</td>
<td>“Holy Spirit” 7 times</td>
<td>“God the Son” 0 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 times</td>
<td>His “firstborn” 4 times</td>
<td>“Spirit of Christ” 2 times</td>
<td>“God in three persons” 0 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Mighty God”</td>
<td>“Comforter” 4 times</td>
<td>“Thy spirit” 4 times</td>
<td>“Trinity” 0 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 times</td>
<td>“Mediator” 4 times</td>
<td>“Spirit of Christ” 2 times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Highest”</td>
<td>God's “holy child” 2 times</td>
<td>“The Holy Spirit of God” 1 time</td>
<td>“Triune God” 0 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 times</td>
<td>“The firstbegotten” 1 time</td>
<td>“Spirit of your Father” 1 time</td>
<td>“Co-equal” 0 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ancient of days”</td>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>“Spirit of Jesus Christ” 1 time</td>
<td>“Co-eternal” 0 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>“The Holy thing” 1 time</td>
<td>“Spirit of His Son” 1 time</td>
<td>“Consubstantial” 0 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Almighty God”</td>
<td>“Advocate” 1 time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The only true God”</td>
<td>1 time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is One Unity or Quantity?

*****Some of, even a lot the confusion regarding the number of beings in the Godhead comes from a misunderstanding of the word “one.” Simply put, “one” in the Bible does not always mean numerical quantity. Depending on the Scripture, “one” often means unity.*****

We see this principle established very early in Scripture. “Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one flesh.” Genesis 2:24. “One flesh” here does not mean that a married couple melt into one human after their wedding, but rather they are to be united into one family. Romans 12:5 says, “So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.”

*****So does that make us all one single Christian? You would have to say yes if you follow the Trinitarian formula!*****
In John 10:30 we find Christ proclaimed, “I and my Father are one,” which has caused many to think that Jesus was saying that He and His Father are the same person. The Jewish leaders were outraged by His statement and sought to execute Him because they thought Jesus was claiming equality with 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. Three verses on we find Jesus clarifies and said that His claim was to be the Son of God. “Say you of him, whom the Father has sanctified, and sent into the world, You blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?” John 10:36

Hence Jesus did not mean He was the same person as He clarified and because the Father is a distinct person from the Son, and the Son a distinct person from the Father. As Gill's Commentary on John 10:30 states, this is further shown from the use of the verb plural, “I and my Father” εσμεν, “we are one.” In any case, we do not have to speculate what Jesus meant when He said He and His Father are one, because the words of Christ further on in John reveal exactly what He meant. Christ meant one in unity as He also prayed that the apostles would be one in the same way He and His Father are one, “And the glory which You gave Me I have given them, that they may be one just as We are one:” John 17:22 and “Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom you have given me, that they may be one, as we are.” John 17:11

*****According to the teaching on the trinity, John 10:30 should have said, “I and my Father and the Holy Spirit are one.” But not so. There are only two literal beings in the Godhead.*****

He that has Seen Me has Seen the Father

What did Jesus mean in John 14:9 when He said to Philip “he that has seen me has seen the Father”? Some use this to say that Jesus is the Father. Below are comments from two theologians revealing the truth on this flawed argument.

John Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible on John 14:9 says:

He that hath seen me; not with the eyes of his body, but with the eyes of his understanding; he that has beheld the perfections of the Godhead in me: 

Hath seen the Father; the perfections which are in him also; for the same that are in me are in him, and the same that are in him are in me: I am the very IMAGE of him, and am possessed of the same nature, attributes, and glory, that he is; so that he that sees the one, sees the other:

Christ is the express image of His Father. 2 Corinthians 4:4 “In whom 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.”

Albert Barnes' Notes on the Bible on 2 Corinthians 4:4 says:

Who is the image of God - Christ is called the image of God:
(1) In respect to his divine nature, his exact resemblance to God in his divine attributes and perfections; see Col_ 1:15; and Heb_ 1:3; and,
(2) In his moral attributes as Mediator, as showing forth the glory of the Father to people. He “resembles” God, and in him we see the divine glory and perfections embodied, and shine
It is from his “resemblance” to God in all respects that he is called his image; and it is through him that the divine perfections are made known to people. It is an object of special dislike and hatred to Satan that the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine on people, and fill their hearts. Satan hates that image; he hates that people should become like God; and he hates all that has a resemblance to the great and glorious Yahweh.

Colossians 1:15 “Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature:”

Hebrews 1:3 “Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, 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;”

And according to the trinity teaching, this verse should have said,

“He who has seen Me has seen the Father and the Holy Spirit.”

But again, not so.

*****While there are three in the Godhead, there are only two literal beings.*****

What is the Comma Johanneum?

Speaking of one, here is something so significant that it has been given its own name. The Comma Johanneum is a comma (short clause) in 1 John 5:7-8 which is the “only” passage in the entire Bible that says all three are one without assumptions or unbiblical human logic as previously seen. The King James Version reads as follows, “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. 8 And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.” 1 John 5:7-8

*****The scholarly consensus is that this passage is a Latin corruption that found its way into a Greek manuscript at an early date while absent from others. It is disconcerting to find there is no shortage of evidence that reveals this text was added (Yet Satan still has people deceived and using the added scripture as if it was fact).*****

Thomas Nelson and Sons Catholic Commentary, 1951, page 1186 explains, “It is now generally held that this passage, called the Gomma Johanneum, is a gloss that crept into the text of the Old Latin and Vulgate at an early date, but found its way into the Greek text only in the 15th and 16th centuries.”

1 John 5:7-8 reads from the NIV and most other Bible translations. “For there are three that testify: 8 the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement.” See also Adam Clarke's and other commentaries for further proof.
Erasmus did not include the infamous Comma Johanneum of 1 John 5:7-8 in either his 1516 or 1519 editions of his Greek New Testament but made its way into his third edition in 1522 because of pressure from the Catholic Church. After his first edition appeared in 1516, there arose such a furor over the absence of the *Comma* that Erasmus needed to defend himself. He argued that he did not put in the *Comma* Trinitarian formula because he found no Greek manuscripts that included it. Once one was produced called the Codex 61, that was written by one Roy or Froy at Oxford in c. 1520, he reluctantly agreed to include it in his subsequent editions. Erasmus probably altered the text because of politico-theologico-economic concerns. He did not want his reputation ruined, nor his *Novum Instrumentum* to go unsold. Thus it passed into the Stephanus Greek New Testament in 1551 (first New Testament in verses), which came to be called the Textus Receptus, and became the basis for the Geneva Bible New Testament in 1557 and the Authorized King James Version in 1611. Above is an image of the Codex 61 with the added words underlined in red.

*****There is no doubt that the latter part of 1 John 5:7 and the first part of 1 John 5:8 never existed in the original and inspired words of God. So 400 years after the cross, they knew there was nothing in the Scriptures to support their pagan belief in the trinity, so no problem they thought, we will just add it! And since this was not from God, then who was it really from?*****

See also “Was 1 John 5:7 Added to the Bible” later in this Message.

For Adventists: “I saw that God had especially guarded the Bible; yet when copies of it were few, learned men had in some instances changed the words, thinking that they were making it more plain, when in reality they were mystifying that which was plain, by causing it to lean to their established views, which were governed by tradition.” — (E.G. White, *EW*, 220.2)
What Happened to Matthew 28:19?

Trinitarians often say Matthew 28:19 supports their belief stating that by the shared authority of these three we are commissioned to baptize. However, this verse in no way affirms the trinity doctrine which states that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are three co-equal, co-eternal beings that make one God. This verse refers to three but never says they are one and says nothing about their personality. Nobody denies there is the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Matthew 28:19

This verse does not say these three are three in one or one in three, it does not say these three are the Godhead, it does not say these three are co-equal or co-eternal beings, it does not say that these three are God, and yet some Trinitarians draw the conclusion that this supports their belief which is clearly not so.

For Adventists: Here is the Godhead according to Ellen White. “Let them be thankful to God for His manifold mercies and be kind to one another. They have one God and one Saviour; and one Spirit--the Spirit of Christ--is to bring unity into their ranks.” — (E.G. White, 9T, p. 189, 1909). The third person is the Spirit of Christ, not a third being.

In any case, I find myself greatly perplexed by this verse, because where do we see the Apostles or anyone else for that matter following the explicit instructions of Christ here?

*****Here are all verses where anyone was baptized into the name of anyone. Acts 2:38; Acts 8:12; Acts 8:16; Acts 10:48; Acts 19:5; Acts 22:16; Romans 6:3; 1 Corinthians 1:13; Galatians 3:27. But as you can see, there is not one person following what Christ supposedly instructed them to do. In every verse we find people baptized into the name of our Lord Jesus Christ only. So why the apparent disobedience of the apostles?*****

The following dictionary explains, “The historical riddle is not solved by Matthew 28:19, since, according to a wide scholarly consensus, it is not an authentic saying of Jesus, not even an elaboration of a Jesus-saying on baptism.” — (The Anchor Bible Dictionary, Vol. 1, 1992, p. 585).

Further research revealed this to be the case as all Bible commentaries and dictionaries I found quoting on this issue claimed that it was added by the Church of Rome once again to support their Trinitarian formula. Below are some of many quotes. See “Mathew 28:19 added text” later in this message for more.

“The basic form of our (Matthew 28:19 Trinitarian) profession of faith took shape during the course of the second and third centuries in connection with the ceremony of baptism. So far as its place of origin is concerned, the text (Matthew 28:19) came from the city of Rome.” — (Joseph Ratzinger (pope Benedict XVI) Introduction to Christianity: 1968 edition, pp. 82-83)

“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.” — (The Catholic Encyclopedia, II, p. 263)
So how did this happen and what did the original text say if this is truth? It must be remembered that we have no known manuscripts that were written in the first, second or third centuries. There is a gap of over three hundred years between when Matthew wrote his epistle and our earliest manuscript copies. (It also took over three hundred years for the Catholic Church to evolve into what the “early church fathers” wanted it to become.) This is what my research revealed.

Eusebius (c. 260—c. 340) was the Bishop of Caesarea and is known as “the Father of Church History.” He wrote prolifically and his most celebrated work is his Ecclesiastical History, a history of the Church from the Apostolic period until his own time. Eusebius quotes many verses in his writings including Matthew 28:19. But he never quotes it as it appears in modern Bibles. He always finishes the verse with the words “in my name.” For example, in Book III of his History, Chapter 5, Section 2, which is about the Jewish persecution of early Christians, we read, “relying upon the power of Christ, who had said to them, “Go ye and make disciples of all the nations in my name.” And in his Oration in Praise of Emperor Constantine, Chapter 16, Section 8, we read, “Surely none save our only Savior has done this, when, after his victory over death, he spoke the word to his followers, and fulfilled it by the event, saying to them, “Go ye and make disciples of all nations in my name.”

*****Eusebius was present at the council of Nicea and was involved in the debates over the Godhead. If the manuscripts he had in front of him read “in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,” he would never have quoted instead, “in my name.” So it appears that the earliest manuscripts read “in my name,” and the phrase was enlarged to reflect the orthodox position as Trinitarian influence spread.*****

Was Jesus Omniscient and Omnipotent and immortal when He was Here?

We find in John 21:17 Peter saying to Christ, “you know all things.” So how are we to understand Jesus saying, “But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.” Mark 13:32. Compare with Matthew 24:36. So here we have a problem because Jesus is confessing to not knowing something. And Scripture also says, “Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men.” Luke 2:52. How do you increase in wisdom when you know all things? And “Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered.” Hebrews 5:8. Was Jesus limited by the human body prepared for Him and had to learn things just as we do? So what did Peter mean? Was He right? Because Jesus did not contradict Him. Or is there some way that Jesus could effectively know anything He needed?

We find the answer in many Scriptures such as John 14:26 “the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things,”

Does this mean we could literally know all things? Can the human mind even contain all the infinite knowledge of God? The point to be made here is there is nothing that the Spirit of God could not teach or reveal to us or His Son. The Father knows all things and so Christ could know whatever was required through the power of the Holy Spirit whether it be the thoughts of others or any knowledge that is required ACCORDING TO THE WILL OF GOD.

And it does not stop with the omniscience of the Spirit of God but also His power. In Matthew 12:22-32 we find Jesus casting out a demon. The Pharisees claimed He did it
by the power of the devil. But Jesus being fully man said He did it by the Spirit of God. He then informs them that they can speak against the Son of man and be forgiven, but blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven. Why? Because verse 28 says He did this by the power of the Holy Spirit. Remember that Jesus was the Word made flesh and was fully man. The Pharisees were not insulting the Son of man but the Spirit of God by whose power the demon was cast out and hence were blaspheming the Holy Spirit by attributing the work of the Holy Spirit to Satan.

In any case, Jesus would not be casting out demons by the power of the Holy Spirit unless He had given up His omnipotence for a time now would He? Jesus said “I can of mine own self do nothing.” John 5:30

*****So the unpardonable sin and blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is attributing the work of the Holy Spirit to Satan. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God, not another being which was a creation of Satan 348 years after the cross. So if you have this wrong belief, and praised the genuine work of the Holy Spirit, what would you be doing? You would effectively be attributing the work of the Holy Spirit to Satan in fact which is the unpardonable sin! You cannot afford to have this wrong.*****

For Adventists: “What constitutes the sin against the Holy Ghost? It is willfully attributing to Satan the work of the Holy Spirit.” — (E.G. White, 5T, 634.1, 1889)

The Bible reveals a handful of times that the miracles Christ performed while here on Earth were done by His Father in heaven. John 11:40-41 indicates it was through His Father that Lazarus was raised. Every great miracle that Jesus did was done in a similar manner by His disciples or Old Testament prophets including walking on water and raising the dead. (Matthew 14:29; John 14:12; Acts 20:9-10; 1 Kings 17:22).

*****This is not a sign they had all power but a sign that God was with them as He was with His Son*****

After He healed the paralytic man, the crowd, “marvelled, and glorified God, which had given such power unto men.” Matthew 9:8. Peter explains, “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him.” Acts 10:38. Jesus also explains, “The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.” John 14:10

So Scripture reveals that Christ only knew what He had learned as a man and what His Father revealed to Him through His Spirit. Since our Father in Heaven knows all things, then Christ could also effectively know all things “if” the Spirit of God revealed it to Him. Thus if Jesus did not know the hour of His return it could only be because His Father had not revealed this to Him, and we are not told the reason why this was the case. Scripture shows that Jesus knew the thoughts of others but to be consistent with other Scripture, it had to be through the Holy Spirit. Peter, Elisha and Daniel all had the thoughts of others revealed to them by God also. (Acts 5:1-4; 2 Kings 5:25-27; Daniel 2:28-30).

Some will respond that Jesus did not know in His human nature but knew in His divine nature as the trinity teaches that there is one person subsisting in two natures. Jesus cannot have two minds, one that knew something and another that did not. Unless of course you want to make the absurd claim that mind and body are not correlated.

Why is it so hard to accept and understand that the disciples and many others have done all the same miracles that Jesus did by the power of the Holy Spirit (Romans 15:9), and so when
Jesus came as a man that He did them the same way? It seems most refuse to accept that their 
Lord and Saviour gave up a lot when he came as a man, and cannot stand the thought that for 
a while He was not omnipresent, omniscience and omnipotent. Though most accept Christ 
gave up His omnipresence, but only because they have no choice as there is no avoiding this 
fact. However, how many have stopped to consider the incredible love of their Saviour here 
in that temporarily laying aside these things made an even far greater sacrifice that could 
have been disastrous in cosmic proportions. Jesus even had to give up His dignity and have 
dirty diapers changed! By accepting the facts of Scripture, one does not have to go looking 
for ways of explaining away other Scriptures that show one is in error. We need to be able to 
harmonize all Scripture and realize that when we have to start trying to jam a square peg into 
a round hole then we have something wrong.

Paul in Philippians 2:5-9 speaks of the sacrifice and humility of Christ in regards to what 
He gave up coming as a man, even to the point of death, and that we should have the 
same mind and attitude as Him. The Greek text says He had the form or nature of God 
but emptied Himself, meaning He laid aside those divine attributes that prevented Him 
from living and dying as one of us. In having the same form and nature of God, He 
would never have been tired or suffered pain and other things that go with being in 
human form. Jesus had everything including immortality, and yet He willingly gave it 
up sacrificing all for us. But then He made an even greater sacrifice, by giving up 
immortality, He died as a man by one of the most agonizing and drawn out deaths you 
could possibly imagine.

*****When people refuse to acknowledge what Christ did give up, they also fail to 
acknowledge the magnitude and the depth of the sacrifice He really did make for us and 
how it demonstrates the immeasurable love that He and His Father have for us.*****

So what did Jesus get back when He returned to the Father? The fact is we are not 
specifically told. But we know He got back His omnipresence through the Holy Spirit as our 
Comforter. For example, Jesus said “Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age.” 
Matthew 28:20. We also know that Jesus retained the scars in His hands, feet and side (John 
20:25-27). We assume He got back everything but we will have to wait until we see Him to 
find out just how great a sacrifice He and His Father really made in their incredible love for 
us.

Here is one more example to consider that many have overlooked. Revelation 1:1 states, “The 
Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which 
must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John:” 
This revelation was given to Jesus Christ by God. Why would Christ need His Father to 
reveal these things to Him if He knew all things? See also Gills Commentary on John 10:30 
in relation to Mark 13:32.

The trinity doctrine teaches that Jesus Christ is co-equal with His Father in every way. Thus 
it is claimed that since the Father cannot die, then His Son cannot die either. But the Bible 
says there is only One person who cannot die and He is God the Father. The Bible says when 
Jesus appears that He will show, “who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings 
and Lord of lords, who alone has immortality, dwelling in unapproachable light, whom no 
man has seen or can see, to whom be honor and everlasting power.” 1 Timothy 6:15-16. This 
can only be our Heavenly Father for He is the One whom “No man hath seen... at any time.” 
John 1:18. The Father is the one “who alone has immortality.” Yet we know that one day we 
will “put on immortality.” 1 Corinthians 15:53
So when the Bible says the Father “alone has immortality” it must mean immortality in an absolute and unlimited sense. The Bible reveals that the Father is the only One who cannot die under any circumstances. Jesus was made subject to death and “died for our sins.” 1 Corinthians 15:3. Man can die, “The soul that sinneth, it shall die.” Ezekiel 18:20. Angels can die, “everlasting fire,” is “prepared for the devil and his angels.” Matthew 25:41. God said to Satan, “I will bring forth a fire from the midst of thee, it shall devour thee, and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee... and never shalt thou be any more.” Ezekiel 28:18-19. So it is true that the Father is the only Person who cannot die under any circumstances, which excludes His Son who tasted “death for every man” Hebrews 2:9. So Christ was not immortal when He was here and the primary reason for Him becoming a human was so that He could die for our sins.

*****The Son of God suffered a real death for our sins. (Isaiah 53:6 and 1 John 2:2).*****

Others claim that Christ came down from heaven and inhabited a human body and only the human body died while the divine being from heaven remained alive. By this we would have to conclude that there was only a human sacrifice made for our redemption. Huge problem!!!

*****It is unbiblical to say that a human sacrifice is sufficient to redeem mankind or that only half of Christ died. If Christ only pretended to die it takes away the necessity of Him becoming a man and He could have done that without becoming one.*****

The author of Hebrews says He “was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death.” Hebrews 2:9. Christ Himself made it clear to John that He was dead. Jesus said, “I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death.” Revelation 1:18.

*****Jesus Christ really “died for our sins according to the Scriptures.” 1 Corinthians 15:3*****

For Adventists: “He humbled himself, and took mortality upon him. As a member of the human family, he was mortal.” — (E.G. White, RH, September 4, 1900)

So it is that many are confused and do not know who they are worshipping or who abides in them. Is it a three in one god or a real Father and Son? And is the Holy Spirit God the Spirit or the Spirit of God through whom the Son also comes to us?

*****The Bible states many times that Jesus is the literal Son of God. But the trinity doctrine says no, they are just role playing. And so the personality of the Father and Son is destroyed. God is no longer a real Father and Christ is no longer a real Son. This is Satan’s master plan to have Christians deny the Father and Son and to obtain the worship he has always desired.*****

Christ is the one who Comforts us and both He and His Father make their abode in us through His Spirit. John 14:16-23. So is the trinity doctrine true or false? The testimony of Scripture states that there is but one God the Father and one Lord Jesus Christ and their Holy Spirit being the presence and power of God.

The Father and Son not only created us, but loved us and devised an amazing plan to save a lost world from sin to restore us to His presence in paradise.
Pagan Origins of the Trinity

The New Bible 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 [A.D.] 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.”

While Tertullian introduced the term “trinity,” what he taught and believed is different to what the trinity doctrine is today. And since he introduced this term, then that means the trinity doctrine as taught today did not exist in the time of Tertullian. And if it did not exist in his time, then it could never have existed in the time of Christ and the apostles.

Tertullian however did introduce pagan ideas into the worship service. He taught oblations for the dead and made the sign of the cross on the forehead of worshipers. He also dipped people three times to baptize them. Tertullian freely admitted that he had adopted these ideas from pagan teachings and could not support them from Scripture, but he thought that if Christians adopted some heathen rituals of the pagans that they would find it easier to join Christianity.

Wikipedia states what Tertullian believed on the Godhead:

Tertullian was just a forerunner of the Nicene doctrine and did not state the immanent trinity. His use of trinitas (Latin: 'Threeness') emphasised the manifold character of God. In his treatise against Praxeas he used the words, “Trinity and economy, persons and substance.” The Son is distinct from the Father, and the Spirit from both the Father and the Son. “These three are one substance, not one person; and it is said, 'I and my Father are one' in respect not of the singularity of number but the unity of the substance.” In his book Tertullian against Praxeas, he also states that the Son was not co-eternal with the Father and did have a beginning as the begotten Son of God. He also did not teach that the Holy Spirit was a literal being. So the trinity doctrine as we know it today did not even come from the man who introduced the word Trinity.

So the doctrine of the trinity wasn't formalized until long after the Bible was completed and the apostles were long dead in their graves, and long after the man who introduced the word Trinity was dead and in his grave. It took later theologians centuries to sort out what they believed and to formulate the belief in the trinity!

By no means are theologians' explanations of the trinity doctrine clear.

Religious writer A.W. Tozer in his book The Knowledge of the Holy states that the trinity is an “incomprehensible mystery” and that attempts to understand it “must remain forever futile.” He admits that Churches, “without pretending to understand,” have nevertheless continued to teach this doctrine (1961, pp. 17-18) He then remarkably concludes, “The fact that it cannot be satisfactorily explained, instead of being against it, is in its favor.” — (p. 23)

The New Unger's Bible Dictionary in its article on the trinity concedes that the Trinitarian concept is humanly incomprehensible, “It is admitted by all who thoughtfully deal with this
subject that the Scripture revelation here leads us into the presence of a deep mystery; and that all human attempts at expression are of necessity imperfect.” — (1988, p. 1308)

Cyril Richardson, professor of Church history at New York's Union Theological Seminary, though a dedicated Trinitarian himself said this in his book The Doctrine of The Trinity, “My conclusion, then, about the doctrine of the Trinity is that it is an artificial construct... It produces confusion rather than clarification; and while the problems with which it deals are real ones, the solutions it offers are not illuminating. It has posed for many Christians dark and mysterious statements, which are ultimately meaningless, because it does not sufficiently discriminate in its use of terms.” — (1958, pp. 148-149)

He also admitted, “Much of the defense of the Trinity as a 'revealed' doctrine, is really an evasion of the objections that can be brought against it.” — (p. 16)

A Dictionary of Religious Knowledge states regarding the trinity, “Precisely what that doctrine is, or rather precisely how it is to be explained, Trinitarians are not agreed among themselves.” — (Lyman Abbott, editor, 1885, “Trinitarians”)

Why do even those who believe in the trinity doctrine find it so difficult to explain? The answer is simple yet shocking.

*****It is because the Bible does not teach it! One cannot prove or explain something from the Bible that is not Biblical. The Bible is our only reliable source of divine revelation. And the truth as we will see is that the trinity concept simply is not part of God's revelation to mankind.*****

These following admissions from a number of reputable sources and authors who, while themselves affirming the Trinity, acknowledge that the word Trinity and the doctrine is not found in the Bible.

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia acknowledges that “'trinity' is a second-century term found nowhere in the Bible, and the Scriptures present no finished trinitarian statement.” — (1988, Vol. 4, “Trinity,” p. 914). It further states that “church fathers crystallized the doctrine in succeeding centuries”—long after the apostles had passed from the scene.

Martin Luther who was the German priest who initiated the Protestant Reformation said, “It is indeed true that the name 'Trinity' is nowhere to be found in the Holy Scriptures, but has been conceived and invented by man.” — (reproduced in The Sermons of Martin Luther, John Lenker, editor, Vol. 3, 1988, p. 406)

Historian and science fiction writer H.G. Wells in his noted work The Outline of History stated, “There is no evidence that the apostles of Jesus ever heard of the trinity—at any rate from him.” — (1920, Vol. 2, p. 499)

The HarperCollins Encyclopedia of Catholicism says, “Today, however, scholars generally agree that there is no doctrine of the Trinity as such in either the OT or the NT... It would go far beyond the intention and thought-forms of the OT to suppose that a late-fourth-century or thirteenth-century Christian doctrine can be found there... Likewise, the NT does not contain an explicit doctrine of the Trinity.” — (Richard McBrien, general editor, 1995, “God,” pp. 564-565)
And the HarperCollins Bible Dictionary states, “The formal doctrine of the Trinity as it was defined by the great church councils of the fourth and fifth centuries is not to be found in the NT.” — (Paul Achtemeier, editor, 1996, “Trinity”)

Professor Charles Ryrie wrote, “Many doctrines are accepted by evangelicals as being clearly taught in the Scripture for which there are no proof texts. The doctrine of the Trinity furnishes the best example of this. It is fair to say that the Bible does not clearly teach the doctrine of the Trinity . . . In fact, there is not even one proof text, if by proof text we mean a verse or passage that 'clearly' states that there is one God who exists in three persons.” — (Basic Theology, p. 89)

He goes on to say, “The above illustrations prove the fallacy of concluding that if something is not proof texted in the Bible we cannot clearly teach the results . . . If that were so, I could never teach the doctrine of the Trinity.” — (Ibid, p. 90)

Shirley Guthrie, professor of theology at Columbia Theological Seminary wrote, “The Bible does not teach the doctrine of the Trinity. Neither the word 'trinity' itself nor such language as 'one-in-three,' 'three-in-one,' one 'essence' (or 'substance'), and three 'persons,' is biblical language. The language of the doctrine is the language of the ancient church taken from classical Greek philosophy.” — (Christian Doctrine, 1994, pp. 76-77)

Millard Erickson who is a research professor of theology at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary writes that the Trinity “is not clearly or explicitly taught anywhere in Scripture, yet it is widely regarded as a central doctrine, indispensable to the Christian faith. In this regard, it goes contrary to what is virtually an axiom of biblical doctrine, namely, that there is a direct correlation between the scriptural clarity of a doctrine and its cruciality to the faith and life of the church.

In view of the difficulty of the subject and the great amount of effort expended to maintain this doctrine, we may well ask ourselves what might justify all this trouble.” — (God in Three Persons: A Contemporary Interpretation of the Trinity, p. 12)

He further states that the Trinity teaching “is not present in biblical thought, but arose when biblical thought was pressed into this foreign mold [of Greek concepts]. Thus, the doctrine of the Trinity goes beyond and even distorts what the Bible says about God.” — (Ibid, p. 20)

He also stated, “It is claimed that the doctrine of the Trinity is a very important, crucial, and even basic doctrine. If that is indeed the case, should it not be somewhere more clearly, directly, and explicitly stated in the Bible? If this is the doctrine that especially constitutes Christianity's uniqueness ... how can it be only implied in the biblical revelation? ... For here is a seemingly crucial matter where the Scriptures do not speak loudly and clearly. Little direct response can be made to this charge. It is unlikely that any text of Scripture can be shown to teach the doctrine of the Trinity in a clear, direct, and unmistakable fashion.” — (Ibid, pp. 108-109)

Since the trinity is not found in the Bible as so many scholars and theologians admit, then how did it come to be viewed as such an important teaching?

Theology professors Roger Olson and Christopher Hall explain part of the puzzle in their book The Trinity, “It is understandable that the importance placed on this doctrine is
perplexing to many lay Christians and students. Nowhere is it clearly and unequivocally stated in Scripture ... How can it be so important if it is not explicitly stated in Scripture? ... The doctrine of the Trinity developed gradually after the completion of the New Testament in the heat of controversy, but the church fathers who developed it believed they were simply exegeting [explaining] divine revelation and not at all speculating or inventing new ideas. The full-blown doctrine of the Trinity was spelled out in the fourth century at two great ecumenical (universal) councils: Nicea (325 A.D.) and Constantinople (381 A.D.).”
— (2002, pp. 1-2)

We see from this and other sources quoted above that the idea of a trinity was foreign to Biblical writers. Instead, as many of these sources openly acknowledge, the doctrine of the trinity developed considerably later and over a span of several centuries through undeniable Catholic influence. To understand the factors that led to the introduction of this belief, we must first go way back to Babel.*****

It would surprise many to know that the absolute beginnings of the three in one trinity doctrine goes right back to the Tower of Babel on the plain of Shinar by the River Euphrates many generations after the flood. At the time of the construction of Babylon at the Tower of Babel, mankind had multiplied and spoken one language. (Genesis 11:1-4) Cush was the son of Ham and grandson of Noah (Genesis 10:1, 6), he helped to plan with his son Nimrod a way to rule the world through a wicked counterfeit religion. Nimrod was the originator of sun worship and founder of Babylon. The Targum says, “Nimrod became a mighty man of sin, a murderer of innocent men, and a rebel before the Lord.”

So the beginning of Nimrod's plan had its origin at Babel which was later known as Babylon. This city of Babylon with a tower “whose top may reach unto heaven” was built by Nimrod

(Genesis 10:8-10; 11:4).

They called the tower “Babel, the gate to heaven,” but God called it “Babel, confusion,” and there God confused the language of the people which forced them to scatter. These people wanted one government to rule the world and one religion to sway the hearts of man. This was Satan's attempt to defy God and His authority, but God came down and stopped this rebellion in defiance of His command for mankind to replenish the earth (Genesis 9:1) by confusing their language. So they stopped building and were scattered to different parts of the world (Genesis 11:8-9).

Nimrod had a plan to strengthen his evil religious system and so he married his own mother Semiramis. She was the first deified queen of Babylon and Nimrod was the first deified king.
Nimrod's and Semiramis' followers plunged so deeply into the occult that they even sacrificed babies to Satan in their worship of him. This became a common practice until Shem who was one of Noah's three sons and the great uncle of Nimrod, in his anger and wrath killed Nimrod and cut him up into small pieces as an example to others to not commit such abominable sins.

Alexander Hislop in his book The Two Babylons said, “the Tower of Babel was actually the worship of Satan in the form of fire, the sun and the serpent. However, Satan worship could not be done openly because of the many who still believed in the true God of Noah. So a mystery religion began at Babel where Satan could be worshipped in secret.” — (Alexander Hislop, The Two Babylons, 2nd American ed.(Neptune, New Jersey: Loizeaux Brothers, 1959) 5, 24)

Because of Nimrod's death, his followers and Semiramis were afraid to continue in their worship of Satan for fear that what happened to Nimrod would also happen to them, so a mystery religion developed at Babel where Satan could be worshipped in secret. The same thing is happening in these last days. Satan is using mysteries and deceptions to deceive people into thinking that they are worshipping the true God when they are actually worshipping Satan.

This counterfeit religion ceased for a short time but Semiramis had a brilliant idea of how she could successfully revive her and Nimrod's pagan religion with a new form. It was not long after the death of her husband that Semiramis became pregnant. She claimed that when Nimrod died he went up to the sun, and so the sun then became a symbol of Nimrod. She told the people that a ray of the sun had come to her and impregnated her with a child and that it was actually Nimrod coming back in a reincarnation of the sun god. The child was called Tammuz and these three were worshipped as the personification of the sun god. The trinity got its start in Ancient Babylon with Nimrod - Tammuz - and Semiramis. Semiramis demanded worship for both her husband and her son as well as herself. She claimed that her son, was both the father and the son. Yes, he was “god the father” and “god the son” - The first divine incomprehensible trinity.” — (The Two Babylons, Alexander Hislop, p. 51)

So Semiramis proclaimed that her husband Nimrod was a god, and she as the wife of Nimrod was a goddess. She then announced herself to be “The Queen of Heaven” and that she should be worshiped as such. She claimed that her spirit was the moon and that when she died she would dwell in the moon, even as Nimrod was already in the sun.

This system of paganism while professing to be the true religion is actually devil worship. It professes and claims to be the truth of God but in reality it is Satan's masterpiece and the “mystery of iniquity.”

Semiramis and her priests of Satan were deep into the occult and were masters of lies and deception. Everywhere there were statues or idols of this mother/child cult. Semiramis was soon hailed as “The Queen of Heaven” (Ashtarte). Her symbol became the moon and her husband Nimrod, was called Baal the sun god and hence his symbol became the sun.
So in Egypt, their trinity became Osiris, Horus and Isis (top left). In Greece it was Zeus, Apollo and Athena (top right). And in India there was Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva (bottom left). Notice also the yellow halo around their heads which represents the sun god. The system of Rome adopted the same symbol where you see saints with a halo around their head. Most tend to think that this means they are holy but it actually represents the sun god. And speaking of Rome, they had Jupiter, Mars and Venus (bottom right).

These few are by no means a comprehensive list but in all the many cultures and pagan systems of worship, we find the ultimate worship of their gods always ends up in three. The common denominator is that they all started at the very same place. But now that they had different languages, they all had different names. As far back into the ancient world as we can go, we find that all known cultures had a three in one triune god.

****So we find that the trinity has its origins all the way back in Babylon. If God had not interfered and confused the languages then we would have had no hope of any truth that we have today. We also find that this worship of three was carried to all the different cultures that we have today but they took on different names since God had confused the languages.****

There is a lot more that could be covered on this topic but what we have is adequate for this study. **The parts that have not been examined can be briefly covered by the following summary of the heathen trinity.**

1. There are always three beings in this triune god.
2. One is the father, one is the mother and one is the son.
3. The son is also the husband of the mother.
4. The son is the father incarnate.

5. All three have been deified as gods.

6. Often these three are said to be one god. That is, one in three forms, or three in one.

7. The father is often not mentioned and instead the mother and son are worshipped by themselves.

8. At times the heathen trinity is seen as one god playing three roles, and is pictured with three heads.

9. At other times this one god is seen with three faces on one head.

10. In several branches of heathenism, the third person of this trinity is regarded as evil and a destroyer.

In this last version, the 1st person is the creator, the 2nd person is the maintainer, and the 3rd person is the destroyer.

None of these heathen concepts should EVER be found in Christianity!

Alexander Hislop summed up the trinity with the following, “All these have existed from ancient times. While overlaid with idolatry, the recognition of a trinity was universal in all the ancient nations of the world.” — (The Two Babylons, pp. 17-18)

Remember that the trinity doctrine, and why it is called as such, is as follows. The Father is God, Jesus is God, the Holy Spirit is God, and yet there are not three gods but one God, and that's the trinity! In other words, 1+1+1=One! This of course makes no sense at all and is not found in the Bible, so where did it really come from?

The very first three-in-one trinity was the worship of the three stages of the sun!

(1. New born at dawn. (2. Mature and full grown at 12 noon. (3. Old and dying at the end of the day. (Jordan Maxwell. BBC of America Quoted in Exposure Vol. 5, No. 6 1999). All three of course were one divinity being the sun. And so the main medium through which Satan was worshipped in Babylon was the sun. They noticed that the sun had three distinct stages and this fitted well with their belief as they were already worshipping three. Thus the sun was worshiped as three gods. The rising and new born sun as it came to life, the mature and full grown sun at noon, and the dying sun as it set at the end of the day. Yet while they worshipped the sun as three gods, they were not three gods but one god!

So the rising sun was god, the midday sun was god, the setting sun was god, and yet there were not three gods but one god! In other words, 1+1+1=One! So here is the true absolute origin of the trinity doctrine. And this became incorporated into this mystery religion and the worship of Satan.

“Three became the most universal number of deity. Sun worship is one of the most primitive forms of religion, and early man sometimes distinguished between rising, midday, and setting sun. The Egyptians, for example, divided the sun god into three deities: Horus, rising sun, Ra
or Re, midday sun, and Osiris, old setting sun.” — (Egyptian Deities, New International Encyclopedia. NY: Dodd, 1917. Volume 7, p. 529)

And all of this started in Babylon. So as each group travelled it took with them the same concept except they now had different names.

The pagans also believed that the three phases of the sun were the three manifestations of the supreme deity as evident in the Egyptian sun gods. See image left. This became known as the three in one god. In order to be able to represent their sun god properly, they combined all three stages of the sun into one, and the result of that would be a picture of what they really believed.

When you put all three parts together, you have one and this symbol became a symbol of the sun god, and the being behind that worship was Satan.

They found this symbolism very effective and used this to disguise their true religion. These three interlocking circles formed an equilateral triangle which is a triangle with three equal sides. With an equilateral triangle all sides are equal and must add up to 180 degrees. Each side was representing a phase of the sun with each angle of the triangle being 60 degrees. It does not take a genius to see that the next step, \(60 + 60 + 60\) represented 666. See image above.

“The ancient Babylonians recognised the doctrine of a trinity, or three persons in one god— as appears from a composite god with three heads forming part of their mythology, and the use of the equilateral triangle, also, as an emblem of such trinity in unity.” — (Thomas Dennis Rock, The Mystical Woman and the Cities of the Nations, 1867, pp. 22-23)
It is also very significant that the Babylonians used the sexagesimal (base-60) number system from which comes 60 minutes in an hour, 60 seconds in a minute, 360 (60×6) degrees in a circle and 60 degrees in each angle of an equilateral triangle and so on. 360 divided by 10 = 36 and 6 * 6 = 36

This is derived from their system of worship of 36 supreme gods, which included the sun god as number one which they believed to be the father of all the other gods (Nimrod), and the moon was the mother god (Semiramis) as number two. The other gods numbered 3 to 36 were considered the children of the sun god, and included the various stars and constellations that these gods were associated with.

These numbers from 1 to 36 total 666, which they also assigned to the sun god since it was the father of all their gods. The calculation is simply this: 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6 + 7 + 8 + 9 + 10 + 11 + 12 + 13 + 14 + 15 + 16 + 17 + 18 + 19 + 20 + 21 + 22 + 23 + 24 + 25 + 26 + 27 + 28 + 29 + 30 + 31 + 32 + 33 + 34 + 35 + 36 = 666. Note the Babylonian solar seal amulet with the numbers 1 to 36 and the number 666 underneath these numbers that represented the sun. The numbers are so arranged that each row and column as well as the two diagonals add up to 111. They feared their gods and believed these amulets had more power to protect them from their god's striking them down with this number arrangement. These solar seals are almost impossible to find today and most are in private collections where Satan wants them. This true origin of the number 666 is known by very few and once again how Satan wants it as it reveals too much truth on what this number is all about and who God now assigns this number. See in the following link 666 number of the beast for detailed information.

So the pagans used these symbols and numbers to hide the worship they were giving to Satan, and sun worship or Satan worship became the religion of 666. And of course in the Bible we are told this is the number of the beast and it is the number of a man. “Here is wisdom. Let him that has understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six.” Revelation 13:18. And of course the beast (Papal Rome) that has this number is also called Babylon in Revelation and here is one reason why. This number has been found on many archaeological digs in Babylon such as the solar seal shown above. This system of Satan worship was a mystery religion and explains the meaning of the word mystery in Revelation 17:5 “And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.” See in the following link who is mystery Babylon the great.

Those who believe this is a meaning of the number 666 are destroying the image of the sun, the symbol for the Bible’s God and the symbol for the sun god or Jesus. And they are taking away the symbol of the sun from the people and giving it to Satan, which is another name for Jesus. They are taking away the image of the sun like the Jews did in the Old Testament and the Bolsheviks did in the former Soviet Union, both in a very religious manner. They were destroying the image of the sun, the image of God, the image of Jesus, and calling it the image of Satan. This is not just a Christian issue. It is a religious issue about worship of God and Satan, and God’s image and Satan’s image and who the people are worshipping, who Satan is the father of and who God is the father of. And this is also a political issue about whether the Christian church is a political, religious or social organization.
The image to the left is called the Shield of the Trinity. The precise origin of this type of diagram is unknown, but it is said that it was influenced by 12th century experiments in symbolizing the trinity in abstract visual form. This is the God that is worshipped in the Roman Catholic system. They are worshipping a God that is three in one and one in three. And we know this concept does not originate from God's Word but goes all the way back to Babylon. Despite the origin of the Shield of the trinity being unknown, you will notice all the similarities to the symbolism from Babylon and so the absolute origin no doubt came from a much earlier time. Notice that we still have the equilateral triangle and three circles representing three gods with the only difference being that here we have a circle in the middle to show that all three are supposed to be one god. This concept of all three being the one god is from Babylon and is not found in the Bible and was not taught by the Apostles or Christ.

****The trinity doctrine represented by this diagram shows Jesus is not only the Son of God but He is also the God and therefore He is His own Son. And our Heavenly Father is not only our Father but He is also God and hence God is His own Father. It also means that God sent Himself into the world, died to reconcile the world to Himself, raised Himself from the dead, ascended to Himself in heaven, pleads before Himself in heaven to reconcile the world to Himself, and is the only mediator between man and Himself. And that also means that in the garden God prayed to Himself, if it were possible, to let the cup pass from Himself. Are you confused? And yet the Bible says, “God is not the author of confusion,” 1 Corinthians 14:33, Satan is.****

Should we expect anything less since this three in one doctrine is not in the Bible but comes from Babylon (means confusion) and is actually the worship of Satan?

And if one truly understands the implications of the three in one trinity doctrine then it becomes like the following. And with this being the case then one might ask, “Who do you worship?”

“The Puranas, one of the Hindoo Bibles of more than 3,000 years ago, contain the following passage: ‘O ye three Lords! know that I recognize only one God. Inform me, therefore, which of you is the true divinity, that I may address to him alone my adorations.’ The three gods, Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva, becoming manifest to him, replied, ‘Learn, O devotee, that there is no real distinction between us. What to you appears such is only the semblance. The single being appears under three forms by the acts of creation, preservation, and destruction, but he is one.’ Hence the triangle was adopted by all the ancient nations as a symbol of the Deity ... Three was considered among all the pagan nations as the chief of the mystical numbers,
because, as Aristotle remarks, it contains within itself a beginning, a middle, and an end. Hence we find it designating some of the attributes of almost all the pagan gods.” — (Sinclair, pp. 382-383)

Below we see three interlocking circles or sections. This is known as a triquetra and they found that these three interlocking sections can be substituted for the whole so that part of each circle can be used rather than the whole. This symbol that still represents the three in one sun god is found throughout different cultures and different pagan institutes of belief, and this system is still alive and well to this very day. You will often see the triqueta drawn in many different ways and you will find them in temples, shrines, paintings, etches and carvings.

“The triquetra is a satanic symbol that has its origins in the occult. It has always been associated with pagan beliefs, satanic practise and witchcraft. The triquetra is composed of three 6's overlaid. This logo is the ancient symbol for the pagan trinity. The symbol was popularised again by Satanist Aleister Crowley for the Royal Arch (Lucifer) or the 3rd Degree of the Year Order of Masonry.” — New King James Omissions A.V. Publications.)

In other words, this symbol is also used today by various secret societies. And we can see from history how this has progressed throughout time. This information helps us see and unmask the deception Satan is using to deceive the whole world. For example, you can find this symbol in some of the most interesting places. Here are a few of them.

To the left we have wiccan chalices or goblets if you like, which are used by witches in their practises. And what is the symbol on it? 666, Satan, the triquetra. And why would that be? Because witches communicate with Satan. So we should not be at all surprised to find this symbol there.
The next one to the left is from a TV series about three witches, not four witches but three witches interestingly enough. And likewise the symbol they use is the symbol of the sun god or the three in one god. It seems that the world is being trained to accept something and so we need to be very selective in what we watch and expose ourselves to.

And here are another three. The Aquarian Conspiracy with the three interlocking 6's, The Craft, which if you look carefully has a small triquetra in the middle of the cover. And last is the witches Book of Shadows. And what is the symbol there enlarged? Once again we have the symbol of the sun god, the three in one god, and the symbol for Satan. So this is the witches book of shadows and they make their intentions very plain and do not hide who their loyalties belong to.

As shocking as this may be, you will also find this symbol on some editions of the New King James Bible and the New
International Version of the Bible. So this symbol has even found its way onto the Bible where it does not belong. This is not a symbol of the God of the Bible but the sun god. When you read inside the cover of the Bible, if it has the triquetra on it, the description there will tell you it is the ancient symbol of the trinity. Yet these symbols belong to Satan and the three in one sun god. A symbol of the worship of the devil.

When you read inside the cover of the Bible, if it has the triquetra on it, the description there will tell you it is the ancient symbol of the trinity. Yet these symbols belong to Satan and the three in one sun god. A symbol of the worship of the devil.

Compare the top and bottom row of pictures in the image to the above. The bottom row are Christian book covers and the bottom middle picture is a book on the trinity. This is the ultimate deception when the author is teaching the unbiblical and pagan three-in-one trinity doctrine. But then also uses the pagan imagery that represents the true satanic origin of this doctrine by using things such as sun haloes around the heads of what are supposed to represent the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Did you notice the same sun haloes on both rows?

You will also note the triangles around the heads on the bottom left and right with one having three circles representing the sun and the other with one circle representing the sun and the rays of light within. The pagan imagery is blatantly obvious and appears many times in each image so coincidence is an impossibility. Much of the pagan imagery used in ancient times was often carved or engraved in stone and something that God abhors and ordered it to be destroyed. “Then you shall drive out all the inhabitants of the land from before you, and destroy all their pictures, and destroy all their molten images, and quite pluck down all their high places.” Numbers 33:52.

Trinitarians, such as those who write these books, will deny or change the truth in support of their belief and say that the trinity does not have its roots in paganism, but the weight of evidence is overwhelming and cannot be avoided. As all the experts say, the three in one god is not found explicitly in scripture but it is in paganism from the worship of the sun god. The bishops that formulated the trinity doctrine were the beginnings of the Papal Church that outlawed Sabbath keeping in favour of Sunday worship that came from sun worship, as well as purgatory and dozens of other unbiblical teachings that have their roots in paganism. These bishops who formulated the doctrine of the trinity were steeped in Greek and Platonic philosophy, and there can be no doubt this influenced their religious views and teaching i.e. (doctrines of demons).

*****By the second century, faithful members of the true Church had largely been scattered by waves of deadly persecution and were mostly underground. They held firmly to the biblical truth about Jesus Christ and God the Father, though they were persecuted by the Roman authorities as well as those who professed Christianity. The
Church that was above ground grew in power and influence, and within a few short centuries came to dominate even the mighty Roman Empire!*****

Now Satan desired to be worshipped like the most High (Isaiah 14:12-14) and wanted his own day of worship. So sun worship gave rise to Sunday worship in the Church instead of the true day of worship being the Seventh day that we call Saturday, as well as the pagan three in one trinity doctrine. Paganism eventually became mingled with Christianity and was officially adopted by the Papal Church. Many Catholics deny this ever happened but their own Church admits that it is true.

“The use of temples, and these dedicated to particular saints, and ornamented on occasions with branches of trees; incense, lamps, and candles; votive offerings on recovery from illness; holy water; asylums; holydays and seasons, use of calendars, processions, blessings on the fields; sacerdotal vestments, the tonsure, the ring in marriage, turning to the East, images at a later date, perhaps the ecclesiastical chant, and the Kyrie Eleison are all of pagan origin, and sanctified by their adoption into the Church.” — (An Essay on The Development of the Christian Doctrine John Henry “Cardinal Newman” p.373)

“It has often been charged… that Catholicism is overlaid with many pagan incrustations. Catholicism is ready to accept that accusation and even to make it her boast… the great god Pan is not really dead, he is baptized.” — (The Story of Catholicism, p. 37)

“It is interesting to note how often our Church has availed herself of practices which were in common use among pagans … Thus it is true, in a certain sense, that some Catholic rites and ceremonies are a reproduction of those of pagan creeds…” — (The Externals of the Catholic Church, Her Government, Ceremonies, Festivals, Sacramentals and Devotions, by John F. Sullivan, p. 156, published by P.J. Kennedy, NY, 1942)

*****So it is not surprising that the two things the Roman Catholic Church mock Protestants for are the two things they brought into the Church that are pagan, and both originated from sun worship, which was Satan worship from Babylon. If only more Christians had a desire to learn the real truth instead of defending what Satan has brought into the Church.*****

“Most Christians assume that Sunday is the biblically approved day of worship. The Catholic Church protests that it transferred Christian worship from the biblical Sabbath (Saturday) to Sunday, and that to try to argue that the change was made in the Bible is both dishonest and a denial of Catholic authority. If Protestantism wants to base its teachings only on the Bible, it should worship on Saturday.” — (Rome's Challenge, www.immaculateheart.com/maryonline, December 2003)

“Our opponents sometimes claim that no belief should be held dogmatically which is not explicitly stated in scripture ... But the Protestant Churches have themselves accepted such dogmas, as the Trinity, for which there is no such precise authority in the Gospels,” — (Assumption of Mary, Life magazine, October 30, 1950, p. 51)

The question was asked in the Catholic Catechism, “What is Sunday...” The answer was, “It is a day dedicated by the Apostles to the honor of the most holy Trinity.” — (RH, vol. 5, no. 24, p. 86). An interesting statement considering “Sunday worship” and the “Trinity doctrine” both came from sun and Satan worship in Babylon, and they were both brought into Christendom by the Catholic Church whom God calls Babylon!
Some of the above information has been taken from the video “The gods of Babylon” and is only a small portion of the information available. I highly recommend watching the entire video for the rest of the story that I have not covered above. You will find it by selecting the link above inbedded in the title of the video The Gods of Babylon.

The Origins of the Trinity Doctrine into the Church

So now we know the absolute origins of the trinity doctrine but very few understand how it came to be accepted by the Church several centuries after the Bible was completed. And as you have just seen, its roots go back much farther in history. By late in the first century as we see from 3 John 9-10, conditions had grown so dire that false ministers openly refused to receive representatives of the apostle John and were excommunicating true Christians from the Church!

Of this troubling period Edward Gibbon, the famed historian, wrote in his classic work The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire of a “dark cloud that hangs over the first age of the church.” — (1821, Vol. 2, p. 111)

*****It was not long before true servants of God became a marginalized and scattered minority among those calling themselves Christian. A very different religion, now compromised with many concepts and practices rooted in ancient paganism (such mixing of religious beliefs being known as syncretism, common in the Roman Empire at the time), took hold and transformed the faith founded by Jesus Christ.*****

Historian Jesse Hurlbut says of this time of transformation, “We name the last generation of the first century, from 68 to 100 A.D., 'The Age of Shadows,' partly because the gloom of persecution was over the church, but more especially because of all the periods in the [church's] history, it is the one about which we know the least. We have no longer the clear light of the Book of Acts to guide us; and no author of that age has filled the blank in the history ... For fifty years after St. Paul's life a curtain hangs over the church, through which we strive vainly to look; and when at last it rises, about 120 A.D. with the writings of the earliest church fathers, we find a church in many aspects very different from that in the days of St. Peter and St. Paul.” — (The Story of the Christian Church, 1970, p. 33)

This “very different” Church would grow in power and influence, and within a few short centuries would come to dominate even the mighty Roman Empire! By the second century, faithful members of the Church, Christ's “little flock” (Luke:12:32) had largely been scattered by waves of deadly persecution. They held firmly to the biblical truth about Jesus Christ and God the Father, though they were persecuted by the Roman authorities as well as those who professed Christianity but were in reality teaching “another Jesus” and a “different gospel.”

Different Ideas about the Godhead Lead to Conflict

Ignatius of Antioch was a student and disciple of the Apostle John whom God trusted the book of Revelation. Note below from John's disciple some of the different errors that were creeping into the early Church. Would John have corrected Ignatius if he was in error? And most significantly, note that Ignatius did not believe that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one god or that Jesus was co-eternal with the Father and this with little doubt is what John had taught his student.
“They introduce God as a Being unknown; they suppose Christ to be unbegotten; ... Some of them say that the Son is a mere man, and that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are but the same person, and that the creation is the work of God, not by Christ, but by some other strange power. Be on your guard, therefore, against such persons.” — (The Epistle of Ignatius to the Trallians, Chapter VI - Abstain from the Poison of Heretics)

*****Those who reject the pagan three in one god principle are typically called heretics today, and yet in John's time it was the other way around. Note the chapter title above. Never underestimate Satan to turn truth into error and error into truth.*****

These four verses following from John are the only Scriptures in the entire Bible that use the word antichrist. You will note that John says that these people he called antichrist used to be part of the early Church but apostatized and went out on their own (see green highlighted text) and were in the world in his lifetime (see blue highlighted text). Thus these people John is calling antichrist used to be with them and were professed Christians, but they began teaching something that was wrong. So what error did they teach that caused John to call them antichrist? (see purple highlighted text) We can see that John says they were denying the Father and the Son and that Jesus came in the flesh. But how does a Christian deny the Father and the Son?

*****Read on and find out as this is clearly a salvation issue.*****

1 John 2:18-19 “Little children, it is the last time: and as you have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time. 19 They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.”

1 John 2:22-23 “Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. 23 Whosoever denieth the Son, the same has not the Father: (but) he that acknowledgeth the Son has the Father also.”

1 John 4:3 “And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof you have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.”

2 John 1:7 “For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist.”

From the video “The gods of Babylon” mentioned before you will also learn that the beloved Apostle John had two students that he taught. Under the guidance and direction of John's teachings, they taught that Jesus was the literal Son of God. One of these students (Ignatius of Antioch as just seen above) stated that some were wrongly teaching that all three are one god just as the trinity doctrine teaches today, and also states that this was antichrist.

*****So who was John calling antichrist? Those who were teaching that all three are the one same god! Why is this antichrist? Because teaching all three are the same one god denies there is a literal Father and Son and so it denies both the Father and Son.*****

The trinity doctrine claims it was the one God playing the role of the Son who died on the cross and hence denies that Jesus came in the flesh as the Son of God! Denying that Jesus is the Son of God also denies God is the Father and so also denies the Father and Son. Note
The trinity doctrine claims it was the one God who died on the cross and not the literal Son of God, and hence denies that Jesus came in the flesh as the Son of God! This is a startling revelation that reveals the truth and the seriousness of this matter.

*****This is the main reason the Bible teaches that the Papal Church is antichrist. Antichrist is not one man such as the pope as wrongly taught today. It is the entire Catholic system.*****

They say, “The mystery of the trinity is the central doctrine of the Catholic faith. Upon it are based all the other teachings of the church.” — (Handbook for Today's Catholic, p. 11).

*****It is antichrist because it denies Jesus because it denies He is truly the literal Son of God who came in the flesh.*****

For Adventists: Note that Ellen White also confirms the above information, so if you choose to believe that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one as the trinity doctrine teaches, then John would actually call you antichrist. This is very serious if you value your salvation!

“And Peter, describing the dangers to which the church was to be exposed in the last days, says that as there were false prophets who led Israel into sin, so there will be false teachers, “who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them.... And many shall follow their pernicious ways.” 2 Peter 2:1, 2. Here the apostle has pointed out one of the marked characteristics of spiritualist teachers. They refuse to acknowledge Christ as the Son of God. Concerning such teachers the beloved John declares: “Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father. .... He who denies the personality of God and of his Son Jesus Christ, is denying God and Christ. “If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father.” — (E.G. White, RH, March 8, 1906, Par. 19)

So what wrong belief denies the personality of God and His Son which is denying God and Christ? Her husband explains, “Here we might mention the Trinity, which does away [with] the personality of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ,” — (James White, RH, December 11, 1855). While Ellen White did not use the word trinity, her husband did.

*****So if you believe in the trinity doctrine then you deny the personality of God and His Son which also denies Jesus is the literal Son of God, which the Apostle John said is antichrist.*****

So this was the setting in which the doctrine of the trinity emerged. In those early decades after Jesus Christ's ministry, death and resurrection, and spanning the next few centuries,
various ideas sprang up as to His exact nature. Was He man? Was He God? Was He God appearing as a man? Was He an illusion? Was He a mere man who became God? Was He created by God the Father, or did He exist eternally with the Father?

All of these ideas had their proponents. The unity of belief of the original Church was lost as new beliefs, many borrowed or adapted from pagan religions replaced the teachings of Jesus and the apostles. Let us be clear that when it comes to the intellectual and theological debates in those early centuries that led to the formulation of the trinity, the true Church of God was largely absent from the scene as it was eventually driven underground. For this reason, in that stormy period we often see debates not between truth and error, but between one error and a different error.

*****This is a fact seldom recognized by many modern scholars as they are mesmerised by the Trinitarian doctrine.*****

A classic example of this was the dispute over the nature of Christ that led the Roman emperor Constantine the Great to convene the Council of Nicea (in modern-day western Turkey) in 325 A.D. Constantine, although held by many to be the first Christian Roman Emperor, was actually a sun worshiper who was only baptized on his deathbed. During his reign he had his eldest son and his wife murdered. He was also vehemently anti-Semitic, referring in one of his edicts to “the detestable Jewish crowd” and “the customs of these most wicked men,” customs that were in fact rooted in the Bible and practiced by Jesus and the apostles who were Jews. Many are also unaware that Jews are non-Trinitarian and always have been! So what does that mean in relation to Jesus and the apostles?

As emperor in a period of great tumult within the Roman Empire, Constantine was challenged with keeping the empire unified. He recognized the value of religion in uniting his empire. This was in fact one of his primary motivations in accepting and sanctioning the “Christian” religion which, by this time, had drifted far from the teachings of Jesus Christ and the apostles and was Christian in name only.

But now Constantine faced a new challenge. Religion researcher Karen Armstrong explains in A History of God that “one of the first problems that had to be solved was the doctrine of God ... a new danger arose from within which split Christians into bitterly warring camps.” — (1993, p. 106)

**Athanasius versus Arius at the Council of Nicea**

Constantine convened the Council of Nicea in the year 325 A.D. as much for political reasons for unity in the empire as religious ones. The primary issue at that time came to be known as the Arian controversy.

“*In the hope of securing for his throne the support of the growing body of Christians he had shown them considerable favor and it was to his interest to have the church vigorous and united. The Arian controversy was threatening its unity and menacing its strength. He therefore undertook to put an end to the trouble. It was suggested to him, perhaps by the Spanish bishop Hosius, who was influential at court, that if a synod were to meet representing the whole church both east and west, it might be possible to restore harmony. Constantine himself of course neither knew nor cared anything about the matter in dispute but he was eager to bring the controversy to a close, and Hosius' advice appealed to him as sound.*” — (Arthur Cushman McGiffert, A History of Christian Thought, 1954, Vol. 1, p. 258)
Arius was a priest from Alexandria in Egypt who supposedly taught that Christ, because He was the Son of God, must have had a beginning and therefore was created or established. Further, if Jesus was the Son, the Father of necessity must be older. Opposing the teachings of Arius was Athanasius, a deacon also from Alexandria. His view was an early form of Trinitarianism wherein the Father, Son and Holy Spirit were one but at the same time distinct from each other.

The decision as to which view the Church council would accept was to a large extent arbitrary. Karen Armstrong explains in *A History of God*, “When the bishops gathered at Nicaea on May 20, 325, to resolve the crisis, very few would have shared Athanasius's view of Christ. Most held a position midway between Athanasius and Arius.” — (p. 110)

As emperor, Constantine was in the unusual position of deciding Church doctrine even though he was not really a Christian. (The following year is when he had both his wife and son murdered)

Historian Henry Chadwick attests, “Constantine, like his father, worshipped the Unconquered Sun.” — (*The Early Church*, 1993, p. 122). As to the emperor's embrace of Christianity, Chadwick admits, “His conversion should not be interpreted as an inward experience of grace ... It was a military matter. His comprehension of Christian doctrine was never very clear.” (p. 125)

Chadwick does say that Constantine's deathbed baptism itself “implies no doubt about his Christian belief,” it being common for rulers to put off baptism to avoid accountability for things like torture and executing criminals (p. 127). But this justification doesn't really help the case for the emperor's conversion being genuine.

Norbert Brox, a professor of Church history confirms that Constantine was never actually a converted Christian, “Constantine did not experience any conversion; there are no signs of a change of faith in him. He never said of himself that he had turned to another god ... At the time when he turned to Christianity, for him this was Sol Invictus (the victorious sun god).” — (*A Concise History of the Early Church*, 1996, p. 48)

When it came to the Nicene Council, *The Encyclopaedia Britannica* states, “Constantine himself presided, actively guiding the discussions, and personally proposed ... the crucial formula expressing the relation of Christ to God in the creed issued by the council ... Overawed by the emperor, the bishops, with two exceptions only, signed the creed, many of them much against their inclination.” — (1971 edition, Vol. 6, “Constantine,” p. 386)

With the emperor's approval, the Council rejected the minority view of Arius and, having nothing definitive with which to replace it, approved the view of Athanasius which was also a minority view. The Church was left in the odd position of officially supporting, from that point forward, the decision made at Nicea to endorse a belief held by only a minority of those attending. Constantine is also believed to have exiled those who refused to accept the Nicean creed being Arius himself, the deacon Euzoios and the Libyan bishops Theonas of Marmarica and Secundus of Ptolemais. He also exiled the bishops who signed the creed but refused to join in the condemnation of Arius, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicea. However, there is no evidence that Constantius II who was his son and successor was exiled for being an Arian Christian. The Emperor also ordered all copies of the Thalia to be burned, which was the book in which Arius expressed his teachings. The groundwork for official acceptance of the trinity was now laid, but it had taken more than three centuries after Jesus Christ's death and resurrection for this unbiblical teaching to emerge!
Several years later Constantine became more lenient toward those he had condemned and exiled at the council. First he allowed Eusebius of Nicomedia to return who was a protégé of his sister, and then Theognis once he had signed an ambiguous statement of faith. These two and other friends of Arius worked towards getting Arius returned. In 335 A.D. they brought accusations against Athanasius and so Constantine now had Athanasius banished! In the same year, the Synod of Jerusalem under Constantine's direction readmitted Arius to communion in 336 A.D. Arius however died on the way. Some scholars suggest that Arius was poisoned by his opponents. Eusebius and Theognis remained in the Emperor's favour and when Constantine accepted baptism on his deathbed, it was performed by Eusebius of Nicomedia.


**An Attempt to Cover Up History**

Note that all references to Arius presented outside of this section is the generally accepted historical view. But there is more to the generally accepted historical view that has been covered up as you are about to see.

Those who understand how the Papal Church came to rule for 1260 years known as the dark ages also know they had to uproot three opposing kingdoms. But did you ever notice that these were all Arian tribes? We know Athanasius taught the unbiblical pagan view, and that the Catholic Church is known for casting truth to the ground as explained in scripture, so it would certainly make sense that the Arians actually had Biblical truth and explains why these Arian tribes were all destroyed.

“The three divisions which were plucked up were the Heruli in 493, the Vandals in 534, and the Ostrogoths in 538 A.D. Justinian, the emperor, whose seat was at Constantinople, working through the general Belisarius, was the power which overthrew the three kingdoms represented by the three horns, and the reason for their overthrow was their adherence to Arianism in opposition to the orthodox Catholic faith. The details of the overthrow, and the religious controversy which was the root of the trouble, are fully given by Gibbon in the “Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.” — (S.N. Haskell, *The Story of Daniel the Prophet*, p. 117, 1908) Further, “The contest between Arianism and the orthodox Catholicism was the means of enthroning the papacy.” — (Ibid, p. 266)

Ever since the inception of the trinity doctrine into Christianity in the 4th century, in one way or another, Trinitarians have consistently persecuted those who did not hold to the trinity faith. They generally regarded them as heretics and the record of Christian history shows this and it is still happening today! So what spirit is behind persecution?

*****I have seen non-Trinitarians falsely accused of teaching that Christ was created as a means to discredit them. I have found that when the accusers are corrected, they still continue to say the same thing even though they know it is not true. This of course is dishonest and so can only be a deliberate attempt at discrediting non-Trinitarians. So did this same thing happen to Arius? Were rumours started to say that he taught Christ was created when in fact he did not, and was it just a means of discrediting him to help the pagan doctrine of the trinity take hold?*****
“His [Arius’] book, ‘Thalia,’ was burnt on the spot; and this example was so generally followed, that it became a very rare work.” — Stanley ‘History of the Eastern Church,’ Lecture iv, par. 39. The decree banishing Arius was shortly so modified as simply to prohibit his returning to Alexandria.” — (The Two Republics, A.T. Jones, p. 351)

The Catholic Church exerted all her power to destroy any records of what Arius believed. The only records we have are those that either fell through the hands of the Catholic power, or those which they have chosen to keep, whether in their original form or altered by them.

“An erroneous charge was circulated that all who were called Arians believed that Christ was a created being. [Footnote: It is doubtful if many believed Christ to be a created being. Generally, those evangelical bodies who opposed the papacy and who were branded as Arians confessed both the divinity of Christ and that He was **begotten**, not **created**, by the Father. They recoiled from other extreme deductions and speculations concerning the Godhead.]” — (Benjamin G. Wilkinson, Truth Triumphant, p. 92)

“In 538 A.D, the Arian believers were completely wiped out (murdered) by the Catholic Church, leaving the Papacy as the sole “Corrector of heretics.” Anyone opposing the Catholic teaching of the trinity was exterminated, for “the Mystery of the Trinity is the central doctrine of the Catholic Faith.” — (Handbook for Today's Catholic, p. 11)

So how was the trinity doctrine finally established? Was it through careful study of the Scriptures by all parties to establish what the truth was? No! It happened through decades of persecution and bloodshed and by the Papal Church murdering the three Arian tribes that opposed them!

*****The trinity view was won by taking out (murdering) the opposition.*****

**Does History Reveal Who Taught Biblical Truth?**

It is interesting that the history of the Arian controversy has been so well hidden that it is hard to determine just what Arius believed. Yet it seems doubtful that all the accusations brought against Arius and those of like persuasion are accurate. It had become the general rule to brand all those who did not subscribe to the trinity doctrine as Arians. Since it is commonly thought that Arians believe that Christ is a created being, and thus not divine, it has been the continual accusation that if you deny the trinity doctrine, you believe that Christ is a created being, and deny the divinity of Christ.

This accusation, when applied to those who dissented from the accepted teachings of the Catholic Church on this subject, has seldom been accurate. I have very reluctantly quoted mainstream history elsewhere in this document but I think other historical evidence reveals the real truth. Looking at the background of Athanasius and Arius for example sheds a lot of light.
Since the trinity doctrine belongs to Satan, then we can expect him to do all he can to protect his counterfeit. That would mean hiding any false teaching from Athanasius but doing all he can to condemn Arius by having history altered, spreading false rumours and destroying what Arius did believe, which we know was actually done. The Catholic Church are known experts at this. Since Satan has this base covered, what one can do instead is look at the people Athanasius and Arius received their education from and see what they taught and then the truth becomes very clear.

Athanasius (296-373) who came up with the Catholic Trinitarian view was very strongly influenced by the writings of Origen (184-254) who was a Greek philosopher and theologian who reinterpreted Christian doctrine through the philosophy of neo-platonism. When he taught, he wore the pagan robes of the pagan philosopher. He castrated himself in a lecture in front of his students based on his Gnostic views of the evil of the flesh among other strange practices. Origen also wrote that the creation account in Genesis is a fictitious story. His work was later condemned as unorthodox. Arius (250-336) on the other hand was a student of Lucian of Antioch (240-312). Lucian was responsible for producing what is known as the Textus Receptus that was later restored by Erasmus, and is what gave us the trusted New Testament of the KJV Bible.

This excerpt speaks volumes. “Unlike Origen, Athanasius's reputation is unsullied in all major branches of Christendom. Although some of his opinions turned out to be heretical by later standards of orthodoxy, he was never condemned or even harshly criticized.” — (Roger Olson, The Story of Christian Theology, p. 162)

So what was Satan's goal? Make sure the truth is discredited and that those teaching his counterfeit can do no wrong.

The following author states that the influence of Origen on the writings of Athanasius is seen throughout his work. “That being said, Athanasius is applying these standard arguments to a more highly developed neo-Platonist philosophy and a more cultural diverse society than any previous theologian had faced. Still, the influence of Origen is felt throughout the work, particularly in Athanasius' opening statements about the existence (or rather, non-existence) of evil and the refutation of various dualistic cosmologies.” — (Critique of Athanasius Two Books against the Heathens, Jonathan Shelley)

There can be no doubt that Athanasius incorporated neo-platonism into his works and was greatly influenced by Plato, Origen and Greek philosophy rather than following the true meaning of Scripture. Origen was a student of the humanistic philosophies of Plato, Aristotle and Ammonius and he altered the Bible to make God's Word say what he wanted it to say. Origen was also a student of Clement of Alexandria who sought to combine Greek philosophy with Christianity as many religions do today corrupting Christianity by combining it with pagan ideas. (See George E. Karamanolis, Plato and Aristotle in Agreement, Oxford University Press, 2006, p. 208)

As previously seen, the trinity doctrine is not found in Scripture but it is found in Greek philosophy and paganism. So the trinity was not derived from scripture but was conceived in philosophy and adopted from paganism.

Note the definition of neo-platonism. “1. A philosophical system developed at Alexandria in the third century a.d. by Plotinus and his successors. It is based on Platonism with elements of mysticism and some Judaic and Christian concepts and posits a single source
from which all existence emanates and with which an individual soul can be mystically united.”—(TheFreeDictionary)

James Strong who wrote the famous Strong's Concordance stated, “Towards 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.” —(Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, 1891, Vol. 10, “Trinity,” p. 553)

Almost two thousand years ago Origen wrote, “Could any man of sound judgment suppose that the first, second, and third days (of creation) had an evening and a morning, when there were as yet no sun or moon or stars? Could anyone be so unintelligent as to think that God made a paradise somewhere in the east and planted it with trees, like a farmer, or that in that paradise he put a tree of life, a tree you could see and know with your senses, a tree you could derive life from by eating its fruit with the teeth in your head? When the Bible says that God used to walk in paradise in the evening or that Adam hid behind a tree, no one, I think, will question that these are only fictitious stories of things that never actually happened, and that figuratively they refer to certain mysteries.” —(Tadros Y. Malaty, Before Origen, p. 134)

Origen also “believed the Holy Spirit was a feminine force, that Jesus was only a created being and Gnosticism taught that Jesus became Christ at his baptism but that he was never God. He was a just a good man with very high morals. He believed in the doctrine of Purgatory, transubstantiation, transmigration of the soul and reincarnation of the soul. He doubted the temptations of Jesus in Scripture and claimed they could have never happened. The Scriptures were not literal. Genesis 1-3 was a myth, not historical or literal, as there was no actual person named “Adam.” Based upon Matthew 19, a true man of God should be castrated, which he did to himself. He taught eternal life was not a gift, instead one must grab hold of it and retain it. Christ enters no man until they mentally grasp the understanding of the consummation of the ages. He taught there would be no physical resurrection of the believers.” — (See Dr. Ken Matto, Origen's Gnostic Belief System)

Origen's belief system clearly indicates that he was a Gnostic Greek Philosopher and not a true child of God.

*****Now on the opposite side let's look at how much influence Lucian had on the teachings of Arius and if he was grounded in the Word.*****

“The leaders in the Arian movement (Arius himself, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris and Theognis) received their training under Lucian and always venerated him as their master and the founder of their system.” — (New World Encyclopedia, Lucian of Antioch)

It was Antioch where Lucian was taught to love and obey God's Word as a child and is also where the disciples were first called Christians. (Acts 11:26) As a young man he became aware of disturbing news from the Roman Churches in the West. Two movements were forming within the early Christian Church. The Churches in Rome looked to the famous college at Alexandria for spiritual guidance, while the Syrian's trusted their leaders in Antioch to guide them.

*****Lucian taught that the Church must choose obedience to the Bible rather than allowing man made traditions to creep into worship.*****
“Lucian quickly discerned that there were two movements taking shape in Christendom, one loose in doctrine and affiliating itself with heathenism, the other based on the deep foundations of the Christian faith.” — (Benjamin G. Wilkinson, *Truth Triumphant*, p. 46).

****It was Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Athanasius who were affiliating themselves with heathenism and hence came the doctrine of the trinity. Lucian on the other hand was the other based on the deep foundations of the Christian faith that produced the Textus Receptus which gave us the trusted New Testament of the KJV Bible.****

“The Alexandria catechetical school, which revered Clement of Alexandria and Origen, the greatest theologian 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 [pagan] theological speculations. Athanasius and the three Cappadocians [the men whose Trinitarian views were adopted by the Catholic Church at the Councils of Nicaea and Constantinople] had been included among its members.” — (Hubert Jedin, *Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church: an Historical Outline*, 1960, p. 28)

When Babylon was conquered in 538 B.C, the Babylonian pagan priests went to Rome and Alexandria and took their pagan teachings with them. It was about 200 B.C. when the Jews began sending their best scholars to Alexandria, but they were introduced to many pagan teachings. Hebrew students were taught to accept man made traditions and to look for mystical meanings in Scripture rather than accept the plain teachings of the Bible.

****Lucian was aware that the Jewish leaders rejected Jesus as their Messiah because of their faulty teaching in Alexandria.****

“Lucian believed in the literal sense of the biblical text and emphasized the need for textual accuracy. Lucian undertook to revise the Septuagint based on the original Hebrew. By comparing the Greek text with Hebrew grammatical styles, and giving priority to the literal sense, Lucian sought to limit the symbolical interpretation characteristic of the Alexandrian (Egyptian) allegorical tradition which incorporated pagan philosophy into Christianity. Lucian's influence permanently oriented Christian theology towards historical realism in its debate with classical non-Christian thought.” — (New World Encyclopedia, Lucian of Antioch)

Satan had success in changing the Jewish Church and now plotted to use the school at Alexandria to destroy the Christian Church. Two well known teachers at Alexandria, Clement of Alexandria and his famous pupil Origen taught students how to allegorize the Bible. For example, they made people, cities or stories in the Bible represent something else.

****Lucian knew that accepting Clement's and Origen's way of interpreting Scripture would change the meaning of Scripture and would result in the truths of the Bible being changed by human reasoning and tradition.****

“The Alexandrines incorporated Greek Pagan philosophical beliefs from Plato's teachings into Christianity (Neoplatonism), and interpreted much of the Bible allegorically, ... Lucian rejected this system entirely and propounded a system of literal interpretation that dominated the Eastern Church for a long period.” — (New World Encyclopedia, Lucian of Antioch)

****Lucian would not compromise with the man made changes Alexandria and Rome were bringing into Christianity. Knowing that Christians must have nothing to do with these pagan practices, Lucian began a college in Antioch which would give young people
a true Biblical foundation. Now early Christianity had two rival cities; Alexandria being a powerful center for Satan's errors, and Antioch being the protector of true Christianity.

So unlike Origen and Athanasius, Lucian followed Scripture only and was well aware of the problems with Greek philosophy and paganism. Being strongly opposed, Lucian tried to counteract what was happening. Because Antioch was on the border between Rome and Persia, news and culture steadily streamed in. Lucian saw that “the churches of Rome and Alexandria had entered into an alliance. Alexandria had, for more than two centuries before Christ, been the real capital of the Jews who were compromising with paganism.” — (Benjamin G. Wilkinson, Truth Triumphant, p. 47)

*****From the history of the Jewish nation Lucian could see the effect of accepting the Greek education taught in Alexandria. It was because of their acceptance of Greek culture that the Jews were unprepared to accept Christ.*****

“The church at Alexandria was in this atmosphere. The city of Rome had been for seven hundred years, and was still to be for some time, the world capital of paganism. This environment greatly influenced the church at Rome. Lucian grew up in the churches of Syria and of the Near East, which were modeled after the churches of Judea. Lucian founded a college at Antioch which strove to counteract the dangerous ecclesiastical alliance between Rome and Alexandria.” — (Ibid)

*****The graduates from Lucian's school were solid Bible students. Their goal was to share with others the peace and joy they had received from accepting Jesus into their heart. Pagan superstitions were swept away as faith in God produced transformed followers of Christ. We owe a lot to Lucian who resulted in the true gospel spreading through the world. (However as we are learning, error crept in.)*****

Students at Lucian's college also received training in trades and occupations including foreign languages, the sciences and medicine. Antioch became world famous for its medical school and students were skilled in all branches of natural healing. Because of their excellent education, students were hired for important jobs with government officials and even royalty. God blessed them with remarkable occupational success.

*****But Lucian's greatest gift to Protestant history was his editing of the Textus Receptus. Lucian took all the manuscripts that were known to the early Christians and compiled them together into the New Testament.*****

Dr B. G. Wilkinson states that “The Protestant denominations are built upon that manuscript of the Greek New Testament, sometimes called the Textus Receptus, or Received Text. It is that Greek New Testament from which the writings of the apostles have been translated into the various languages. During the Dark Ages, the Received Text was practically unknown... It was restored to Christendom by the labors of that great scholar, Erasmus. However, neither Lucian nor Erasmus, but rather the apostles wrote the Greek New Testament.” — (Benjamin G. Wilkinson, Truth Triumphant, p. 50)

“Lucian had an enduring influence on Biblical textual study and is known for his critical revision of the text of the Septuagint and the Greek New Testament. Basing his revision on the original Hebrew, Lucian emphasized the need for textual accuracy and sought to limit the allegorical interpretation of the Alexandrian Christian tradition, which incorporated pagan philosophy. Lucian’s edition contributed significantly to the Syrian recension, that was used
by Chrysostom and the later Greek fathers, and became the basis of the textus receptus from which most of the Reformation era New Testament translations were made. Lucian's rationalist approach permanently oriented Christian theology towards historical realism.” — (New World Encyclopedia, Lucian of Antioch)

*****The Textus Receptus from Lucian is also called the Majority Text because it was based on the majority (90%) of the 5000 plus Greek manuscripts in existence. It did not have material added, removed or modified as did the Minority Text.*****

Origen however also made translations and commentaries of the Bible. But these were written in a way that allowed many errors to be introduced into Christianity.

“Origen... denied the deity of Christ, teaching that Jesus was a lesser, created god. He and other false teachers who did not confess the Lord Jesus Christ set to mutilating the Alexandrian group of manuscripts, 'editing,' omitting, and changing passages of Scripture. The Alexandrian texts underlying the modern Bible versions are based on these corrupted manuscripts.” — (Matthew Brill, Evangelism Expounded, WinePress Publishing, 2011, pp. 113-114)

“Origen, being the textual critic, is supposed to have corrected numerous portions of the sacred manuscripts. Evidence to the contrary shows that he changed them to agree with his human philosophy of mystical and allegorical ideas. Thus, through deceptive scholarship of this kind, certain manuscripts became corrupt.” — (Les Garrett, Which Bible Can We Trust, Prophecy Club, 1998)

There is an explosion of new Bibles today. However, very few use the Textus Receptus as the basis for their translations as the King James Version has. These modern translations come from the Greek text produced by Wescott and Hort who used the Codex Sinaiticus, which has 14800 edits which is more than any other manuscript in Biblical history. The other is the Codex Vaticanus which comes from the Vatican and is claimed to be older than what was used by the reformers.

*****However, it is said that most of it has been overwritten by a fifteenth century scribe, and we know what that means when it comes from the Papacy! Satan is doing everything he can to lead people away from God and has found a very clever way to give us something that looks like Scripture but actually contains some of his lies in place of God's truths. History is very clear and leaves no doubt that God used Lucian of Antioch for many very important works and that he played a major role in keeping God's true Church alive, though it was eventually driven underground.*****

But Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Athanasius are major figures in the origins of the Apostate Church that persecuted the Christian saints through the dark ages. God calls this Apostate Church Babylon with very good reason. What are two of the biggest errors they introduced in opposition to the Word of God? Sunday worship and the trinity doctrine that both originated from sun and Satan worship in Babylon.

It is clear that Lucian was part of God's true Church and those who studied under him and called him master were no doubt also. This as you have seen includes Arius.
So Arius who studied under the Biblical teachings of Lucian of Antioch who was opposed to Greek philosophy is almost certainly the one who had Biblical truth and was deliberately discredited just as Trinitarians do to non-Trinitarians today.

Origen on the other hand who Athanasius learned from was definitely influenced by Greek and Platonic philosophy and reinterpreted Christian doctrine through the philosophy of Neoplatonism. So these facts also verify that the trinity doctrine came from paganism and Greek philosophy. The weight of evidence is overwhelming.

Those who understand Bible prophecy also know from history and the following verse that God's true Church was hiding in the wilderness from Papal persecution for 1260 years called the dark ages.

“And the woman [God's true Church] fled into the wilderness, where she has a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days [1260 years on the day for a year rule].” Revelation 12:6. Parentheses are added.

*****The Papal Church ruling instituted and enforced the trinity doctrine, but the true Church hiding in the wilderness was non-Trinitarian. So Scripture and history reveal the non-Trinitarian view is correct. You cannot be the true Church if you are teaching serious error on the Godhead!****

“No wonder that the Celtic, the Gothic, the Waldensian, the Armenian Churches, and the great Church of the East, as well as other bodies, differed profoundly from the papacy in its metaphysical conceptions of the Trinity and consequently in the importance of the Ten Commandments.” — (Truth Triumphant, Church in the Wilderness, B.G. Wilkinson, Ch. 7, pp. 87-88)

**Debate Not Ended by the Nicean Council**

The Council of Nicea did not end the controversy. Karen Armstrong explains, “Athenasius managed to impose his theology on the delegates ... with the emperor breathing down their necks ...

“The show of agreement pleased Constantine, who had no understanding of the theological issues, but in fact there was no unanimity at Nicaea. After the council, the bishops went on teaching as they had before, and the Arian crisis continued for another sixty years. Arius and his followers fought back and managed to regain imperial favor. Athanasius was exiled no fewer than five times. It was very difficult to make his creed stick.” — (pp. 110-111)

So after Constantine's death in 337 A.D. disputes continued. Constantine's son Constantius II who had become Emperor of the eastern part of the Empire encouraged the Arians and set out to reverse the Nicene creed. His advisor in these affairs was Eusebius of Nicomedia who had already at the Council of Nicea been the head of the Arian party and who was also made bishop of Constantinople. Constantius used his power to exile bishops that followed the Nicene creed and especially Athanasius who fled to Rome. In 355 A.D. Constantius became the sole Emperor and extended his pro-Arian policy toward the western provinces. The continuing debates resulted in numerous synods. Among them was the Council of Sardica in 343 A.D, the Council of Sirmium in 358 A.D. and the double Council of Rimini and Seleucia in 359 A.D. There were no fewer than fourteen further creed formulas between 340 and 360 A.D.
So the fires of this Godhead quarrel burned brightly for over fifty years. From 351 to 360 A.D, Emperor Constantius (son of Constantine) convened no fewer than nine councils of bishops for the sole purpose of trying to settle them to no avail. After the death of Constantius in 361 A.D, his successor Julian who was a devotee of Rome's pagan gods declared that he would no longer favor one church faction over another and allowed all exiled bishops to return. This resulted in further increasing dissension among Christians. The Emperor Valens however revived Constantius' policy and supported the “Homoian” party exiling bishops. During this persecution many bishops were exiled to the other ends of the Empire.

The ongoing disagreements were at times violent and bloody. Of the aftermath of the Council of Nicea, noted historian Will Durant writes, “Probably more Christians were slaughtered by Christians in these two years (342-3) than by all the persecutions of Christians by pagans in the history of Rome.” — (The Story of Civilization, Vol. 4: The Age of Faith, 1950, p. 8). While claiming to be Christian many believers fought and slaughtered one another over their differing views of God!

Of the following decades, Professor Harold Brown writes, “During the middle decades of this century, from 340 to 380, the history of doctrine looks more like the history of court and church intrigues and social unrest... The central doctrines hammered out in this period often appear to have been put through by intrigue or mob violence rather than by the common consent of Christendom led by the Holy Spirit.” (Heresies: Heresy and Orthodoxy in the History of the Church, 2003, p. 119)

**Debate Shifts to the Nature of the Holy Spirit**

The Nicean Council, convened by Emperor Constantine in 325 A.D, did not actually declare the belief in the doctrine of the trinity as it is today. The bishops decided that Jesus is God just as the Father is God, but the creed they adopted did not mention the deity of the Holy Spirit. The statement issued at the Council of Nicea in this regard simply said, “We believe in the Holy Spirit.” This “seemed to have been added to Athanasius's creed almost as an afterthought,” writes Karen Armstrong. “People were confused about the Holy Spirit. Was it simply a synonym for God or was it something more?” — (p. 115) Trinitarian professors Roger Olson and Christopher Hall said, “the Spirit had appeared almost as a footnote to the Creed of Nicea...” — (The Trinity, p. 40) So disagreements soon centered around the nature of the Holy Spirit.

Professor Charles Ryrie writes, “In the second half of the fourth century, three theologians from the province of Cappadocia in eastern Asia Minor [today central Turkey] gave definitive shape to the doctrine of the Trinity.” — (Basic Theology, p. 65). They proposed an idea that was a step beyond Athanasius' view, being that God the Father, Jesus the Son and the Holy Spirit were co-equal and together in one being, yet also distinct from one another. These three men were Basil “the Great” who was bishop of Caesarea (330-379 A.D.), his younger brother Gregory, bishop of Nyssa (335-394 A.D.) and their friend Gregory of Nazianzus (330-390 A.D.), and they were all “trained in Greek philosophy,” (Armstrong, p. 113) which undoubtedly affected their outlook and beliefs. Together they comprised what has come to be known as “the three Cappadocians.”

In the view of these three, as Karen Armstrong explains, “the Trinity only made sense as a mystical or spiritual experience ... It was not a logical or intellectual formulation but an
imaginative paradigm that confounded reason. Gregory of Nazianzus made this clear when he explained that contemplation of the Three in One induced a profound and overwhelming emotion that confounded thought and intellectual clarity.

'No sooner do I conceive of the One than I am illumined by the splendor of the Three; no sooner do I distinguish Three than I am carried back into the One. When I think of any of the Three, I think of him as the whole, and my eyes are filled, and the greater part of what I am thinking escapes me.’” — (p. 117).

So Karen Armstrong concludes, it is little wonder that, “For many Western Christians ... the Trinity is simply baffling.” — (ibid.)

Ongoing Disputes Lead to the Council of Constantinople

It was not until the co-reigns of Gratian and Theodosius that Arianism lost control among the ruling class and elite of the Eastern Empire. Theodosius' wife St Flacilla was also instrumental in his campaign to stop Arianism. Valens died in the Battle of Adrianople in 378 A.D. and was succeeded by Theodosius I who followed the Nicene creed.

On 24 November 380 A.D, two days after Theodosius arrived in Constantinople, he expelled the Homoiousian bishop Demophilus of Constantinople and surrendered the Churches of that city to Gregory of Nazianzus who was the leader of a small Nicene community there. This act provoked rioting. Bishop Acholius of Thessalonica had just baptized Theodosius during a severe illness as was common in the early Christian world. In February he and Gratian had published an edict that all their subjects should profess the faith of the bishops of Rome and Alexandria (i.e., the Nicene faith), or be handed over for punishment for not doing so. [Above information sourced from Sozomen's Church History VII.4]

So what was the significance of Rome and Alexandria? They were the only places in the world where many Christians kept only Sunday and not the true Sabbath. Why? Because this is where the pagan practices of Babylon landed after it was conquered. And what was the dominant pagan practice that the Babylonian priests brought with them? Sun worship which was done on Sun-day! Throughout the entire history of the change of Sabbath to Sunday, Rome and Alexandria had worked together. Alexandria provided the philosophical reasons for the changes and Rome provided the decrees and anathemas.

Church historian Socrates Scholasticus (5th century) wrote: “For although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries [of the Lord's Supper] on the Sabbath of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, have ceased to do this.” — (Socrates Scholasticus, Ecclesiastical History, Book 5, Ch. 22)

So the trinity doctrine and Sunday worship both came from sun and Satan worship that grew in power from the Catholic Church that came from the bishops of Rome and Alexandria. Two pagan practices with the same origin!

In the year 381 A.D. being 44 years after Constantine's death, Emperor Theodosius convened the Council of Constantinople (today Istanbul, Turkey) to put an end to the disputes. Gregory of Nazianzus who was recently appointed as archbishop of Constantinople was to preside over the council to urge the adoption of his view on the Holy Spirit.
Historian Charles Freeman states, “Virtually nothing is known of the theological debates of the council of 381, but Gregory was certainly hoping to get some acceptance of his belief that the Spirit was consubstantial with the Father [meaning that the persons are of the same being, as substance in this context denotes individual quality]. Whether he dealt with the matter clumsily or whether there was simply no chance of consensus, the 'Macedonians,' bishops who refused to accept the full divinity of the Holy Spirit, left the council ... Typically, Gregory berated the bishops for preferring to have a majority rather than simply accepting 'the Divine Word' of the Trinity on his authority.” — (A.D. 381: Heretics, Pagans and the Dawn of the Monotheistic State, 2008, p. 96)

However, Gregory soon became ill and had to withdraw from the council. Who would preside now? “So it was that one Nectarius, an elderly city senator who had been a popular prefect in the city as a result of his patronage of the games, but who was still not a baptized Christian, was selected ... Nectarius appeared to know no theology, and he had to be initiated into the required faith before being baptized and consecrated.” — (Freeman, pp. 97-98)

*****It is absolutely bizarre that a man who up to this point wasn't a Christian was appointed to preside over a major Church council tasked with determining what it would teach regarding the nature of God!*****

The Trinity Becomes Official Doctrine

The teaching of the three Cappadocians “made it possible for the Council of Constantinople (381) to affirm the divinity of the Holy Spirit, which up to that point had nowhere been clearly stated, not even in Scripture.” — (Harper-Collins Encyclopedia of Catholicism, p. 568)

Trinitarian Baptist professor Millard J. Erickson states, “What Athanasius did was to extend his teaching about the Word to the Spirit, so that God exists eternally as a Triad sharing one identical and indivisible substance. The Cappadocians - Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa - developed the doctrine of the Spirit, and thus of the Trinity, further.” — (God In Three Persons, p. 90)

Note that “Although Athanasius prepared the ground, constructive agreement on the central doctrine of the Trinity was not reached in his lifetime (297-373 A.D.)” — (Macropaedia, Vol. 16, p. 319)

Nineteenth century historian Adolph Harnack wrote, “The Cappadocians were still relatively independent theologians, worthy disciples and admirers of Origen, using new forms to make the faith of Athanasius intelligible to contemporary thought, and thus establishing them, though with modifications.” — (History of Dogma, Vol. 3, p. 151)

“Gregory (of Nyssa) was able to demonstrate the application of the incarnation more definitely than Athanasius could... But he does so by the aid of a thoroughly Platonic idea which is only slightly suggested in Athanasius, and is not really covered by Biblical reference.” — (Vol. 3, p. 297)

The council adopted a statement that translates into English as, in part, “We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all ages ... And we believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of life, who
proceeds from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spoke by the prophets ...” The statement also affirmed belief “in one holy, catholic [meaning in this context universal, whole or complete] and apostolic Church ...”

Although much of the Church hierarchy in the East had opposed the Nicene Creed in the decades leading up to Theodosius' accession, he eventually succeeded in achieving unity with the Nicene Creed. With this declaration in 381 A.D. which would become known as the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, the trinity as generally understood today became the official belief and teaching concerning the nature of God. Thus for the first time in history, Christianity had a doctrine of the trinity.

The Platonic beliefs of “the three Cappadocians” had prevailed.

So was Theodosius a Christ-like individual looking for Biblical truth? Or was he a ruthless Emperor who enforced his view and opinion by physical force and persecution? Was he influenced by Scripture or by the bishops of Rome and Alexandria who were steeped in Greek philosophy?

****So had Biblica

I truth prevailed? Not a chance!****

Theology professor Richard Hanson observes that a result of the council's decision “was to reduce the meanings of the word 'God' from a very large selection of alternatives to one only,” such that “when Western man today says 'God' he means the one, sole exclusive [Trinitarian] God and nothing else.” — (Studies in Christian Antiquity, 1985, pp. 243-244)

*****Thus, Emperor Theodosius who himself had been baptized only a year before convening the council was, like Constantine nearly six decades earlier, instrumental in establishing major Church doctrine.*****

As historian Charles Freeman notes, “It is important to remember that Theodosius had no theological background of his own and that he put in place as dogma a formula containing intractable philosophical problems of which he would have been unaware. In effect, the emperor's laws had silenced the debate when it was still unresolved.” — (p. 103)

****It is bad enough that the three-in-one part of the trinity doctrine that came from sun and Satan worship becoming an accepted doctrine by the Church. But now it was decided that the Holy Spirit was a literal being co-equal with the Father and Son by people with little or no knowledge of theology, and three men steeped in Platonic and Greek philosophy! Why should we follow something that could never have been taught by the Apostles or the early Church since this was not decided until 400 hundred years after the cross? How could this be correct when it was never taught before this time? Personally, I would rather establish what the Bible teaches than follow what was decided in some council under such bizarre circumstances. Clearly this has serious issues that no true Christian should ever consider to be the truth of God’s word.*****

There is no Scripture that says the Holy Spirit is God or that the Holy Spirit is a literal being as decided by this council in 381 A.D. And to later justify what was decided by saying that the Holy Spirit can be grieved, so therefore the Spirit of God must be a person is not theology! That is red fire engine logic. That is, fire engines are red, my car is red, therefore my car is a fire engine. What Paul said on the other hand is Biblical, “For who among men
knows the thoughts of a man except the man's spirit within him? In the same way no one knows the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God.” 1 Corinthians 2:11 NIV.

Here Paul likens the spirit of man to the Spirit of God. Just as a man has a spirit, God also has a Spirit in the same manner, and His Spirit is the part of Him associated with the mind, will, and emotions the same as a man. My spirit can also be grieved but that does not make my spirit another person any more than it does God's according to Paul. The only difference as Paul points out is that a man's spirit is within him but the Spirit of God can go anywhere.

As was demonstrated earlier, Quoting Acts 5:3-4 is also red fire engine logic. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God and thus is from God. This is why Peter showed that to lie to the Spirit of God that revealed the deception, is to lie to God Himself and is no different.

*****A true Christian studies and follows the Word of God. Not put their trust in man, let alone men with little or no theological knowledge and then later search the Scriptures to see what can be found to match their chosen belief.*****

Other Beliefs About the Nature of God Banned

Now that a decision had been reached, Theodosius would tolerate no dissenting views. He issued his own edict that read, “We now order that all churches are to be handed over to the bishops who profess Father, Son and Holy Spirit of a single majesty, of the same glory, of one splendor, who establish no difference by sacrilegious separation, but (who affirm) the order of the Trinity by recognizing the Persons and uniting the Godhead.” — (Richard Rubenstein, When Jesus Became God, 1999, p. 223)

Another edict from Theodosius went further in demanding adherence to the new teaching, “Let us believe the one deity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, in equal majesty and in a holy Trinity. We authorize the followers of this law to assume the title of Catholic Christians; but as for the others, since, in our judgement, they are foolish madmen, we decree that they shall be branded with the ignominious name of heretics, and shall not presume to give their conventicles [assemblies] the name of churches. They will suffer in the first place the chastisement of the divine condemnation, and the second the punishment which our authority, in accordance with the will of Heaven, shall decide to inflict.” — (Documents of the Christian Church, Henry Bettenson, editor, 1967, p. 22)

*****Thus we see a teaching forced onto the Church that was foreign to Christ, never taught by the apostles and unknown to the other Biblical writers, was locked into place and the true Biblical revelation about the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit was permanently locked out. Those who agreed with the decision of Emperor Theodosius were considered Catholics. But anyone who disagreed was in accordance with the edicts of the emperor and Church authorities branded a heretic and dealt with accordingly (murdered). If this was done today in this manner, would you accept it?*****

The Trinity Doctrine was then decided by Trial and Error

This unusual chain of events is why theology professors Anthony and Richard Hanson would summarize the story in their book Reasonable Belief: A Survey of the Christian Faith by noting that the adoption of the trinity doctrine came as a result of “a process of theological exploration which lasted at least three hundred years ... In fact it was a process of trial and error (almost of hit and miss), in which the error was by no means all confined
to the unorthodox ... It would be foolish to represent the doctrine of the Holy Trinity as having been achieved by any other way.” — (1980, p. 172)

They then conclude, “This was a long, confused, process whereby different schools of thought in the Church worked out for themselves, and then tried to impose on others, their answer to the question, 'How divine is Jesus Christ?' ... If ever there was a controversy decided by the method of trial and error, it was this one.” — (p. 175)

Anglican churchman and Oxford University lecturer K. E. Kirk writes on the adoption of the trinity doctrine, “The theological and philosophical vindication of the divinity of the Spirit begins in the fourth century; we naturally turn to the writers of that period to discover what grounds they have for their belief. To our surprise, we are forced to admit that they have none ...

This failure of Christian theology ... to produce logical justification of the cardinal point in its trinitarian doctrine is of the greatest possible significance. We are forced, even before turning to the question of the vindication of the doctrine by experience, to ask ourselves whether theology or philosophy has ever produced any reasons why its belief should be Trinitarian.” — (The Evolution of the Doctrine of the Trinity, published in Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation, A.E.J. Rawlinson, editor, 1928, pp. 221-222)

This in brief is the amazing story of how the doctrine of the trinity came to be introduced and how those who refused to accept it came to be branded as heretics or unbelievers and were tortured and murdered.

*****So should we base our view of God on a doctrine that is not spelled out in the Bible, that was not formalized until three centuries after the time of Jesus Christ and the apostles, that was debated and argued for decades (not to mention for centuries since), that was imposed by religious councils presided over by novices or nonbelievers and that was “decided by the method of trial and error” and a lot of bloodshed? I pray that the answer is obvious to all.*****

Here is a brief summary of the pagan origin of the trinity doctrine.

1. The three in one trinity doctrine originated from paganism with the worship of the sun and Satan at Babel.

2. Paganism entered the Church at Rome during the early centuries, including the heathen teachings about God. As a result, the heathen trinity was brought into the Catholic Church. Over the years it took on many forms.

3. The Catholic Church officially condemned the heathen trinity of Modalistic Monarchianism and Sabbellianism in 264 A.D. at Antioch. Many Catholics have continued to teach this form of heathenism down through the years. (Some Protestant Christians still teach this form of the heathen trinity)

4. The Council of Nicea in 325 A.D. deliberately condemned the Arians for believing that Jesus had a beginning, without regard as to whether He was created or begotten. The decision of the council was that Christ was eternally begotten, without beginning. Arius said this made Christ the “unbegotten begotten One,” which was a contradiction of terms.

5. Emperor Theodosius the Great convened the Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D. to affirm the divinity of the Holy Spirit, which up to that point had nowhere been
clearly stated, not even in Scripture. It was decided by people with little or no knowledge of theology and “the three Cappadocians” that the Holy Spirit was a literal being, co-equal and co-eternal with the Father and Son. Those disagreeing were branded as foolish madmen and heretics and were dealt with accordingly. It was in this year (381 A.D.) that the doctrine of the trinity was fully established.

6. After the passing of the Nicene Creed, the Arians were proscribed. The uprooting of the three horns on the head of the fourth beast of Daniel 7 eradicated the Arians by force. In 538 A.D. the last of the three horns was uprooted, giving the Papacy full dominion over the Churches.

7. The debate over the trinity doctrine continued on until the 6th century until it was firmly established as Papal dogma.

Seventh day Adventists and quite a few other denominations who understand the identity of antichrist also know that the Papacy has continually cast the truth to the ground. (Daniel 8:12) So the pagan doctrine of the trinity as well as Sunday keeping was passed on to all the new Protestant Churches that began from the Protestant Reformation, and remains with the majority today. Arius almost definately did not teach that Christ was created, but taught Biblical truth and so what he taught was truth cast to the ground by the Papal Church as Scripture states.
More than 15 years after Ellen White had “supposedly” become a Trinitarian, she states that Jesus was the “divine” Son of God before He was born in Bethlehem. Woodrow Whidden on the other hand who is one of the authors of the book “The Trinity” believes that words such as “Father”, “Son”, “Son of God”, “first born”, “only begotten”, “the only true God”, “one God the Father” etc. in Scripture are all just figurative and metaphorical. That makes a mockery of several hundred verses in the Bible! **If you cannot take these words as being literal then you cannot take anything in the Bible as being literal, and so you may as well discard the entire Bible as a bad joke!**

****If you cannot see the deception in this example of the implications of the trinity doctrine and how it denies the Father and Son then you will never see it and are a blind leader of the blind both falling into the ditch of deception placed by the enemy of our sole (Satan) and you are unfortunately lost, fallen from grace.****

**Who Receives the Worship?**

When Christians are asked if they believe in the trinity, they often say yes without even knowing exactly what it is. And most also say that it does not really matter anyway as it is not a salvation issue. **But that could not be further from the truth and if we truly love the Lord then we should want to know anyway.** As seen earlier, John called those teaching that all three are one were antichrist. Are those John calls antichrist saved? Not likely! Many serious problems arise from not knowing as we have seen already, but the following is one of the worst. Seventh day Adventists are most easily misled here because when informed of the truth, they typically turn to the internet where they eventually find a handful of easily misunderstood quotes by Ellen White, which were compiled by LeRoy Froom with the deliberate intent to deceive. Without even checking what the Bible says, they put their trust in these misunderstood quotes and never look deeper, or examine her other writings to see what she really meant. **Some have the mentality that their Church could never be wrong. What a tragic mistake.**

Reading Revelation chapters 13 and 14 we find that the **mark of the beast** is about who we worship. Isaiah 14:12-14 says that Satan desires to be worshipped as God. But if Satan asked you to worship him, would you do it? Of course not. And Satan of course knows this. So Satan gets himself a front man and props him up so when they are worshipped, he receives worship by proxy. This is called worship by representation. There are two ways Satan does this with Christians and both come from sun worship, which as you have already seen is really the worship of Satan.

**The first way is through Sunday worship.**

For those who are unaware, Scripture informs us that the Lord's Sabbath is a sign that it is God we worship and God who sanctifies us when we keep His Seventh day Holy. Revelation 13:2 says Satan gave his power, throne and great authority to the first beast which is the Papal Church system. So when this beast power is being worshipped, who is really being worshipped? Satan himself! So where does worship come into this? By Satan through the Catholic Church implementing his own day of worship being Sunday. That is, Sunday worship that evolved from sun worship.

**The second way is by worship of the Holy Spirit as a non-existent literal being, and so Satan steps in to receive this worship by representation once again.**
This was something he put in place a long time ago in 381 A.D. as we have just seen. The Bible never teaches that the Holy Spirit is God or that the Holy Spirit should be prayed to or worshipped, and yet the Catholic Church does this. Today there are more and more from other denominations now doing the same. Just recently some Adventists are now teaching we should pray to the Holy Spirit. Yet we are only supposed to worship God through His Son.

Jerry Moon from the Seventh day Adventist theological seminary, who is one of the authors of the book The Trinity, first says in this book, “In the spirit of the pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist church, the authors of this book firmly hold the following conviction: if we cannot support any teaching biblically, we do not want it.” — (The Trinity, p. 10) “We will be very candid with our readers—if it is not biblical we do not want it, even if the vast majority of authorities in the religious world endorse it (including Adventist pioneers and the theologians of 'Babylon').” — (The Trinity, p.11)

*****Considering the last bracketed statement, why is there a triquetra on the front cover and even worse, with three fiery rings? What do they represent? The theologians of Babylon of course are the pagan sun worshippers, where astrology originated from!*****

Next we have an interesting confession that we have already seen many times from other writers and historians, “The only way for the pioneers in their context to effectively separate Scripture from tradition was to abandon every doctrine not clearly supported from the Bible alone. Thus they initially rejected the traditional doctrine of the Trinity, which clearly contained elements not evident in Scripture.” — (The Trinity, p. 202)

So the authors say that “if it is not Biblical we do not want it” as they clearly state more than once. And yet below they say that even if there is no Biblical support for it, as long as it seems logical it is okay! “But what about direct prayer to the Holy Spirit? While we have no clear example of or direct command to pray to the Spirit in Scripture, doing so does have, in principle, some implicit biblical support. . . . it only seems logical that God's people can pray directly to and worship the Holy Spirit.” — (The Trinity, pp. 272-273, Emphasis).

*****Is this one reason that the trinity doctrine is now accepted by so many Churches? Even if it is not evident in Scripture, as long as it seems logical then it is okay. Though I am not sure what is logical about 1+1+1=One!*****
And if you think that Satan is not leading Adventists to start praying to the Holy Spirit then watch this 35 second YouTube video clip. Close the window to return to this page. Did you notice that he says “God the Spirit” which is a Catholic Trinitarian phrase and hence is never found in the Bible which uses the term “Spirit of God” which has a totally different meaning.

Should one trust these authors Of “The Trinity” at all after such major contradictions and unbiblical statements? John W. Reeve being one of the authors is currently a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Notre Dame which is Catholic. And he also teaches at the Seventh day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University. Catholic and Adventist? Does this explain the above problems and why they have a triquetra on the front cover? The black pope did say to bring the Adventist Church over to Rome.

However, here is one statement from Jerry Moon that I do agree with and especially the highlighted red part. “That most of the leading SDA pioneers were non-Trinitarian in their theology has become accepted Adventist history, surprising as it sounded to most Adventists 40 years ago when Erwin R. Gane wrote an M.A. thesis on the topic.” “More recently, a further question has arisen with increasing urgency: was the pioneers’ belief about the Godhead right or wrong? “As one line of reasoning goes, either the pioneers were wrong and the present church is right, or the pioneers were right and the present Seventh-day Adventist Church has apostatized from biblical truth.” — (Jerry Moon, The Trinity, Chapter, Trinity and antitrinitarianism in Seventh-day Adventist history, p. 190)

*****Seventh day Adventists were once non-Trinitarians but one man managed to slowly get this counterfeit doctrine into their Church. Adventists are aware of the Sabbath deception but most are totally ignorant of the trinity deception. Some Adventists who have discovered this deception have formed their own ministries such as the people responsible for the videos linked on this page. The Adventist Church before they accepted the trinity doctrine was as close to Biblical truth as one can ever be and one can learn a lot from them and especially on Bible prophecy.*****

I strongly suggest taking advantage of their knowledge in this area. See the next page for how the trinity doctrine crept into the Adventist Church. Earlier we saw that in several branches of heathenism, the third person of this trinity is regarded as evil and a destroyer. If the Holy Spirit is not a literal being and was instigated by Satan who steps up to receive worship as this third person, is he evil and a destroyer? This is something we need to consider very seriously.

**Greek Philosophy’s Influence on the Trinity Doctrine**

Greek philosophers were greatly influenced by Greek philosopher Plato (427-347 BC) who was considered the greatest of all philosophers. Plato thought he could define God and most Greek philosophy was based on his theories. Since the triad deities were among all ancient religions, and Plato was ingrained in trinitarian thought, he wanted to come up with a better definition to define God above all deities of Greek mythology. Plato's definition of God was, (1) The “first God,” who was the Supreme Being in the universe; (2) the “second God,” whom Plato described as the “soul of the universe”; and (3) the “third God,” defined as the “spirit.”

The Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria (15 BC-AD 50) who was a follower of Greek philosophy, and was influenced by Plato's version saw God as, (1) Father, who created all things (Philo named him “the Demiurge”), (2) Mother, who was Knowledge the Maker possessed and (3) the Beloved Son was the world. Supposedly the union of “Demiurge” and
“Knowledge” produced man's world. **This esoteric type of thinking led to the birth of the development of the trinity.**

Many historians and religious scholars attest to the influence of Greek or Platonic philosophy in the development and acceptance of the trinity doctrine in the fourth century. But what did such philosophy entail and how did it come to affect the doctrine of the trinity?

Charles Bigg stated that the famous Greek philosopher Plato believed in a divine triad of “God, the ideas, [and] the World-Spirit,” though he “nowhere explained or harmonized this triad.” — (Charles Bigg, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*, 1886, p. 249)

Later Greek thinkers refined Plato's concepts into what they referred to as three “substances,” the supreme God or “the One,” from which came “mind” or “thought” and a “spirit” or “soul.” In their thinking, all were different divine “substances” or aspects of the same God. Another way of expressing this was as “good,” the personification of that good, and the agent by which that good is carried out. Again, these were different divine aspects of that same supreme good, distinct and yet unified as one.

*****Such metaphysical thinking was common among the intelligentsia of the Greek world and carried over into the thinking of the Roman world of the New Testament period and succeeding centuries. As the last of the apostles died off, some of this metaphysical thinking began to affect and infiltrate the early Church, primarily through those who had already begun to compromise with paganism.*****

As Bible scholars John McClintock and James Strong explain, “Towards the end of the 1st century, and during the 2d, 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.” — (Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, 1891, Vol. 10, “Trinity,” p. 553)

The true Church largely resisted such infiltration and held firm to the teaching of the apostles, drawing their doctrine from the writings of the apostles and “the Holy Scriptures [the books of the Old Testament] which are able to make you wise for salvation.” (2 Timothy:3:15)

**Two distinct threads of Christianity split and developed separately. One remained true to the plain and simple teachings of the Bible and the other became increasingly compromised with pagan thought and practices adopted from the Greco-Roman world.**

Thus, as debate swelled over the nature of God in the fourth century leading to the Councils of Nicea and Constantinople, it was no longer a debate between biblical truth and error. **Many sides in the debate had been seriously compromised by their acceptance of unbiblical philosophical ideas.**

Many of the Church leaders who formulated the doctrine of the trinity were steeped in Greek and Platonic philosophy, and this influenced their religious views and teaching. The language they used in describing and defining the trinity is, in fact, taken directly from Platonic and Greek philosophy.

*****The word trinity itself is neither biblical nor Christian. Rather, the Platonic term trias, from the word for three, was Latinized as trinitas, the latter giving us the English word trinity.*****
“The Alexandria catechetical school, which revered Clement of Alexandria and Origen, the greatest theologian 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 [pagan] theological speculations. Athanasius and the three Cappadocians [the men whose Trinitarian views were adopted by the Catholic Church at the Councils of Nicaea and Constantinople] had been included among its members.” — (Hubert Jedin, Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church: an Historical Outline, 1960, p. 28)

“The doctrines of the Logos [i.e., the “Word,” a designation for Christ in John 1] and the Trinity received their shape from Greek Fathers, who ... were much influenced, directly or indirectly, by the Platonic philosophy ... That errors and corruptions crept into the Church from this source cannot be denied.” — (The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Samuel Macauley Jackson, editor, 1911, Vol. 9, p. 91)

The preface to historian Edward Gibbons’ History of Christianity sums up the Greek influence on the adoption of the trinity doctrine by stating, “If Paganism was conquered by Christianity, it is equally true that Christianity was corrupted by Paganism. The pure Deism [basic religion, in this context] of the first Christians ... was changed, by the Church of Rome, into the incomprehensible dogma of the trinity. Many of the pagan tenets, invented by the Egyptians and idealized by Plato, were retained as being worthy of belief.” — (1883, p. xvi)

The link between Plato’s teachings and the trinity as adopted by the Catholic Church centuries later is so strong that Edward Gibbon, in his masterwork The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, referred to Plato as “the Athenian sage, who had thus marvelously anticipated one of the most surprising discoveries of the Christian revelation.” — (The Trinity 1890, Vol. 1, p. 574)

*****Thus we see that the doctrine of the trinity owes far less to the Bible than it does to the metaphysical speculations of Plato and other pagan Greek philosophers.*****

No wonder the apostle Paul warns us in Colossians:2:8 NIV to beware of “hollow and deceptive philosophy, which depends on human tradition and the basic principles of this world rather than on Christ.”

How Ancient Trinitarian Gods Influenced Adoption of the Trinity

Many who believe in the trinity are surprised to learn that the idea of divine beings existing as trinities or triads long predated Christianity. Yet the evidence is abundantly documented.

Marie Sinclair, Countess of Caithness, in her 1876 book Old Truths in a New Light, states, “It is generally, although erroneously, supposed that the doctrine of the Trinity is of Christian origin. Nearly every nation of antiquity possessed a similar doctrine. [The early Catholic theologian] St. Jerome testifies unequivocally, 'All the ancient nations believed in the Trinity!'.” — (p. 382)

Notice how the following quotes document belief in a divine trinity in many regions and religions of the ancient world.

Sumeria
“The universe was divided into three regions each of which became the domain of a god. Anu's share was the sky. The earth was given to Enlil. Ea became the ruler of the waters. Together they constituted the triad of the Great Gods.” — (The Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology, 1994, pp. 54-55)

Babylonia

“The ancient Babylonians recognised the doctrine of a trinity, or three persons in one god— as appears from a composite god with three heads forming part of their mythology, and the use of the equilateral triangle, also, as an emblem of such trinity in unity.” — (Thomas Dennis Rock, The Mystical Woman and the Cities of the Nations, 1867, pp. 22-23)

India

“The Puranas, one of the Hindoo Bibles of more than 3,000 years ago, contain the following passage: 'O ye three Lords! know that I recognize only one God. Inform me, therefore, which of you is the true divinity, that I may address to him alone my adorations.' The three gods, Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva [or Shiva], becoming manifest to him, replied, 'Learn, O devotee, that there is no real distinction between us. What to you appears such is only the semblance. The single being appears under three forms by the acts of creation, preservation, and destruction, but he is one.' Hence the triangle was adopted by all the ancient nations as a symbol of the Deity ... Three was considered among all the pagan nations as the chief of the mystical numbers, because, as Aristotle remarks, it contains within itself a beginning, a middle, and an end. Hence we find it designating some of the attributes of almost all the pagan gods.” (Sinclair, pp. 382-383)

Greece

“In the Fourth Century B.C. Aristotle wrote: 'All things are three, and thrice is all: and let us use this number in the worship of the gods: for, as the Pythagoreans say, everything and all things are bounded by threes, for the end, the middle and the beginning have this number in everything, and these compose the number of the Trinity.'” — (Arthur Weigall, Paganism in Our Christianity, 1928, pp. 197-198)

Egypt

“The Hymn to Amun decreed that 'No god came into being before him (Amun)' and that 'All gods are three: Amun, Re and Ptah, and there is no second to them. Hidden is his name as Amon, he is Re in face, and his body is Ptah.' ... This is a statement of trinity, the three chief gods of Egypt subsumed into one of them, Amon. Clearly, the concept of organic unity within plurality got an extraordinary boost with this formulation. Theologically, in a crude form it came strikingly close to the later Christian form of plural Trinitarian monotheism.” — (Simson Najovits, Egypt, Trunk of the Tree, Vol. 2, 2004, pp. 83-84)

Other areas

Many other areas had their own divine trinities. In Greece they were Zeus, Poseidon and Adonis. The Phoenicians worshipped Ulomus, Ulusuros and Eliun. Rome worshipped Jupiter, Mars and Venus. In Germanic nations they were called Wodan, Thor and Fricco. Regarding the Celts, one source states, “The ancient heathen deities of the pagan Irish, Criosan, Biosena, and Seeva, or Sheeva, are doubtless the Creeshna [Krishna], Veeshnu [Vishnu], [or the all-inclusive] Brahma, and Seeva [Shiva], of the Hindoos.” — (Thomas Maurice, The History of Hindostan, Vol. 2, 1798, p. 171)
The deception is beautifully seen by the astonishing admission of Arthur Weigall who himself is a Trinitarian. Egyptologist Arthur Weigall summed up the influence of ancient beliefs on the adoption of the trinity doctrine by the Catholic Church in the following excerpt from his book:

“It must not be forgotten that Jesus Christ never mentioned such a phenomenon [the Trinity], and nowhere in the New Testament does the word 'Trinity' appear. The idea was only adopted by the Church three hundred years after the death of our Lord; and the origin of the conception is entirely pagan ... The ancient Egyptians, whose influence on early religious thought was profound, usually arranged their gods or goddesses in trinities: there was the trinity of Osiris, Isis, and Horus, the trinity of Amen, Mut, and Khonsu, the trinity of Khnum, Satis, and Anukis, and so forth ... The early Christians, however, did not at first think of applying the idea to their own faith. They paid their devotions to God the Father and to Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and they recognized the mysterious and undefined existence of the Holy Spirit; but there was no thought of these three being an actual Trinity, co-equal and united in One ... The application of this old pagan conception of a Trinity to Christian theology was made possible by the recognition of the Holy Spirit as the required third 'Person,' co-equal with the other 'Persons' ...

The idea of the Spirit being co-equal with God was not generally recognized until the second half of the Fourth Century A.D... . In the year 381 the Council of Constantinople added to the earlier Nicene Creed a description of the Holy Spirit as 'the Lord, and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and Son together is worshipped and glorified.' ...

Thus, the Athanasian creed, which is a later composition but reflects the general conceptions of Athanasius [the 4th-century Trinitarian whose view eventually became official doctrine] and his school, formulated the conception of a co-equal Trinity wherein the Holy Spirit was the third 'Person'; and so it was made a dogma of the faith, and belief in the Three in One and One in Three became a paramount doctrine of Christianity, though not without terrible riots and bloodshed ...

Today a Christian thinker ... has no wish to be precise about it, more especially since the definition is obviously pagan in origin and was not adopted by the Church until nearly three hundred years after Christ.” — (Arthur Weigall, Paganism in Our Christianity, 1928, pp. 197-203)

James Bonwick summarized the story well on page 396 of his 1878 work Egyptian Belief and Modern Thought, “It is an undoubted fact that more or less all over the world the deities are in triads. This rule applies to eastern and western hemispheres, to north and south.

Further, it is observed that, in some mystical way, the triad of three persons is one. The first is as the second or third, the second as first or third, the third as first or second; in fact, they are each other, one and the same individual being. The definition of Athanasius, who lived in Egypt, applies to the trinities of all heathen religions.”

DOES 1 JOHN 5:7 HAVE ADDED TEXT?

1 John 5:7 “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.”
The only verse in the Bible that explicitly states God, Jesus and the Holy Spirit are one Triune being is 1 John 5:7 that from the KJV says: 1 John 5:7 “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. 8 And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.”

This is the clear and decisive type of Scripture that you would expect to find in the Bible if the Godhead was literally a three in one god. However, it is slowly becoming universally recognized that this verse is a later insertion of the Catholic Church. So what does that tell us? All recent versions of the Bible and most others do not include much of the text which also includes verse 8 and with very good reason!

Here it is from the NIV. 1 John 5:7 “For there are three that testify: 8 the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement.”

*****Some person or persons in centuries past were so zealous to find support for their belief in the trinity that they literally added it. Bible commentaries that mention this added text inform us that it is a spurious comment that has undoubtedly been added.*****

The King James Version reads as follows, “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. 8 And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.” 1 John 5:7-8

The extra words are found only in the KJV, NKJV but are missing from almost every other translation. Thomas Nelson and Sons Catholic Commentary, 1951, page 1186 explains, “It is now generally held that this passage, called the Gomma Johanneum, is a gloss that crept into the text of the Old Latin and Vulgate at an early date, but found its way into the Greek text only in the 15th and 16th centuries.”

*****The scholarly consensus is that this passage is a Latin corruption that found its way into a Greek manuscript at an early date while being absent from the thousands of other manuscripts. This addition is so famous and hence well known that is has been given its own name and is called the “Comma Johanneum.” Comma means a short clause.*****
This is an image of the Codex 61 with the added words underlined in red.

It began with Desiderius Erasmus and his “Novum Instrumentum omne” which was the first New Testament in Greek to be published. This Greek text is also referred to as the Textus Receptus. Erasmus did not include the infamous Comma Johanneum of 1 John 5:7-8 in either his 1516 or 1519 editions of his Greek New Testament with very good reason. But it made its way into his third edition in 1522 because of pressure from the Catholic Church. After his first edition appeared in 1516, there arose such a furor over the absence of the Comma that Erasmus needed to defend himself. He argued that he did not put in the Comma Trinitarian formula because he found no Greek manuscripts that included it. Once one was produced called the Codex 61, that was written by one Roy or Froy at Oxford in c. 1520, he reluctantly agreed to include it in his subsequent editions. Erasmus probably altered the text because of politico-theologico-economic concerns. He did not want his reputation ruined, nor his Novum Instrumentum to go unsold. Thus it passed into the Stephanus Greek New Testament in 1551 (first New Testament in verses), which came to be called the Textus Receptus, and became the basis for the Geneva Bible New Testament in 1557 and the Authorized King James Version in 1611.

Scripture translator Benjamin Wilson gave the following explanation in his “Emphatic Diaglott.” Mr. Wilson says, “This text concerning the heavenly witness is not contained in any Greek manuscript which was written earlier than the fifteenth century. It is not cited by any of the ecclesiastical writers; not by any of early Latin fathers even when the subjects upon which they treated would naturally have lead them to appeal to its authority. It is therefore evidently spurious.”

Not only was the latter part of 1 John 5:7 added but the first part of 1 John 5:8 was also. This is how the passage reads in the King James Version Bible with the parts that were added being in red text. “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. 8 And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.” 1 John 5:7-8 KJV. Here is how the New International Version and most others Bible translations read for this passage. “For there are three that testify: 8 the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement.” 1 John 5:7-8 NIV.

Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible. Adam Clarke, LL.D., F.S.A., (1715-1832) explains in more detail.
“It is wanting in every MS. of this epistle written before the invention of printing, one excepted, the Codex Montfortii, in Trinity College, Dublin: the others which omit this verse amount to one hundred and twelve. It is wanting in both the Syriac, all the Arabic, Ethiopic, the Coptic, Sahidic, Armenian, Slavonian, etc., in a word, in all the ancient versions but the Vulgate; and even of this version many of the most ancient and correct MSS. have it not. It is wanting also in all the ancient Greek fathers; and in most even of the Latin. The words, as they exist in all the Greek MSS. with the exception of the Codex Montfortii, are the following: -

1 John 5:6. This is he that came by water and blood, Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness because the Spirit is truth.

1 John 5:7. For there are three that bear witness, the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one.

1 John 5:9. If we receive the witness of man, the witness of God is greater, etc.”

The words that are omitted by all the MSS., the above excepted, and all the versions, the Vulgate excepted, are these: -

[In heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one, and there are three which bear witness in earth].

To make the whole more clear, that every reader may see what has been added, I shall set down these verses, with the inserted words in brackets (and highlighting in purple added by me). “1 John 5:6. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. 1 John 5:7. For there are three that bear record [in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. 1 John 5:8. And there are three that bear witness in earth], the Spirit, and the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one. 1 John 5:9. If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater, etc.”

Any man may see, on examining the words, that if those included in brackets, which are wanting in the MSS. and versions, be omitted, there is no want of connection; and as to the sense, it is complete and perfect without them; and, indeed much more so than with them. I shall conclude this part of the note by observing, with Dr. Dodd, “that there are some internal and accidental marks which may render the passage suspected; for the sense is complete, and indeed more clear and better preserved, without it. Besides, the Spirit is
mentioned, both as a witness in heaven and on earth; so that the six witnesses are thereby reduced to five, and the equality of number, or antithesis between the witnesses in heaven and on earth, is quite taken away. Besides, what need of witnesses in heaven? No one there doubts that Jesus is the Messiah; and if it be said that Father, Son, and Spirit are witnesses on earth, then there are five witnesses on earth, and none in heaven; not to say that there is a little difficulty in interpreting how the Word or the Son can be a witness to himself.”

So Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible makes the issue very clear as to exactly what was added. The square brackets have been bolded to make them clearer and easier to see what was added and the addition is highlighted in purple.

Below is a list of Bible translations for 1 John 5:7 that reveal that most translations have excluded this added text or have included the text in light gray italics to inform the reader that it is added text and does not exist in the inspired words of God (i.e. the original manuscripts).

(A Conservative Version) “Because those who testify are three:”
(Analytical-Literal Translation) “Because three are the Ones testifying:”
(An Understandable Version-The New Testament) “For there are three who give their testimony [about Jesus].”
(American Standard Version) “And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth.”
(Bible Basic English) “And the Spirit is the witness, because the Spirit is true.”
(Contemporary English Version) “In fact, there are three who tell about it.”
(The Complete Jewish Bible) “There are three witnesses.”
(Common Edition, New Testament) “And it is the Spirit who bears witness, because the Spirit is the truth.”
(Darby) “For they that bear witness are three:”
(English Majority Text Version) “For there are three that bear witness:”
(English Standard Version) “For there are three that testify:”
(Good News Bible) “There are three witnesses:”
(God's Word) “There are three witnesses:”
(Holman Christian Standard Bible) “For there are three that testify:”
(The Hebrew Names Version) “For there are three who testify:”
(International Standard Version) “For there are three witnesses:”
(King James Version) “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.”
(Literal Translation of the Holy Bible) “For there are three bearing witness in Heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one.”
(Living Oracles New Testament) “And it is the Spirit who testified; because the Spirit is the truth.”
(Modern King James Version) “For there are three that bear witness in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one.”
(The Message) “A triple testimony:”
(New American Standard Bible) “For there are three that testify:”
(New Century Version) “So there are three witnesses that tell us about Jesus:”
(NET Bible) “For there are three that testify:”
(New International Reader's Version) “There are three that give witness about Jesus.”
(New International Version) “For there are three that testify:”
(New King James Version) “For there are three that bear witness in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one.”
(New Living Translation) “So we have these three witnesses -”
(New Revised Standard Version Bible) “There are three that testify:”
(Revised Standard Version) “And the Spirit is the witness, because the Spirit is the truth.”
(Revised Version) “And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth.”
(The Scriptures 1998) “Because there are three who bear witness:”
(Twentieth Century New Testament) “It is a three-fold testimony—”
(Updated Bible Version) “For there are three who bear witness,”
(World English Bible) “For there are three who testify:”
(Young's Literal Translation) “because three are who are testifying in the heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these--the three--are one;”

*****So we can see in the above list that only the KJV and the NKJV Bible have included the added text without letting the reader know that it is added and not in the original manuscript. Very deceptive practice.*****

Some have tried to combine the pagan concept with scripture

Numbers 33:52: Then ye shall drive out all the inhabitants of the land from before you, and 
**destroy all their pictures,**
and destroy all their molten images, and quite pluck down all their high places:

Beware those who do not follow the instructions of God!

Note the words of The New Bible Commentary: Revised, “Notice that AV [the Authorized Version] includes additional material at this point. But the words are clearly a gloss [an added note] and are rightly excluded by RSV [the Revised Standard Version] even from its margins.” — (1970, p. 1269)

Dr. Neil Lightfoot, a New Testament professor says the textual evidence is against 1 John 5:7. “Of all the Greek manuscripts, only two contain it. These two manuscripts are of very late dates, one from the fourteenth or fifteenth century and the other from the sixteenth century. Two other manuscripts have this verse written in the margin. All four manuscripts show that this verse was apparently translated from a late form of the Latin Vulgate.” — (How We Got the Bible, 2003, pp. 100-101)
The Expositor's Bible Commentary also dismisses the King James and New King James Versions' additions as “obviously a late gloss with no merit.” — (Glenn Barker, Vol. 12, 1981, p. 353)

The famous Edward Gibbon explains the reason for the discardal of this verse from the Bible with the following words:

“Of all the manuscripts now extant, above fourscore in number, some of which are more than 1200 years old, the orthodox copies of the Vatican, of the Complutensian editors, of Robert Stephens are becoming invisible; and the two manuscripts of Dublin and Berlin are unworthy to form an exception...In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the Bibles were corrected by LanFrank, Archbishop of Canterbury, and by Nicholas, a cardinal and librarian of the Roman church, secundum Orthodoxam fidel...Notwithstanding these corrections, the passage is still wanting in twenty-five Latin manuscripts, the oldest and fairest; two qualities seldom united, except in manuscripts...The three witnesses have been established in our Greek Testaments by the prudence of Erasmus; the honest bigotry of the Complutensian editors; the typographical fraud, or error, of Robert Stephens in the placing of a crotchet and the deliberate falsehood, or strange misapprehension, of Theodore Beza.” — (Decline and fall of the Roman Empire, IV, Gibbon, p. 418)

Gibbon was defended in his findings by his contemporary, the brilliant British scholar Richard Porson who also proceeded to publish conclusive proof that 1 John 5:7 was first added by the Church in 400 A.D. Regarding Porson's evidence, Gibbon later said, “His structures are founded in argument, enriched with learning, and enlivened with wit, and his adversary neither deserves nor finds any quarter at his hands. The evidence of the three heavenly witnesses would now be rejected in any court of justice; but prejudice is blind, authority is deaf, and our vulgar Bibles will ever be polluted by this spurious text.”

*****No modern Bible now contains the interpolation called the Comma Johanneum. However, just as Gibbon had predicted, the simple fact that the most learned scholars of Christianity now unanimously recognize this verse to be a later interpolation of the Church has not prevented the preservation of this fabricated text in our modern Bibles. To this day, the Bible in the hands of the majority of Christians such as the KJV still unhesitantly includes this verse as the inspired word of God without so much as a footnote to inform the reader that all scholars of Christianity of note unanimously recognize it as a later fabrication.*****

It was only the horrors of the great inquisitions which held back Sir Isaac Newton from openly revealing these facts to all. According to Newton, this verse first appeared for in the third edition of Erasmus's (1466-1536) New Testament.

Peake's Commentary on the Bible is very incisive as well, “The famous interpolation after 'three witnesses' is not printed in RSV and rightly [so] . . . No respectable Greek [manuscript] contains it. Appearing first in a late 4th century Latin text, it entered the Vulgate [the 5th-century Latin version, which became the common medieval translation] and finally NT [New Testament] of Erasmus [who produced newly collated Greek texts and a new Latin version in the 16th century].” — (p. 1038)

The Big Book of Bible Difficulties tells us, “This verse has virtually no support among the early Greek manuscripts . . . Its appearance in late Greek manuscripts is based on the fact that Erasmus was placed under ecclesiastical pressure to include it in his Greek NT of 1522, having omitted it in his two earlier editions of 1516 and 1519 because he could not find any
Greek manuscripts which contained it.” — (Norman Geisler and Thomas Howe, 2008, pp. 540-541)

Theology professors Anthony and Richard Hanson, in their book Reasonable Belief: A Survey of the Christian Faith, explain the unwarranted addition to the text this way, “It was added by some enterprising person or persons in the ancient Church who felt that the New Testament was sadly deficient in direct witness to the kind of doctrine of the Trinity which he favoured and who determined to remedy that defect . . . It is a waste of time to attempt to read Trinitarian doctrine directly off the pages of the New Testament.” — (1980, p. 171)

Thomas Nelson and Sons Catholic Commentary, 1951, page 1186 explains, “It is now generally held that this passage, called the Gomma Johanneum, is a gloss that crept into the text of the Old Latin and Vulgate at an early date, but found its way into the Greek text only in the 15th and 16th centuries.”

A Commentary by Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset and David Brown says, “The only Greek manuscripts in any form which support the words, “in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one; and there are three that bear witness in earth,” are the Montfortianus of Dublin, copied evidently from the modern Latin Vulgate; the Ravianus, copied from the Complutensian Polyglot; a manuscript at Naples, with the words added in the Margin by a recent hand; Ottobonianus, 298, of the fifteenth century, the Greek of which is a mere translation of the accompanying Latin. All the old versions omit the words. The oldest manuscripts of the Vulgate omit them: the earliest Vulgate manuscript which has them being Wizanburgensis, 99, of the eighth century. ... Vigilius, at the end of the fifth century, is the first who quotes the disputed words as in the text; but no Greek manuscript earlier than the fifteenth is extant with them. The term “Trinity” occurs first in the third century in Tertullian.”

And one more for Seventh day Adventists. “The passage as given in the KJV is in no Greek MS earlier than the 15th and 16th centuries. The disputed words found their way into the KJV by way of the Greek text of Erasmus (see Vol. V, p. 141). It is said that Erasmus offered to include the disputed words in his Greek Testament if he were shown even one Greek MS that contained them. A library in Dublin produced such a MS (known as 34), and Erasmus included the passage in his text. It is now believed that the later editions of the Vulgate acquired the passage by the mistake of a scribe who included an exegetical marginal comment in the Bible text that he was copying. The disputed words have been widely used in support of the doctrine of the Trinity, but, in view of such overwhelming evidence against their authenticity, their support is valueless and should not be used. In spite of their appearance in the Vulgate A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture freely admits regarding these words: “It is now generally held that this passage, called the Comma Johanneum, is a gloss that crept into the text of the Old Latin and Vulgate at an early date, but found its way into the Greek text only in the 15th and 16th centuries” (Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1951, p. 1186).” — (The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, vol. 7, p. 675)

“Erasmus omitted the passage from the first printed Greek Testament of 1516, but undertook to introduce the words if a Greek manuscript containing them could be produced. He was faced with a late manuscript which did in fact contain the passage, and against his judgment kept his promise. So, by way of Erasmus’ 1522 edition the interpolation invaded the text of the Greek New Testament. The action of the RV in cutting out the spurious words was tardy justice. We should treasure every word of the inspired record, but we want no invasion of that record by the addition of men, however sound the theology expressed.” — (F. M. Blaiklock, Commentary on the New Testament, p. 246)
For Adventists: “I saw that God had especially guarded the Bible; yet when copies of it were few, learned men had in some instances changed the words, thinking that they were making it more plain, when in reality they were mystifying that which was plain, by causing it to lean to their established views, which were governed by tradition. But I saw that the Word of God, as a whole, is a perfect chain, one portion linking into and explaining another. True seekers for truth need not err; for not only is the Word of God plain and simple in declaring the way of life, but the Holy Spirit is given as a guide in understanding the way to life therein revealed.”—(E.G. White, EW, 220.2, 1882)

When thirty two Biblical scholars backed by fifty collaborating Christian denominations work together to compile the Revised Standard Version of the Bible based upon the most ancient Biblical manuscripts available to them today, there were some very extensive changes made. Among these was the unceremonious discardal of the verse of 1 John 5:7 as the fabricated insertion that it is which never belonged in the inspired Word of God.

*****Even the added wording does not by itself proclaim the Trinity doctrine. The addition illegitimate as it is merely presents the Father, Word and Holy Spirit as witnesses. This says nothing about the personhood of all three since verse 7 shows inanimate water and blood serving as such. And as seen on earlier pages, the word trinity did not come into common use as a religious term until after the Council of Nicea on May 20, 325 A.D. several centuries after the last books of the New Testament were complete and is not a Biblical concept, but one that has been proven to originate from pagan sun worship.*****

What are the results of our understanding of 1 John 5:7

God is either a committee, just like the pagans have already claimed... Or a Loving Father who sent His only Son to die for all mankind.
For every truth Satan always has a lie. But I could not believe that someone would actually try and claim that this text in 1 John 5:7-8 was removed from all the translations instead of it being added.

DOES MATTHEW 28:19 HAVE ADDED TEXT?

Matthew 28:19 “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

Below are many historical quotes from theologians and other writers that heavily indicate that Matthew 28:19 has been altered. It must be remembered that we have no known manuscripts that were written in the first, second or third centuries. There is a gap of over three hundred years between when Matthew wrote his epistle and our earliest manuscript copies. (It also took over three hundred years for the Catholic Church to evolve into what the “early church fathers” wanted it to become.)

This is what my research revealed. Eusebius was the Bishop of Caesarea and is known as “the Father of Church History.” He wrote prolifically and his most celebrated work is his Ecclesiastical History, a history of the Church from the Apostolic period until his own time. Eusebius quotes many verses in his writings including Matthew 28:19. But he never quotes it as it appears in modern Bibles. He always finishes the verse with the words “in my name.”

For example, in Book III of his History, Chapter 5, Section 2, which is about the Jewish persecution of early Christians, we read, “relying upon the power of Christ, who had said to them, “Go ye and make disciples of all the nations in my name.” And in his Oration in Praise of Emperor Constantine, Chapter 16, Section 8, we read, “Surely none save our only Savior has done this, when, after his victory over death, he spoke the word to his followers, and fulfilled it by the event, saying to them, “Go ye and make disciples of all nations in my name.”

Eusebius was present at the council of Nicea and was involved in the debates between Arias and the pagan view of Athanasius that became the trinity doctrine. If the manuscripts he had in front of him read “in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,” he would never have quoted instead, “in my name.” So it appears that the earliest manuscripts read “in my name,” and the phrase was enlarged to reflect the orthodox position as Trinitarian influence spread.

Below is Matthew 28:19 from the King James Bible.
Matthew 28:19 “Go you therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

So many are asking why the apparent disobedience of the Apostles and why there is not even one person who obeyed these supposed words of Jesus Christ from Matthew 28:19. Here are all the scriptures relating to baptism in the New Testament. New converts were all baptized into the name of Jesus Christ only.
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 you 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 8:16 “For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.”

Acts 10:48 “And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Then prayed they him to tarry certain days.”

Acts 19:5 “When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.”

Acts 22:16 “And now why tarriest you? arise, and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on the name of the Lord.”

Romans 6:3 “Know you not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?”

1 Corinthians 1:13 “Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?” [Implied]

Galatians 3:27 “For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.”

For Adventists: “I saw that God had especially guarded the Bible; yet when copies of it were few, learned men had in some instances changed the words, thinking that they were making it more plain, when in reality they were mystifying that which was plain, by causing it to lean to their established views, which were governed by tradition. But I saw that the Word of God, as a whole, is a perfect chain, one portion linking into and explaining another. True seekers for truth need not err: for not only is the Word of God plain and simple in declaring the way of life, but the Holy Spirit is given as a guide in understanding the way to life therein revealed.”

— (E.G. White, EW, 220.2, 1882)

The following images are from Dr. G. Reckart, Apostolic Theological Bible College, who claims these are absolute proof of the change to Matthew 28:19. He states we now have absolute proof the Catholic Church fathers perverted the text in Matthew 28:19. We now have the Hebrew Matthew Gospel, a manuscript that was preserved by the Jews from the first century [Shem Tov's Hebrew Matthew Gospel]. In this Shem Tov MSS, the text at Matthew 28:19 does not contain the trinitarian statement. Dr. Reckart states that he was the first to provide this evidence on the internet and wants the credit accordingly. Not completely sure that these images can be called guaranteed proof though.

Shem Tov's Hebrew Matthew Gospel Matthew 28:9-20
Catholic Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger:
He makes this confession as to the origin of the chief Trinity text of Matthew 28:19. “The basic form of our (Matthew 28:19 Trinitarian) profession of faith took shape during the course of the second and third centuries in connection with the ceremony of baptism. So far as its place of origin is concerned, the text (Matthew 28:19) came from the city of Rome.” — Joseph Ratzinger (pope Benedict XVI) Introduction to Christianity: 1968 edition, pp. 82-83.

****The Trinity baptism and text of Matthew 28:19 therefore did not originate from the original Church that started in Jerusalem around AD 33. It was rather as the evidence proves a later invention of Roman Catholicism completely fabricated. Very few know about these historical facts.****

Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church:
By Dr. Stuart G. Hall 1992, pages 20 and 21. Professor Stuart G. Hall was the former Chair of Ecclesiastical History at King’s College, London England. Dr. Hall makes the factual statement that Catholic Trinitarian Baptism was not the original form of Christian Baptism, rather the original was Jesus name baptism. “In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,” although those words were not used, as they later are, as a formula. Not all baptisms fitted this rule.” Dr Hall further, states: “More common and perhaps more ancient was the simple, “In the name of the Lord Jesus or, Jesus Christ.” This practice was known among Marcionites and Orthodox; it is certainly the subject of controversy in Rome and Africa about 254, as the anonymous tract De rebaptismate (“On rebaptism”) shows.”

Edmund Schlink, The Doctrine of Baptism, page 28:
“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.”

Hastings Dictionary of the Bible 1963, page 1015:
“The Trinity...is not demonstrable by logic or by Scriptural proofs....The term Trias was first used by Theophilus of Antioch (c AD 180),...The term Trinity) not found in Scripture...” “The chief Trinitarian text in the NT is the baptismal formula in Mt 28:19...This
late post-resurrection saying, not found in any other Gospel or anywhere else in the NT, has been viewed by some scholars as an interpolation into Matthew. It has also been pointed out that the idea of making disciples is continued in teaching them, so that the intervening reference to baptism with its Trinitarian formula was perhaps a later insertion into the saying. Finally, Eusebius's form of the (ancient) text (“in my name” rather than in the name of the Trinity) has had certain advocates. (Although the Trinitarian formula is now found in the modern-day book of Matthew), this does not guarantee its source in the historical teaching of Jesus. It is doubtless better to view the (Trinitarian) formula as derived from early (Catholic) Christian, perhaps Syrian or Palestinian, baptismal usage (cf Didache 7:1-4), and as a brief summary of the (Catholic) Church's teaching about God, Christ, and the Spirit:...

James Moffett's New Testament Translation:
In a footnote on page 64 about Matthew 28:19 he makes this statement: “It may be that this (Trinitarian) formula, so far as the fullness of its expression is concerned, is a reflection of the (Catholic) liturgical usage established later in the primitive (Catholic) community, It will be remembered that Acts speaks of baptizing “in the name of Jesus, cf. Acts 1:5 +.”

New Revised Standard Version says this about Matthew 28:19:
“Modern critics claim this formula is falsely ascribed to Jesus and that it represents later (Catholic) church tradition, for nowhere in the book of Acts (or any other book of the Bible) is baptism performed with the name of the Trinity...”

Tom Harpur:
Tom Harpur, former Religion Editor of the Toronto Star in his “For Christ's sake,” page 103 informs us of these facts: “All but the most conservative scholars agree that at least the latter part of this command [Triune part of Matthew 28:19] was inserted later. The [Trinitarian] formula occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, and we know from the only evidence available [the rest of the New Testament] that the earliest Church did not baptize people using these words (“in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost”) Baptism was “into” or “in” the name of Jesus alone. Thus it is argued that the verse originally read “baptizing them in My Name” and then was expanded [changed] to work in the [later Catholic Trinitarian] dogma. In fact, the first view put forward by German critical scholars as well as the Unitarians in the nineteenth century, was stated as the accepted position of mainline scholarship as long ago as 1919, when Peake's commentary was first published: “The Church of the first days (AD 33) did not observe this world-wide (Trinitarian) commandment, even if they knew it. The command to baptize into the threefold [Trinity] name is a late doctrinal expansion.”

The Bible Commentary 1919 page 723:
Dr. Peake makes it clear that: “The command to baptize into the threefold name is a late doctrinal expansion. Instead of the words baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost we should probably read simply—“into My Name.”

The Catholic Encyclopedia, II, page 263:
“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.”

The Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C. 1923, New Testament Studies Number 5:
The Lord's Command To Baptize An Historical Critical Investigation. By Bernard Henry
The passages in Acts and the Letters of St. Paul. These passages seem to point to the earliest form as baptism in the name of the Lord. Also we find, “Is it possible to reconcile these facts with the belief that Christ commanded his disciples to baptize in the triune form? Had Christ given such a command, it is urged, the Apostolic Church would have followed him, and we should have some trace of this obedience in the New Testament. No such trace can be found. The only explanation of this silence, according to the anti-traditional view, is this the short christological (Jesus Name) formula was (the) original, and the longer triune formula was a later development.”

“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.

The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics:
As to Matthew 28:19, it says: “It is the central piece of evidence for the traditional (Trinitarian) view. If it were undisputed, this would, of course, be decisive, but its trustworthiness is impugned on grounds of textual criticism, literary criticism and historical criticism.” The same Encyclopedia further states that: “The obvious explanation of the silence of the New Testament on the triune name, and the use of another (JESUS NAME) formula in Acts and Paul, is that this other formula was the earlier, and the triune formula is a later addition.”

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. 4, page 2637, Under “Baptism,” says:
“Matthew 28:19 in particular only canonizes a later ecclesiastical situation, that its universalism is contrary to the facts of early Christian history, and its Trinitarian formula (is) foreign to the mouth of Jesus.”

The Jerusalem Bible, a scholarly Catholic work, states:
“It may be that this formula, (Triune Matthew 28:19) so far as the fullness of its expression is concerned, is a reflection of the (Man-made) liturgical usage established later in the primitive (Catholic) community. It will be remembered that Acts speaks of baptizing “in the name of Jesus,”...”

The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge:
“Jesus, however, cannot have given His disciples this Trinitarian order of baptism after His resurrection; for the New Testament knows only one baptism in the name of Jesus (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:43; 19:5; Gal. 3:27; Rom. 6:3; 1 Cor. 1:13-15), which still occurs even in the second and third centuries, while the Trinitarian formula occurs only in Matt. 28:19, and then only again (in the) Didache 7:1 and Justin, Apol. 1:61...Finally, the distinctly liturgical character of the formula...is strange; it was not the way of Jesus to make such formulas... the formal authenticity of Matt. 28:19 must be disputed...” page 435.
The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, I, page 275:
“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.”

Theology of the New Testament:
By R. Bultmann, 1951, page 133 under Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church and the
Sacraments. The historical fact that the verse Matthew 28:19 was altered is openly confessed
to very plainly. “As to the rite of baptism, it was normally consummated as a bath in which
the one receiving baptism completely submerged, and if possible in flowing water as the
allusions of Acts 8:36, Heb. 10:22, Barn. 11:11 permit us to gather, and as Did. 7:1-3
specifically says. According to the last passage, [the apocryphal Catholic Didache] suffices
in case of the need if water is three times poured [false Catholic sprinkling doctrine] on the
head. The one baptizing names over the one being baptized the name of the Lord Jesus
Christ,” later expanded [changed] to the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit.”

Wilhelm Bousset, Kyrios Christianity, page 295:
“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.”

A History of The Christian Church:
1953 by Williston Walker former Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Yale University. On
page 95 we see the historical facts again declared. “With the early disciples generally baptism
was “in the name of Jesus Christ.” There is no mention of baptism in the name of the Trinity
in the New Testament, except in the command attributed to Christ in Matthew 28:19. That
text is early, (but not the original) however. It underlies the Apostles' Creed, and the
practice recorded (*or interpolated) in the Teaching, (or the Didache) and by Justin. The
Christian leaders of the third century retained the recognition of the earlier form, and, in
Rome at least, baptism in the name of Christ was deemed valid, if irregular, certainly from
the time of Bishop Stephen (254-257).”

On page 61 Professor and Church historian Walker, reviles the true origin and purpose of
Matthew 28:19. This text is the first man-made Roman Catholic Creed that was the
prototype for the later Apocryphal Apostles' Creed. Matthew 28:19 was invented along
with the Apocryphal Apostles' Creed to counter so-called heretics and Gnostics that
baptized in the name of Jesus Christ! Marcion although somewhat mixed up in some of his
doctrine still baptized his converts the Biblical way in the name of Jesus Christ. Matthew
28:19 is the first non-Biblical Roman Catholic Creed!

*****The spurious Catholic text of Matthew 28:19 was invented to support the newer
triune, Trinity doctrine. Therefore, Matthew 28:19 is not the “Great Commission of
Jesus Christ.” Matthew 28:19 is the great Catholic hoax!*****

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?

While the power of the episcopate and the significance of churches of apostolical (Catholic)
foundation was thus greatly enhanced, the Gnostic crisis saw a corresponding development of
(man-made non-inspired spurious) creed, at least in the West. Some form of instruction
before baptism was common by the middle of the second century. At Rome this developed,
apparently, between 150 and 175, and probably in opposition to Marcionite Gnosticism, into
an explication of the baptismal formula of Matthew 28:19 the earliest known form of the so-called Apostles Creed.”

The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles Volume 1, Prolegomena 1: The Jewish Gentile, and Christian Backgrounds by F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake 1979 version pages 335-337. “There is little doubt as to the sacramental nature of baptism by the middle of the first century in the circles represented by the Pauline Epistles, and it is indisputable in the second century. The problem is whether it can in this (Trinitarian) form be traced back to Jesus, and if not what light is thrown upon its history by the analysis of the synoptic Gospels and Acts. According to Catholic teaching, (traditional Trinitarian) baptism was instituted by Jesus. It is easy to see how necessary this was for the belief in sacramental regeneration. Mysteries, or sacraments, were always the institution of the Lord of the cult; by them, and by them only, were its supernatural benefits obtained by the faithful. Nevertheless, if evidence counts for anything, few points in the problem of the Gospels are so clear as the improbability of this teaching. The reason for this assertion is the absence of any mention of Christian baptism in Mark, Q, or the third Gospel, and the suspicious nature of the account of its institution in Matthew 28:19: “Go ye into all the world, and make disciples of all Gentiles (nations), baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.” It is not even certain whether this verse ought to be regarded as part of the genuine text of Matthew. No other text, indeed, is found in any extant manuscripts, in any language, but it is arguable that Justin Martyr, though he used the triune formula, did not find it in his text of the Gospels; Hermas seems to be unacquainted with it; the evidence of the Didache is ambiguous, and Eusebius habitually, though not invariably, quotes it in another form, “Go ye into all the world and make disciples of all the Gentiles in My Name.” No one acquainted with the facts of textual history and patristic evidence can doubt the tendency would have been to replace the Eusebian text (In My Name) by the ecclesiastical (Catholic Trinitarian) formula of baptism, so that transcriptional evidence” is certainly on the side of the text omitting baptism. But it is unnecessary to discuss this point at length, because even if the ordinary (modern Trinity) text of Matthew 28:19 be sound it cannot represent historical fact. Would they have baptized, as Acts says that they did, and Paul seems to confirm the statement, in the name of the Lord Jesus if the Lord himself had commanded them to use the (Catholic Trinitarian) formula of the Church? On every point the evidence of Acts is convincing proof that the (Catholic) tradition embodied in Matthew 28:19 is a late (non-Scriptural Creed) and unhistorical. Neither in the third gospel nor in Acts is there any reference to the (Catholic Trinitarian) Matthaean tradition, nor any mention of the institution of (Catholic Trinitarian) Christian baptism. Nevertheless, a little later in the narrative we find several references to baptism in water in the name of the Lord Jesus as part of recognized (early) Christian practice. Thus we are faced by the problem of a Christian rite, not directly ascribed to Jesus, but assumed to be a universal (and original) practice. That it was so is confirmed by the Epistles, but the facts of importance are all contained in Acts.”

*****Also in the same book on page 336 in the footnote number one, Professor Lake makes an astonishing discovery in the so-called Teaching or Didache. The Didache has an astonishing contradiction that is found in it. One passage refers to the necessity of baptism in the name of the Lord, which is Jesus. The other famous passage teaches a Trinitarian Baptism. Lake raises the probability that the apocryphal Didache or the early Catholic Church Manual may have also been edited or changed to promote the later Trinitarian doctrine.****
It is also a historical fact that the Catholic Church at one time baptized its converts in the name of Jesus but later changed to Trinity baptism.

“1. In the actual description of baptism in the Didache the triune (Trinity) formula is used; in the instructions for the Eucharist (communion) the condition for admission is baptism in the name of the Lord. It is obvious that in the case of an eleventh-century manuscript *the triune formula was almost certain to be inserted in the description of baptism, while the less usual formula had a chance of escaping notice when it was only used incidentally.”

Other Writers

“The historical riddle is not solved by Matthew 28:19, since, according to a wide scholarly consensus, it is not an authentic saying of Jesus, not even an elaboration of a Jesus-saying on baptism” — (The Anchor Bible Dictionary, Vol. 1, 1992, p. 585)

“It has been customary to trace the institution of the practice (of baptism) to the words of Christ recorded in Matthew 28:19. But the authenticity of this passage has been challenged on historical as well as on textual grounds. It must be acknowledged that the formula of the threefold name, which is here enjoined, does not appear to have been employed by the primitive Church, which, so far as our information goes, baptized 'in' or 'into the name of Jesus' (or 'Jesus Christ' or Lord Jesus': Acts 2:38, 8:16, 10:48, 19:5; 1 Cor. 1:13, 15)” — (The Dictionary of the Bible, 1947, p. 83)

Matthew 28:19, “the Church of the first days did not observe this world-wide command, even if they knew it. The command to baptize into the threefold name is a late doctrinal expansion. In place of the words “baptizing... Spirit” we should probably read simply “into my name,” i.e. (turn the nations) to Christianity, “in my name,” i.e. (teach the nations) in my spirit” — (Peake's Commentary on the Bible, 1929, p. 723)

“On the text, see Conybeare, Zeitsch. Fur die Neutest. Wissensch. 1901, 275 ff.; Hibbert Journal, October 1902; Lake, Inaugural Lecture; Riggenbach, Der Trinitarische Taufbefehl; Chase, Journal Theo. Stud. Vi. 481 ff. The evidence of Eusebius must be regarded as indecisive, in view of the fact that all Greek MSS. and all extant VSS., contain the clause (S1 and S2 are unhappily wanting). The Eusebian quotation: “Go disciple ye all the nations in my name,” cannot be taken as decisive proof that the clause ‘Baptizing...Spirit’ was lacking in copies known to Eusebius, because “in my name” may be Eusebius' way of abbreviating, for whatever reason, the following clause. On the other hand, Eusebius cites in this short form so often that it is easier to suppose that he is definitely quoting the words of the Gospel, than to invent possible reasons which may have caused him so frequently to have paraphrased it. And if we once suppose his short form to have been current in MSS. of the Gospel, there is much probability in the conjecture that it is the original text of the Gospel, and that in the later centuries the clause “baptizing...Spirit” supplanted the shorter “in my name.” And insertion of this kind derived from liturgical use would very rapidly be adopted by copyists and translators. The Didache has ch. 7: “Baptizing in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit”: but the passage need not be dependent on our canonical Gospel, and the Didache elsewhere has a liturgical addition to the text of the Gospels in the doxology attached to the Lord's Prayer. But Irenaeus and Tertullian already have the longer clause.” — (The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; S. Driver, A. Plummer, C. Briggs; A Critical & Exegetical Commentary of St. Matthew Third Edition, 1912, pp. 307-308)

“The disciples are further told to “baptize” (the second of the participles functioning as supplementary imperatives) new disciples. The command to baptize comes as somewhat of a surprise since baptism is referred to earlier only in chap. 3 (and 21:25) where only John's baptism is described (among the Gospels only in John 3:22; 4:1-2 do we read of Jesus' or his disciples' baptizing others). Matthew tells us nothing concerning his view of Christian
baptism. Only Matthew records this command of Jesus, but the practice of the early church suggest its historicity. (cf. Acts 2:38, 41; 8:12, 38; 9:18; 10:48; 19:5; 22:16; etc.). The threefold name (at most only an incipient Trinitarianism) in which the baptism was to be performed, on the other hand, seems clearly to be a liturgical expansion of the evangelist consonant with the practice of his day (thus Hubbard; cf. Did. 7.1). There is a good possibility that in its original form, as witnessed by the ante-Nicene Eusebian form, the text read “make disciples in my name” (see Conybeare). This shorter reading preserves the symmetrical rhythm of the passage, whereas the triadic formula fits awkwardly into the structure as one might expect if it were an interpolation (see H. B. Green; cf. Howard; Hill [IBS 8 (1986) 54-63], on the other hand, argues for a concentric design with the triadic formula at its center). It is Kosmala, however, who has argued most effectively for the shorter reading, pointing to the central importance of “name of Jesus” in early Christian preaching, the practice of baptism in the name of Jesus, and the singular “in his name” with reference to the hope of the Gentiles in Isa. 42:4b, quoted by Matthew in 12:18-21. As Carson rightly notes of our passage: “There is no evidence we have Jesus’ ipissima verba here” (598). The narrative of Acts notes the use of the name only of “Jesus Christ” in baptism (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5; cf. Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27) or simply “the Lord Jesus” (Acts 8:16; 19:5)” — (Word Biblical Commentary, Vol 33B, Matthew 14-28; Donald A. Hagner, 1975, p. 887-888)

“It cannot be directly proved that Jesus instituted baptism, for Matthew 28:19 is not a saying of the Lord. The reasons for this assertion are: (1) It is only a later stage of the tradition that represents the risen Christ as delivering speeches and giving commandments. Paul knows nothing of it. (2) The Trinitarian formula is foreign to the mouth of Jesus and has not the authority of the Apostolic age which it must have had if it had descended from Jesus himself. On the other hand, Paul knows of no other way of receiving the Gentiles into the Christian communities than by baptism, and it is highly probable that in the time of Paul all Jewish Christians were also baptized. We may perhaps assume that the practice of baptism was continued in consequence of Jesus’ recognition of John the Baptist and his baptism, even after John himself had been removed. According to John 4:2, Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples under his superintendence. It is possible only with the help of tradition to trace back to Jesus a “Sacrament of Baptism,” or an obligation to it ex necessitate salutis, through it is credible that tradition is correct here. Baptism in the Apostolic age was in the name of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. 1:13; Acts 19:5). We cannot make out when the formula in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit emerged.” — (History of Dogma, Vol. 1, Adolph Harnack, 1958, p. 79)

“The very account which tells us that at the last, after his resurrection, he commissioned his apostles to go and baptize among all nations (Mt 28:19) betrayed itself by speaking in the Trinitarian language of the next century, and compels us to see in it the ecclesiastical editor, and not the evangelist, much less the founder himself. No historical trace appears of this baptismal formula earlier than the “Teaching of the Twelve Apostles” (ch. 7:1,3 The Oldest Church Manuel, ed. Philip Schaff, 1887), and the first Apology of Justin (Apol. i. 61.) about the middle of the second century: and more than a century later, Cyprian found it necessary to insist upon the use of it instead of the older phrase baptized “into Christ Jesus,” or into the “name of the Lord Jesus.” (Gal. 3:27; Acts 19:5; 10:48. Cyprian Ep. 73, 16-18, has to convert those who still use the shorter form.) Paul alone, of the apostles, was baptized not, but his disciples under his superintendence. It is possible only with the help of tradition to trace back to Jesus a “Sacrament of Baptism,” or an obligation to it ex necessitate salutis, through it is credible that tradition is correct here. Baptism in the Apostolic age was in the name of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. 1:13; Acts 19:5). We cannot make out when the formula in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit emerged.” — (History of Dogma, Vol. 1, Adolph Harnack, 1958, p. 79)

“No historical trace appears of this baptismal formula earlier than the “Teaching of the Twelve Apostles” (ch. 7:1,3 The Oldest Church Manuel, ed. Philip Schaff, 1887), and the first Apology of Justin (Apol. i. 61.) about the middle of the second century: and more than a century later, Cyprian found it necessary to insist upon the use of it instead of the older phrase baptized “into Christ Jesus,” or into the “name of the Lord Jesus.” (Gal. 3:27; Acts 19:5; 10:48. Cyprian Ep. 73, 16-18, has to convert those who still use the shorter form.) Paul alone, of the apostles, was baptized not, but his disciples under his superintendence. It is possible only with the help of tradition to trace back to Jesus a “Sacrament of Baptism,” or an obligation to it ex necessitate salutis, through it is credible that tradition is correct here. Baptism in the Apostolic age was in the name of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. 1:13; Acts 19:5). We cannot make out when the formula in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit emerged.” — (History of Dogma, Vol. 1, Adolph Harnack, 1958, p. 79)
apostle; for if the book of Acts may be trusted, the invariable usage was baptism “in the
name of Christ Jesus,” (Acts 2:38) and not “in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and
of the Holy Spirit.” And doubtless the author (Luke) is as good a witness for the usage of
his own time (about 115 A.D.) as for that of the period whereof he treats.” — (The Seat of
Authority in Religion, James Martineau, 1905, p. 568)
“It is clear, therefore, that of the MSS which Eusebius inherited from his predecessor,
Pamphilus, at Caesarea in Palestine, some at least preserved the original reading, in which
there was no mention either of Baptism or of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. It had been
conjectured by Dr. Davidson, Dr. Martineau, by the present Dean of Westminster, and by
Prof. Harnack (to mention but a few names out of many), that here the received text, could
not contain the very words of Jesus? This long before anyone except Dr. Burgon, who kept
the discovery to himself, had noticed the Eusebian form of the reading.” “It is satisfactory to
notice that Dr. Eberhard Nestle, in his new edition of the New Testament in Latin and Greek,
 furnishes the Eusebian reading in his critical apparatus, and that Dr. Sanday seems to lean
to its acceptance.” — (History of New Testament Criticism, Conybeare, 1910, pp. 98-102,
111-112)
“It is doubted whether the explicit injunction of Matt. 28:19 can be accepted as uttered by
Jesus. ...But the Trinitarian formula in the mouth of Jesus is certainly unexpected.” — (A
“Feine (PER3, XIX, 396 f) and Kattenbusch (Sch-Herz, I, 435 f. argue that the Trinitarian
formula in Matthew 28:19 is spurious. No record of the use of the Trinitarian formula can be
discovered in the Acts of the epistles of the apostles.” — (The International Standard Bible
Encyclopedia, James Orr, 1946, p. 398)
“Footnote to Matthew 28:19, It may be that this formula, so far as the fullness of its
expression is concerned, is a reflection of the liturgical usage established later in the
primitive community. It will be remembered that the Acts speak of baptizing “in the name of
Jesus”, Acts 1:5 +. But whatever the variation on formula the underlying reality remains the
same.” — (The Jerusalem Bible, 1966, p. 64)
“Critical scholarship, on the whole, rejects the traditional attribution of the tripartite
baptismal formula to Jesus and regards it as of later origin. Undoubtedly then the
baptismal formula originally consisted of one part and it gradually developed into its
tripartite form.” — (The Philosophy of the Church Fathers, Vol. 1, Harry Austryn Wolfson,
1964, p. 143)

trinity doctrine, gives us some new insight on how the original text of Matthew 28:19 was
structured:
“A whole group of exegetes and critics have recognized that the opening declaration of Matt.
28:18 demands a Christological statement to follow it: “All authority in heaven and on earth
has been given to Me” leads us to expect as a consequence, “Go and make disciples unto Me
among all the nations, baptising them in My name, teaching them to observe all things I
commanded you.” In fact, the first and third clauses have that significance: it looks as
though the second clause has been modified from a Christological to a Trinitarian formula
in the interests of the liturgical tradition.” — (G.R. Beasley-Murray, Baptism in the New

How Biblical MSS Were Altered

The following quotations show the ease with which scribes freely altered the MSS of the
New Testament, so unlike the scribes and custodians of the Old Testament Scriptures
who copied the holy Writings with reverence and strict accuracy. These quotations will also show the early start of the practice of triune immersion at the time when the doctrine of the Trinity was being formulated. They will also show how the New Testament writings were made to conform to traditional practice.

CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA
“The threefold immersion is unquestionably very ancient in the Church. ...Its object is, of course, to honor the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity in whose name it is conferred.” — (p. 262)

CONYBEARE
“The exclusive survival of (3) in all MSS., both Greek and Latin, need not cause surprise. In the only codices which would be even likely to preserve an older reading, namely the Sinaitic Syriac and the oldest Latin MS., the pages are gone which contained the end of Matthew. But in any case the conversion of Eusebius to the longer text after the council of Nice indicates that it was at that time being introduced as a Shibboleth of orthodoxy into all codices. We have no codex older than the year 400, if so old; and long before that time the question of the inclusion of the holy Spirit on equal terms in the Trinity had been threshed out, and a text so invaluable to the dominate party could not but make its way into every codex, irrespectively of its textual affinities.” — (Hibbert Journal)

“In the case just examined (Matthew 28:19), it is to be noticed that not a single manuscript or ancient version has preserved to us the true reading. But that is not surprising for as Dr. C. R. Gregory, one of the greatest of our textual critics, reminds us, ‘the Greek MSS of the text of the New Testament were often altered by scribes, who put into them the readings which were familiar to them,’ and which they held to be the right readings. Canon and Text of the N T, 1907, page 424.”

“These facts speak for themselves. Our Greek texts, not only of the Gospels, but of the Epistles as well, have been revised and interpolated by orthodox copyist. We can trace their perversions of the text in a few cases, with the aid of patristic citations and ancient versions. But there must remain many passages which have not been so corrected, but where we cannot today expose the fraud. It was necessary to emphasis this point, because Drs. Westcott and Hort used to say that there is no evidence of merely doctrinal changes having been made in the text of the New Testament. This is just the opposite of the truth, and such distinguished scholars as Alfred Loisy, J. Wellhausen, Eberhard Nestle, Adolph Harnack, to mention only four names, do not scruple to recognize the fact.”

[While this is perfectly true, nevertheless “There are a number of reasons why we can feel confident about the general reliability of our translations.” — (Peter Watkins, 'Bridging the Gap' in The Christadelphian, January 1962, pp. 4-8)]

*****The statement above is pure evil since the overwhelming evidence shows that the trinitarians even agree that they have altered the original text to make it agree with their false doctrine of demons. This is a case of calling evil good and good evil.*****

FRATERNAL VISITOR
“Codex B. (Vaticanus) would be the best of all existing MSS if it were completely preserved, less damaged, less corrected, more easily legible, and not altered by a later hand in more than two thousand places. Eusebius, therefore, is not without grounds for accusing the adherents of Athanasius and of the newly-arisen doctrine of the Trinity of falsifying the Bible more than once.” — (Fraternal Visitor, in The Christadelphian Monatshefte, 1924, p. 148)
Hammond

“There are two or three insertions in the NT which have been supposed to have their origin in the ecclesiastical usage. The words in question, being familiarly known in a particular connection, were perhaps noted in the margin of some copy, and thence became incorporated by the next transcriber; or a transcriber's own familiarity with the words might have led to his inserting them. This is the source to which Dr. Tregelles assigns the Doxology at the close of the Lord's Prayer in Matt. 6, which is wanting most of the best authorities. Perhaps also Acts 8:37, containing the baptismal profession of faith, which is entirely wanting in the best authorities, found its way into the Latin text in this manner.” — (Hammond, Textual Criticism Applied to the NT, (1890) p. 23)

Hastings Dictionary of the Bible

“In the Eastern Churches, triune immersion is regarded as the only valid form of baptism.” — (Vol. 1. p. 243 fn)

Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church

“In the 'Two Ways' of the Didache, the principal duties of the candidates for Baptism and the method of administering it by triple immersion of infusion on the head are outlined. This triple immersion is also attested by Tertullian (Adversus Prax 26). ...The most elaborate form of the rite in modern Western usage is in the Roman Catholic Church.” — (pp. 125-126)

Robert Roberts

“Athanasius... met Flaivan, the author of the Doxology, which has since been universal in Christendom: 'Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, etc.' This was composed in opposition to the Arian Doxology: “Glory to the Father, by the Son, in the Holy Spirit.” — (Robert Roberts, Good Company, Vol. iii, p. 49)

Whiston

“The Eusebians... sometimes named the very time when, the place where, and the person whom they (i.e. forms of doxology) were first introduced... thus Philostratus, a writer of that very age, assures us in Photius's Extracts that A.D. 348 or thereabouts, Flavianus, Patriarch of Antioch, got a multitude of monks together, and did their first use this public doxology, 'Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit.” — (Second Letter concerning the Primitive Doxologies, 1719, p. 17)

“We certainly know of a greater number of interpolations and corruptions brought into the Scriptures... by Athanasius, and relating to the Doctrine of the Trinity, than in any other case whatsoever. While we have not, that I know of, any such interpolations and corruption, made in any one of them by either the Eusebians or Arians.” — (Second letter to the Bishop of London, 1719, p. 15)

Why is The Holy Spirit Sometimes Called He or Him?
The nature of the Holy Spirit has long been a very controversial topic. It was not until 350 years after the cross (381 A.D.) that the Council of Constantinople was held by Emperor Theodosius to try and decide on the nature of the Holy Spirit. It was three Cappadocians that were steeped in Greek Philosophy who first decided that the Holy Spirit was another literal being like the Father and Son.

****So this belief never came from the Apostles but three men not grounded in the Word of God.****

Many people assume that the Holy Spirit is a divine person like the Father and Christ based on references to the Spirit as “he,” “him” or “himself” in the New Testament. This confusion arises from two factors. The first is the use of gender inflected pronouns in the Greek language (a difficult concept to understand for those who speak only English). And second is the bias on the part of some translators. In other words, if the translators have accepted the trinity doctrine as being true, then the translation performed by them will more than likely reflect their belief.

The romance languages deriving from Latin such as Greek, Spanish, French, Italian etc. assign a specific gender for every noun. Every object be it animate or inanimate is designated as masculine, feminine or neuter as in neither. But the gender is often unrelated to whether the item is masculine or feminine.

For example, in French the word livre, meaning “book,” is of the masculine gender and would be referred to by a pronoun equivalent to the English “he” or “him.” And in Spanish, mesa, meaning “table,” is in the feminine. Although these nouns have gender, their gender does not actually refer to being male or female as you can see. In English by contrast, most nouns that do not refer to objects that are male or female are referred to in the neuter sense with the pronoun “it.”

English uses separate gender forms only with pronouns (he, she, it). When speaking of people in English, grammatical gender is normally associated with the sex of the person indicated. For example, “He went to the shop,” says that the person who went to the shop was male, while “She went to the shop,” says that the person who went was female. When English speakers are not referring to people, they would normally, but not always, use the word “it” which does not specify gender.
So as already explained, every noun in Greek is **always** assigned a specific gender. But even nouns that do not refer to people may be masculine or feminine. For example, ἄρτος (Greek word for bread) is masculine, even though the object to which it refers is neither male nor female. And yet some words that do refer to people are assigned neuter gender. For example παιδίον (a Greek word for child) is neuter though a child is either male or female. Yet the word κοράσιον (girl) is also neuter even though it always refers to a female. **So gender in Greek is a matter of grammar, not biological sex, even though most words that refer exclusively to males are assigned masculine gender and most words referring exclusively to females are assigned feminine gender.**

The grammatical gender for “Holy Spirit” actually varies according to the language used. The grammatical gender of the word “spirit” is masculine in Latin (spiritus) and Latin derived languages such as German (Geist). While in the Semitic languages such as Hebrew (רוּחַ), Aramaic and its descendant Syriac, it is feminine. But in Greek it is neuter (πνεῦμα). If speakers of a particular language were to confuse grammatical gender with physical gender, they could think the Holy Spirit was a male or female or neither. Such confusion of course does not affect the real gender or lack of gender of the Holy Spirit. For example, as just seen, in the Hebrew language which the Old Testament was written, the word translated “spirit,” ruach, is referred to with feminine pronouns. But the Holy Spirit clearly is not a female or a woman.

Since the Greek word pneuma for spirit is grammatically neuter, then in the same language, the pronoun referring to the Holy Spirit under that name should also be grammatically neuter. However, the Greek word parakletos, which is translated “Counselor,” “Helper,” “Comforter” and “Advocate” in John chapters 14 to 16 is a masculine word in Greek, and thus is referred to in these chapters by Greek pronouns equivalent to the English “he,” “him,” “his,” “himself,” “who” and “whom,” which are grammatically correct in Greek. But to translate these into English as “he,” “him,” etc., is actually grammatically incorrect.

For example, you would never translate a particular French sentence into English as “I'm looking for my book so I can read him.” While this grammatical construction makes sense in the French language, it is wrong in English. **In the same way, to suppose on this basis that the Holy Spirit is a person to be referred to as “he” or “him” is incorrect. Only if the parakletos or helper were known to be a person could the use of a gender inflected pronoun justifiably be used in English. And the term parakletos certainly does refer to a person in 1 John 2:1 as it refers directly to Jesus Christ.**

Many believe that the Comforter is the Holy Spirit as a literal being, and one of the reasons some assume this is because the pronoun “he” has been used since parakletos is masculine. But the Comforter is actually Christ coming to us through the Spirit, that is the Spirit of God, not a literal being. So using pronouns such as “he” or “him” for the Greek word parakletos, being a masculine word would be correct in the sense of physical gender, as Christ through the Spirit is our Comforter.

****But the grammatical gender “he” or “him” is still technically incorrect for English translations.****

There is absolutely **no** theological or Biblical justification for referring to the term “Holy Spirit” with masculine pronouns, even in Greek. The Greek word pneuma, translated “spirit” (but also translated “wind” and “breath” in the New Testament) is always a grammatically neuter word. Thus in the Greek language, pronouns equivalent to the English “it,” “its,” “itself,” “which” or “that” should be used in referring to this word translated into English as “spirit.”
When the King James or Authorized Version was produced (early in the 1600s), the doctrine of the Trinity had already been accepted for more than 1,000 years. So naturally the translators of that version, influenced by that belief, usually chose personal rather than neutral pronouns when referring to the Holy Spirit in English.

For example, John 16:13-14 "Howbeit when he, 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. 14 He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you." However, this wasn't always the case.

Notice also however that in some passages in the King James Version the translators did use the proper neuter pronouns. For example, Romans 8:16 KJV says, “The Spirit itself [not himself] beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.” And similarly, Romans 8:26 KJV says "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 Another example is Matthew 10:20 KJV where Jesus says, “For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which [not who] speaketh in you.” Another is 1 Peter 1:11 KJV which refers to “the Spirit of Christ which [not who] was in them.”

*****In these 4 above cases the translators correctly used neuter pronouns because the Greek word pneuma, translated “Spirit,” is neuter in gender, the spirit is described as more like a substance (wind, essence of... or breath), not like a person.*****

*****You can however easily see Satan at work when people seem to easily see the example that incorrectly represents God’s spirit as a Person through incorrect translation. rather than correctly as the literal Spirit of God.*****

Regrettably, later English translators of the Bible have gone further than the King James translators in referring to the Holy Spirit with masculine rather than neuter pronouns. Thus the Holy Spirit is almost always referred to as “he” or “him” in the more modern versions. It should also be noted that Holy is always referring to a description rather than a title.

*****This reflects NOT linguistic accuracy, but the doctrinal bias or incorrect assumptions of Bible translators who wrongly believe the Holy Spirit is a person. So here is one more way that Satan tries to convince us of a lie.*****

Here are the same two examples that were translated correctly in the King James version now taken from the New King James Version and the New International Version:

Romans 8:16 NKJV “The Spirit Himself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God.”
Romans 8:26 NKJV “but the Spirit Himself makes intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.”
Romans 8:16 NIV “The Spirit himself testifies with our spirit that we are God's children.”
Romans 8:26 NIV “but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with groans that words cannot express.”

*****This is a perfect example of translator bias leading to deception. Satan is definitately at work here*****
See also “the pagan origins of the trinity doctrine” and how they decided the Holy Spirit was a person 400 years after the cross earlier on in this message. And who really gets the worship if the Holy Spirit is worshipped? And “The Meaning Of I Am In John 8:58” following.

**The Meaning of “I Am” in John 8:58**

Some Trinitarians claim that Christ was declaring Himself to be God in John 8:58 because a large number of Bibles have the words of Jesus translated as, “Before Abraham was, I am.” This erroneous claim is based on the words “I am” being a reference to Exodus 3:14 “And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shall you say unto the children of Israel, I AM has sent me unto you.” From this they attempt to draw the conclusion that Christ must be alluding to the divine name and thereby telling the Jews that He was God. There is in fact nothing in John 8:58 that states Jesus was claiming to be the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. This idea has been wrongly assumed, added to, and read into what Jesus stated. Some further try and support their claim by saying this is why the next verse says they picked up stones to kill Him. But the reason the Jews did that was not because they saw Jesus declaring Himself to be God, but because He declared Himself to be greater than their father Abraham.

**John 8:58 is one of those difficult translations that occurs many times in Scripture. As a result, while there are many translators that have translated this verse correctly, most modern translators have not. And since most Bible translators are Trinitarian, their bias appears in various places in their translation and John 8:58 is a common one. Here is the passage in context.**

John 8:53-59 “Are you greater than our father Abraham, which is dead? And the prophets are dead: whom makest you thyself? 54 Jesus answered, If I honour myself, my honour is nothing: it is my Father that honoureth me; of whom you say, that he is your God: 55 Yet you have not known him; but I know him: and if I should say, I know him not, I shall be a liar like unto you: but I know him, and keep his saying. 56 Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad. 57 Then said the Jews unto him, You are not yet fifty years old, and have you seen Abraham? 58 Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am. 59 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.”

*****Some claim that to deny Jesus is declaring Himself to be God in John 8:58 denies His Deity but it does no such thing. Firstly, it depends on what Jesus was really saying, and secondly, everything that Christ consists of had no beginning because it came from the Father. So His divinity had no beginning. If you trace Christ back you will have to go through the Father and you will never get to a beginning. But His personality as the Son began when He was brought forth by His Father. Jesus is the Son of God and came from God, and so He has the same divine nature as His Father by inheritance and hence is equal with God. “Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.” Philippians 2:6.*****

Note that the phrase “I am” in John 8:58 comes from two Greek words “egō” and “eimi.” The Strong's Definitions are:

“egō: “I” (only expressed when emphatic): - I, me.”
“eimi: I exist (used only when emphatic): - am, have been, X it is I, was.”
So “I exist”, “I have been” and “I was” are other possible translations which have all been used by various Bible translators for John 8:58 as well as elsewhere in the KJV. For example: *ego eimi* has been translated to “I was” in Luke 19:22 “You knewest that I was (ego eimi) an austere man.”

****It is also notable that the phrase *ego eimi* does not have any special meaning. It simply and most commonly just means “I am.” In the following examples Peter, Paul, Gabriel and Zacharias all said, “I am” (ego eimi). But none of them were claiming to be God or without beginning. The following examples prove this.****

Luke 1:18 “And Zacharias said unto the angel, Whereby shall I know this? for I am (ego eimi) an old man,” Luke 1:19 “And the angel answering said unto him, I am (ego eimi) Gabriel,” John 1:27 “He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe’s latchet I am (ego eimi) not worthy to unloose.” Acts 10:21 “Then Peter went down to the men which were sent unto him from Cornelius; and said, Behold, I am (ego eimi) he whom you seek:” Acts 21:39 “Paul said, I am (ego eimi)a man which am a Jew of Tarsus.” Romans 7:14 “For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am (ego eimi) carnal,” In the following verse the blind man identifies himself by saying, *ego eimi* (I am). None of the Jews saw this man as declaring himself to be God. John 9:9 “Some said, This is he: others said, He is like him: but he said, I am (ego eimi) he.” Note that as per John 8:58, there is no predicate as the word “he” is added by the translators.


And so the meaning of the phrase *ego eimi* is governed by context and grammar, not by any special meaning. These words formed a phrase that was in very common use by Jews and Christians and in New Testament Scriptures in the first century. It was not the name of any deity, be it the God of the Bible or any other god. It was never understood by Jews or Christians as declaring one to be God. If it were understood that way, you can be certain that the Jews would have never applied it to themselves as they did so frequently! Christ simply used the present tense of the verb “to be,” and there is actually no proof in these words that he was alluding to the divine name of Exodus 3:14. More on this later. While it is not possible that the Jews would have seen Jesus claiming to be the Almighty God in John 8:58, we can be sure that Jesus meant one of the following things by the phrase “before Abraham came to be, I am (ego eimi).”

1. “Before Abraham came to be, I have been.”
2. “I have been in existence before Abraham came to be.”
3. “I existed before Abraham was born.” (“I was”; “I existed”; “I have been”)
Note also that the words “I am” are present tense but Jesus is speaking of his existence in the past. By using the Greek word “prin” meaning “before”, Jesus places what He states next in the past tense, “before Abraham” came to be existing, and He then relates His own existence “before” Abraham's existence. Some translations treat the present tense verb (transliterated as “eimi”) in John 8:58 as a historical present, while other translators treat it as what some scholars call the progressive past (extending from the past to present). But some scholars say that the historical present is only used in narrative form, and claim that the words of Jesus in John 8:58 are not a narrative form. This however does not change the fact that the present tense verb is still used in a past tense context. Where is there any other scripture in the New Testament wherein modern translators used a present tense verb in a past tense context?

*****It should be very apparent that the “triune God” dogma has influenced most (but not all) Trinitarian translators to make an exception with John 8:58.*****

The late A.T. Robertson who is considered to be one of the greatest Greek NT scholars that ever lived wrote the following concerning John 8:24 and 58: “That I am he (hoti ego eimi). Indirect discourse, but with no word in the predicate after the copula eimi. Jesus can mean either “that I am from above” (verse 23), “that I am the one sent from the Father or the Messiah” (7:18,28), “that I am the Light of the World” (8:12), “that I am the Deliverer from the bondage of sin” (8:28,31,36), “that I am” without supplying a predicate in the absolute sense as the Jews (Deuteronomy 32:39) used the language of Jehovah (cf. Isaiah 43:10 where the very words occur hina pisteusete--hoti ego eimi).” And Jason BeDuhn, Ph.D, historian of religion and culture who is currently Professor of Religious Studies at Northern Arizona University wrote, “A quick glance at Smyth's Greek Grammar reveals that what we are dealing with in John 8:58 is a well-known Greek idiom. The pertinent entry is in section 1885 on verb tenses, which states, “The present, when accompanied by a definite or indefinite expression of past time, is used to express an action begun in the past and continued in the present. The 'progressive perfect' is often used in translation. Thus, ...I have been long (and am still) wondering.” I think you can see immediately that this entry applies to John 8:58, where the present verb eimi is accompanied by an expression of past time, prin Abraam gensthai.” — (Truth In Translation Accuracy and Bias in English Translation of the New Testament, Jason BeDuhn, Ch. 10, Tampering With Tenses p.106)

Despite this, some still argue that “I am” has no predicate such as “I am He” or “I am Christ.” And yet the following two verses have no predicate either. Jesus not only says "I am" (ego eimi), but is declaring Himself to be Christ, not God. While there is no predicate, we know from Matthew's account that “Christ” is indeed meant. **Note that the light gray text means it has been added by the translators. So when Jesus says ego eimi, is He saying “I am God” or “I am Christ” here?**

Mark 13:6 “For many shall come in my name, saying, I am (ego eimi) Christ; and shall deceive many.”

Luke 21:8 “And he said, Take heed that you be not deceived; for many shall come in my name, saying, I am (ego eimi)Christ; and the time draweth near: go you not therefore after them.”

Matthew 24:5 “For many shall come in my name, saying, I am (ego eimi) Christ; and shall deceive many.”

Jesus frequently declares Himself to be the Messiah using the words ego eimi, not God. Notice that Jesus admitted to being the Messiah when the Jews decided to kill him. “Again the high priest asked him, and said unto him, Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? 62 And Jesus said, I am (ego eimi):” Mark 14:61-62. **So again we see Jesus use the**
words *ego eimi* to say that “I am Christ,” which is what enraged the Jews to condemn Him to die! And like John 8:58, there is predicate. Jesus just says “I am!” So once again, when Christ said “I am,” was He declaring to be God or the Son of God? The footnote for John 8:58 in the Trinitarian Holy Bible: Easy-to-Read Version says: “However, it can also mean ‘I am he (the Christ).’” Also in verses 28 and 58.” — (World Bible Translation Center, 2006)

And famous Trinitarian scholar Robert Young (Young's Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible) in explaining John 8:58 informs us that Christ was proclaiming Himself by the words (*ego eimi*) to be “the promised Messiah.” — (Young's Concise Critical Bible Commentary, p. 61, 1977 ed., Baker Book House)

The phrase “I am” (*ego eimi*) occurs many times in the New Testament, and is often translated as “I am Christ” or “I am he” or something equivalent. We find “I am Christ” in Mark 13:6; Luke 21:8 and Matthew 24:5. And “I am he (Christ)” in John 8:24, 28; 13:19; 18:5, 6, 8 and Revelation 2:23, and “it is I (Christ)” in Matthew 14:27; Mark 6:50; Luke 24:39 and John 6:20. If these are parallel uses of *ego eimi* as many Trinitarians claim, then John 8:58 should be understood as “I am Christ.”

Note that in John 8:24, 28; 13:19; 18:5, 6, 8 that is translated “I am he” that there is no predicate, just as John 8:58 has no predicate. The word “he” has been added by the translators to make it read correctly in English. In every instance Jesus is saying I am Christ.

If the phrase in John 8:58 was translated “I am he” as per all the others, it would be easy to see that Christ was speaking of Himself as the Messiah, which He was, and would then be consistent throughout the New Testament.

These verses in John are often called John's “I am” statements by Trinitarians. They claim that whenever John reports Jesus as saying *ego eimi*, that it is a claim to Jesus being God. For example, where Jesus says, “I am the good shepherd” or “I am the bread of life,” then Jesus is really saying “I am God the good shepherd” or “I am God the bread of life” etc. Based on this claim, then they would also be claiming that many shall come in the future saying that they are God since Mark 13:6 says, “For many shall come in my name, saying, I am (ego eimi) Christ; and shall deceive many.” However it is obvious that Jesus is really saying that many will come in His name saying they are Christ. The Trinitarian view would also mean that John 14:6 is really saying, “Jesus saith unto him, I am (ego eimi) God the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.” Therefore God is the only way to Himself (how absurd). The more it is logically looked at, the Trinitarian view makes absolutely no sense at all.

****This kind of reasoning makes perfect sense doesn’t it? The lengths and desperation that some Trinitarians go to prove a lie is extraordinary.****

Some Trinitarians claim that Jesus must have been making a claim to deity because of the reaction of the Jews wanting to stone Him. But this reaction came from a long discourse of increasing hostility with a climactic ending that began when the scribes and Pharisees brought unto him an adulteress woman in verse 3. And as the story goes, because of Jesus she was not stoned and He told her to sin no more. So the tension already exists. In verse 12 Jesus continued speaking again saying, “I am the light of the world. He who follows Me shall not walk in darkness, but have the light of life.” So the Pharisees said to Him, “You bear witness of Yourself; Your witness is not true.” After the exchange of many more words that were taking place in the temple area, Scripture tells us in verse 20 that they would have already seized Jesus but God restrained them for it was not yet time. The Jews said God is their Father but Jesus said that if God was their Father that they would love Him because He came from God who personally sent Him! Jesus then said their father was the devil. Needless
to say, the hostility is increasing. Jesus says they do not hear because they do not belong to God. And the Jews responded that He was demon possessed. Jesus then said that if anyone keeps His word they will never die. The Jews said that Abraham and the prophets died and asked Him if He was greater than them. Jesus says that the one they call their God is who honors Him and again says that they do not know God and that they are liars! Things at this point would have been quite heated. Jesus then said that Abraham rejoiced at the thought of the day Jesus first came and so claimed to have seen Abraham. By now they would have been outraged and would want to kill him. To then say that He existed before Abraham would be the straw that broke the camel's back! Jesus has just claimed to be greater than their father Abraham. In an agitated and impulsive response to the extraordinary claim of Jesus, the Jews became enraged and picked up stones to hurl at Him. Looking at other examples in Scripture we find that they tried to kill Jesus for a whole lot less than what transpired in John Chapter 8.

Jesus in fact told everyone during this discourse who He was and He did not say that He was God. He did however indirectly say numerous times that He was the Son of God but the Pharisees did not understand. In verse 25 they asked Him who He was and Jesus replied that He had already told them in the beginning. After claiming many times to be the Son of God which others listening understood, and then to suddenly claim to be God at the end of this discourse would have caused nothing but confusion. Because others listening did understand and believed that He was the Son of God. (verse 30) The Scriptures prophesy many times that the Messiah would come. But they never prophesy that God Himself would come!

As Dr. John Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible (1690-1771) said for John 8:30, “many believed on him: as the Son of God, and true Messiah: faith came by hearing; Christ's hearers were of different sorts; some understood him not, and disbelieved, and rejected him; others had their eyes, and their hearts opened, and received him, and his words.”

Craig L. Blomberg is a distinguished Professor of the New Testament at Denver Seminary in Colorado since 1986. He wrote, “The fact that the Jews immediately tried to stone him does not mean they understood his statement as a direct equation of himself with God. Claiming that Abraham had seen his day (verse 56) itself bordered on blasphemy, and the Jews had already tried to kill him for much lesser 'crimes', such as healing on the Sabbath and speaking of God's love for the Gentiles! Stephen Motyer plausibly concludes that John 8:58 'would not be heard as a claim to be God. It would be heard as a claim to be a divine agent, anointed with the name and powers of God, and (in this case) active in the genesis of Abraham.'” — (The Historical Reliability of the Gospels: Second edition, pp 209-210). In other words, the annointed one, the Christ!

Jason BeDuhn, Ph.D. who is an historian of religion and culture, currently Professor of Religious Studies at Northern Arizona University wrote, “It is Jesus' claim to be superior to Abraham, and to have a superhuman longevity, not a claim to a divine self-designation, that enrages his audience. Jesus' argument in 8:58 is that he has seniority over Abraham, and so by the standards of Jewish society, he has greater authority than the patriarch. No one listening to Jesus, and no one reading John in his own time would have picked up on a divine self-identification in the mere expression “I am,” which, if you think about, is just about the most common pronoun-verb combination in any language.” — (Jason BeDuhn, Truth in Translation, p. 11)

We know that the Pharisees did not understand that Jesus was telling them that He was the Son of God in John chapter 8 but did they see Jesus as declaring Himself to be God?
Looking ahead just over a chapter, who did the Jews now think Jesus was? John 10:24 “Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him, **How long do you make us to doubt? If you be the Christ, tell us plainly.**” They were wondering if Jesus was the Christ, but being God did not enter the equation! The Jews did not ask if He was God, they asked if He was the Christ which is all Jesus ever claimed to be.

What about by the end of the Gospels? If the Jews understood Christ to be declaring Himself to be God, then the charges against Him would be for saying He is God. Any such claim would have to be well-known by this time. So who did the Jews and others understand Christ to be saying He was? That He was the Son of God or that He was God? Matthew 26:63 “And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure you by the living God, that you **tell us whether you be the Christ, the Son of God.**” Matthew 27:40, 43 “You that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself. **If you be the Son of God, come down from the cross.**” 43 **He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him:** for he said, **I am the Son of God.**” Here the Jews said that Jesus trusted in God and that they heard Him say that He was the Son of God. Did they understand Jesus as saying He was God? That would be an impossibility!

Mark 14:61 “Again the high priest asked him, and said unto him, **Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?**” 62 **And Jesus said, I am.**” Mark 15:39 “when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, **Truly this man was the Son of God.**” Luke 22:67, 70 **“Are you the Christ? tell us. ... 70 Then said they all, Are you then the Son of God? And he said unto them, You say that I am.**” John 19:7 “**The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.**”

****The Jews clearly never understood Jesus to be declaring Himself God. They only saw Him as saying He was the Son of God many times. The outrage would have been heard far and wide if Jesus had actually declared Himself to be God. There is no record anywhere in the entire New Testament of anyone even asking Him if He was God let alone accusing Him of saying that He was God. So how could the Jews have seen Him to be saying He was God in John 8:58?****

The disciples slept, ate, listened to His sermons, and traveled with Jesus almost everywhere He went. So if anyone is going to know if Jesus declared Himself to be God they are. So who did the disciples understand Jesus to be? Matthew 16:15-17 “He saith unto them, But whom say you that I am? 16 And Simon Peter answered and said, You are the Christ, **the Son of the living God.**” 17 And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed are you, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood has not revealed it unto you, but my Father which is in heaven.” So GOD the Father, who is in HEAVEN, revealed to Peter who was on EARTH, that Jesus was the Son of God. The disciples never saw Jesus as being God either.

Does the Bible call Jesus “God the Son” as Catholics and Trinitarians say or does the Bible call Christ the “Son of God”? Scripture always calls Jesus the “Son of God” in fact and with good reason. Because that is what He is to state the obvious! It is interesting that almost every single Bible translation has used CAPITALIZATION in Exodus 3:14 to show this is a NAME or TITLE of God. But almost every translation of John 8:58 for “I am” has NOT used Capitalization. The modern NKJV being one of the rare ones that has. Almost all Bible translations are done by Trinitarians and yet almost all did not Capitalize “I am” in John 8:58. This reveals that all these scholars knew there was no connection between Exodus 3:14 and
John 8:58. We find the same situation with cross-references in many well-known Bibles. For example, in the NASB, Reference Edition, Foundation Press, 1975, the Trinitarian New Testament editors used John 1:1; 17:5, 24 for all the cross-references for John 8:58. There is not one reference to Exodus 3:14 or Isaiah or any other Old Testament verse where God says “I am.” And the very Trinitarian RSV, American Bible Society, 1971 edition also has only John 1:1; 17:5, 24 as cross references for John 8:58.

*****So none of these Trinitarian scholars accepted the “I am” argument as being a reference to God.*****

Some Trinitarian translators have gone even further and have not only not capitalized or used “I am” in John 8:58, but further clarify the probable meaning in English showing that they do not agree this is a reference to God. The translations below which interestingly enough are mostly by Trinitarians render ego eimi in John 8:58 as follows:

*Translation of New Testament, Wakefield, G., (1795):*
“Jesus said unto them: Verily verily I say unto you, before Abraham was born, I am He.”

*New American Standard Bible, 1963 and 1971 editions alternative rendering:*
“I have been”

“Jesus said, truly I tell you, from before Abraham was, I have been.”

*“The Four Gospels” According to the Sinaite Palimpsest, Agnes Smith Lewis, from a 4th-5th century manuscript, (1886):*
“He said unto them, ‘Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I have been.”

“Before Abraham was, I have been.”

*The Unvarnished New Testament, Andy Gaus:*
“Truly, truly I tell you, Before Abraham was born, I have already been.”

*The Documents of the New Testament, G.W. Wade, (1934):*
“Jesus said to them, in very truth I tell you, before Abraham came into being, I have existed.”

*The Bible, A New Translation, Dr. James Moffatt, (1935):*
“Truly, truly I tell you,” said Jesus, “I have existed before Abraham was born.”

*The Clarified New Testament, P.G. Parker:*
“Jesus answered, before Abraham existed, I existed.”

*A Translators Handbook to the Gospel of John, Nida:*
“Before Abraham existed, I existed, or I have existed.”

“I existed before there was an Abraham.”

*The Living Bible:*
“The absolute truth is that I was in existence before Abraham was ever born!”

“I was in existence before Abraham was ever born”

*New Believers Bible, New Living Translation, (1996):*
“Jesus answered, ‘The truth is, I existed before Abraham was even born’”

“I existed even before Abraham was born.”

*New Simplified Bible:*
“Jesus said, I tell you the truth, I existed before Abraham was born.”

*An American Translation, Smith and Goodspeed, (1939):*
“Jesus said to them, “I tell you, I existed before Abraham was born!”
Then Jesus said to them, “I most solemnly say to you, I existed before Abraham was born.”


The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, George Swann, (1947): “Jesus said to them, verily, verily I say unto you, I existed before Abraham was born.”

A Literal Translation from the Syriac Peshito Version, James Murdock, D.D., from 5th century manuscripts, (1896): “Jesus said to them: Verily, verily I say to you, That before Abraham existed, I was.”

Twentieth Century New Testament: “In truth I tell you,” replied Jesus, “before Abraham existed I was.”

The New Testament According To The Eastern Text, George Lamsa Translation, (1940): “Jesus said to them, Truly, truly, I say to you, Before Abraham was born, I was.”

The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, Burkitt, from 5th century manuscripts, (1904): “Before Abraham came to be, I was.”


Ethiopic-Edition: Nouvum Testamentum Æthiopice, T.P. Platt, revised by F. Praetorius, Leipzig, (1899): “Before Abraham was born, I was”

The New Testament, Curt Stage, (1907): “Before Abraham came to be, I was.”

The New Testament, Kleist & Lilly, (1956): “I tell you the plain truth, replied Jesus, I am here - and I was before Abraham.”

Ledyard, G.H. New Life Testament, (1969): “Jesus said to them, for sure I tell you, before Abraham was born, I was and sum and always will be.”

The New Testament Or Rather the New Covenant, Sharpe, (1881): “I was before Abraham was born.”

The Worldwide English New Testament Bible: “Jesus answered, I tell you the truth, I already was before Abraham was born.”

Good News for the World, (1969): “Jesus answered, I tell you the truth, I already was before Abraham was born.”

International English Version, (2001): “I was alive before Abraham was born.”

International Bible Translators, (1981): “Jesus said to them, I am telling the truth: I was alive before Abraham was born.”

The Simple English Bible, (1978): “Jesus said to them, I tell you the truth: I was alive before Abraham was born.”

The Four Gospels and Revelation, Richmond Lattimore, (1979): “Truly, truly I tell you, I am from before Abraham was born.”

New Covenant, J.W. Hanson, (1884): “Jesus said to them, truly, truly, I say to you, I am before Abraham was born.”
“Before Abraham became, I, I am being.”
The New Testament in Hebrew, Isaac Salkinson and David Ginsberg, 1941 edition:
“I have been when there as yet been no Abraham.”
The New Testament (in German), Friedreich Pfaefflin, (1949):
“Jesus: Before there was an Abraham, I was already there.”
“I am speaking the truth, Jesus answered, I am older than Abraham.”
“I am here - and I was before Abraham.”

Footnote from last entry: “Christ here states (1) that he “was” already “in existence” before Abraham “came into being”; and (2) that, since then he has always been, and “still is,” in existence. The two statements, fused into one grammatical expression, stress the idea of continuity from before Abraham’s time down to the present moment and intimate his eternity. The statement from GOD the Father in Exod. 3:14 is different: “I am he whose essence it is to be.,” [Christ is disclosing instead his being before Abraham; but to say that 'he intimated his eternity', is reading more into the statement than is there. ed.]

Even the paraphrased Living Bible (also published as The Word and The Book) which takes great liberties with the literal text to bring out Trinitarian interpretations when it can, denies the ego eimi is God interpretation for John 8:58. Instead it gives the obvious and intended meaning as, “the absolute truth is that I was in existence before Abraham was ever born!” It does not say “I was God before Abraham..” And in the New Living Translation it still says, “The truth is, I existed before Abraham was even born!”

Numerous Trinitarian scholars would not ignore a chance to use a “Jesus is God” proof unless it was obviously invalid. Even the oldest English translations do not render this as “I am.” So why did so many respected Trinitarian scholars translate ego eimi in John 8:58 as above where most of the time they translated ego eimi as “I am” in other verses? They obviously knew how this verse is used by many Trinitarians, so why haven't they rendered it in a Trinitarian way? The only logical reason is that the context of John 8:58 simply does not allow for the “Name of God” interpretation and neither does it fit with parallel uses elsewhere in the new Testament.

That now leaves us with Exodus 3:14, so please note the passage in context. “And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them? 14 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. 15 And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The LORD God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.”

The original words behind the statement “I AM THAT I AM” are the Hebrew words “Ehyeh-Asher-Ehyeh.” These words have been variously understood for centuries. The Vulgate translates it as “I am who am.” The Septuagint to “I am...”
"THE BEING" or “I am he who exists.” The Targum of Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum paraphrase the words as “He who spake, and the world was; who spake, and all things existed.” The original words literally signify, “I will be what I will be.” The Hebrew word “Ehyeh” is transliterated to “hayah” and occurs 76 times in 72 verses in the Hebrew concordance of the KJV. Strong’s dictionary H1961 says the meaning of this word is, “A primitive root to exist, that is, be or become, come to pass.”

So it is clear why the literal translation is, “I will be what I will be” and not “I am.” It is also interesting to note that every other occurrence of the Hebrew word “hayah” in the KJV is never translated as “I am.”

Even with the uncertainty as to the meaning of these words, Trinitarians claim that the words “I am” Jesus spoke in John 8:58 are an allusion to the memorial name “Ehyeh-Asher-Ehyeh” in Exodus 3:14. But this is incorrect and not based on good scholarship. This can also be proven by comparing the words God originally spoke in Exodus and the words Jesus originally spoken in John. You will find that they are not the same and have nothing to do with each other. But how do we compare the words of John 8:58 and Exodus 3:14? The Old Testament was written primarily in Hebrew and the New Testament was written entirely in Greek. Quite easily in fact. If we read the New Testament in the original Greek, we would find that quotes from the Old Testament are also in Greek. This means at some point they were translated from Hebrew to Greek before the New Testament was written. Many of these references are actually excerpts from a Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible called the Septuagint. The Septuagint was completed around 270 B.C. by 70 Jewish scholars and was used by Greek speaking Jews in the time of Christ. The term “Septuagint” means 70 in Latin to the credit of these 70 scholars and it is also called the LXX for the same reason.

Here is Exodus 3:14 from the Greek Septuagint. Exodus 3:14 LXX “And God spoke to Moses, saying, I am THE BEING (ego eimi ho ohn – εγω ειμι ο οων) and he said, Thus shall ye say to the children of Israel, THE BEING (ho ohn – o owh) has sent me to you.”

Now compare it with the biased translation of the KJV. Exodus 3:14 KJV “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.”

Some claim that Christ was quoting the Septuagint in John 8:58 but you are about to discover that is impossible. Keep in mind also that regardless of what some translations may say in English that can be in error, the early original text almost never is. For example: Acts 12:4 in the KJV used the pagan word Easter and yet the Greek word there is “pascha” which means Passover, not Easter. What were they thinking! Other translations have translated “pascha” correctly as Passover.

The Hebrew word “Ehyeh” in the divine name is translated into the Greek OT as “ho ohn.” In the Greek NT, the words of John 8:58 are “Before Abraham was, I am (prin abraam genesthai ego eimi – πριν αβρααμ γενεσθαι εγω ειμι).” There is no mention of “ho ohn” anywhere! The direct translation of these Greek words is “The Being” for the divine name, and “I am” for the statement of Jesus. So Jesus saying “I am” (ego eimi) does not identify him as the God who spoke in Exodus 3:14. God said “ego eimi ho ohn – εγω ειμι ο οων,” while Jesus just said “ego eimi – εγω ειμι.” Note that the words ego eimi (I am – εγω ειμι) in Exodus 3:14 need a predicate. That is, it needs to say what you are. It cannot just say,
“I am nothing.” And so we find that God said, “I am the being – εγω ειμι ὁ ὄν.” And yes, ego eimi is found in John 8:58 but it is not the substance of emphasis, “ho ohn – ὁ ὄν” is. So the divine name is actually “ho ohn – ὁ ὄν”, not “ego eimi – εγω ειμι.” This is further proven by the end of verse 14 which says “(ho ohn – ὁ ὄν) has sent me to you.” (o ὄν απεσταλκεν με προς ὑμας.) It does not say “(ego eimi – εγω ειμι) has sent me to you.” (εγω ειμι απεσταλκεν με προς ὑμας.) It literally says “the being has sent me to you,” not the “I am has sent me to you.” The words are different in either language and there is no connection. No matter how it is translated into English, “ho ohn” is not the same as “ego eimi.” So the Greek has Exodus 3:14 using ho ohn for the divine name, but the same Greek has Jesus saying ego eimi to the Jews in John 8:58. The divine memorial name is not ego eimi (εγω ειμι) which Jesus said. It is however, ho ohn (ὁ ὄν), which Jesus did not say. As you can see, there is no connection between “I AM” in Exodus and “I am” in John. In no way does John 8:58 equate Jesus to God except by biased inference based on weak translation and bad grammar.*****

The Pre-Existence Of Jesus Christ

The pre-existence of Christ is something that you would not expect to be denied as there are so many clear verses throughout the Bible. Without the pre-existence of Christ there can be no incarnation, which is the precursor to the doctrine of salvation and the everlasting covenant of God that is laid out in the Old Testament scriptures. This is why the pre-existence of Jesus Christ is so significant.

But what does it mean to pre-exist and does this mean that Christ had no beginning? What does from everlasting or ancient times mean? Many take these to mean without beginning but what did the Bible authors mean and is this understanding consistent with other Scripture?

The biblical argument for the pre-existence of Christ is certainly multi-faceted. Pre-existence is defined as “existence in a former state or previous to something else.”

*****In the case of Jesus Christ, His pre-existence means that He was already in existence as the divine Son of God before He became a man and walked upon the earth.*****

The Meaning of Pre-Existence

The words pre-exist or pre-existence are not found in the Bible. However, the meaning of these words are certainly applicable to Christ in regards to His incarnation. Here are four definitions from well-known dictionaries for the word pre-existence.

Merriam-Webster Definition:
“Existence in a former state or previous to something else;”

Oxford Dictionaries:
“Exist at or from an earlier time than (something):”

Cambridge Dictionary:
“To exist before something else:”
From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia - Pre-existence of Christ:
“The doctrine of the pre-existence (or preexistence) of Christ asserts the ontological or personal existence of Christ before his conception.”

All dictionaries agree that pre-existence means to exist before something else. **It does not however mean to have always existed.** For example: When applying for health insurance you are typically asked if you have any pre-existing health conditions. Such a condition is normally something that has come into existence sometime during your life. The word pre-existence in fact implies a beginning. **This whole idea of pre-existence is consistent with Scripture which continually reveals Christ to have existed before His incarnation and before all things were created.**

**Bible Verses on the Pre-Existence of Christ**

*****All these verses and there are dozens more reveal that Jesus Christ pre-existed before His incarnation. But to be more precise, they reveal that He existed before all things were created or before the beginning. The question is, the beginning of what? It has to be the beginning of something as God had no beginning! The beginning of something is its origin.*****

Proverbs 8:22-30 “The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. 23 I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. 24 When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. 25 Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth: 26 While as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. 27 When he prepared the heavens, I was there: when he set a compass upon the face of the depth: 28 When he established the clouds above: when he strengthened the fountains of the deep: 29 When he gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment: when he appointed the foundations of the earth: 30 Then I was by him, as one brought up with him: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him;”

Micah 5:2 “But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are small among the clans of Judah, out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel, whose origins are from of old, from ancient times.”

John 1:1-3 “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. 2 The same was in the beginning with God. 3 All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.”

John 8:58 “Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.”

John 16:28 “I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.”

John 17:5 “And now, O Father, glorify you me with thine own self with the glory which I had with you before the world was.”

John 17:24 “Father, I will that they also, whom you have given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which you have given me: for you lovedst me before the foundation of the world.”

Colossians 1:15-17 “Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: 16 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: 17 And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.”

Hebrews 1:1-2 “God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, 2 Has in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he has appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;”

Hebrews 1:10 “And, You, Lord, in the beginning have laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:”

Revelation 22:13 “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.”

Let's look at some of these key Scriptures that are often misinterpreted and see what they mean and what Christ pre-existed before, and if they show Christ to have always existed or if His personality had a beginning. We are going to explain Scripture according to its obvious meaning, unless a symbol or figure is employed and not by assumptions or personal ideas or opinions and ask if you will please do the same.

For Adventists: “The truths most plainly revealed in the Bible have been involved in doubt and darkness by learned men, who, with a pretense of great wisdom, teach that the Scriptures have a mystical, a secret, spiritual meaning not apparent in the language employed. These men are false teachers. It was to such a class that Jesus declared, “Ye know not the Scriptures, neither the power of God.” The language of the Bible should be explained according to its obvious meaning, unless a symbol or figure is employed. Christ has given the promise, “If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine.” If men would but take the Bible as it reads, if there were no false teachers to mislead and confuse their minds, a work would be accomplished that would make angels glad, and that would bring into the fold of Christ thousands upon thousands who are now wandering in error.” — (E.G. White, RH, June 28, 1906)

Proverbs 8:23-36 - From the Beginning

Starting with Proverbs 8:23-26 which says, “I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. 24 When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. 25 Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth: 26 While as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world.” So Christ was brought forth from the Father before the Earth was created in the days of eternity. And of course if Christ was brought forth than this also confirms His personality has an origin. Note that the Hebrew word “Olam” used for everlasting in verse 23 in the KJV has several possible meanings and has been translated in many different ways according to context and what the translators believed to be correct. It can mean “the vanishing point”, “time out of mind - past or future”, “ancient time” and “beginning of the world” to name a few. Here are some other translations that demonstrate this point.

Proverbs 8:23 CJB “I was appointed before the world, before the start, before the earth's beginnings.”
Proverbs 8:23 HCSB “I was formed before ancient times, from the beginning, before the earth began.”
Proverbs 8:23 NLT “I was appointed in ages past, at the very first, before the earth began.”
Proverbs 8:23 NLV “I was set apart long ago, from the beginning, before the earth was.”
Proverbs 8:23 RSV “Ages ago I was set up, at the first, before the beginning of the earth.”
For Adventists: Some say this passage does not refer to Christ but not so, “Through Solomon Christ declared: “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. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth.... When He gave to the sea His decree, that the waters should not pass His commandment; when He appointed the foundations of the earth; then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him; and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him.” — (E.G. White, ST, August 29, 1900)

Some also have the wrong concept of the word beginning in Scripture. God of course has no beginning and the word beginning means the “origin” and source of something. One example from the Oxford dictionary for “beginning” is, “The background or origins of a person or organization.” If Christ was co-eternal with the Father, than like His Father, He would have no beginning. The Septuagint that Jesus quoted from says, “He established me in the beginning, before time was, before He made the earth.” So all Bible translations of Proverbs 8:23 in fact actually say Christ has an origin!

Solomon has also used Hebrew parallelism in verse 23 which expresses a thought one way, and then uses a complementary thought to express it another way. So the last two phrases of this verse are saying the same thing as the first phrase but in a different way. This gives tremendous clarity on when he is referring to and yet most still get it wrong. Bible writers did not understand science as we do and measured time by the spheres in the sky that did not exist until Christ created everything. So Christ was established in the beginning (Genesis 1:1) before He made the earth, which was before time was since there was nothing to measure time by yet. Thus we know that the beginning was when the Earth was made where there was nothing in existence to measure time by and hence was before time was. And so the phrases “from eternity”, “from everlasting”, “before time was”, “the days of eternity”, “from the beginning” and “before the earth was” all mean the same thing. Quite simply, before the earth and all things were created. So this passage states Christ pre-existed before He created all things before the beginning of this world.

Micah 5:2 - From Everlasting

Next is Micah 5:2 which is another verse that is frequently misunderstood. I have seen Trinitarians claim this verse means, “Jesus Christ has existed from all eternity! He had no beginning.” Where does this verse state that Jesus has always existed and had no beginning? It doesn't. It is assumed by Trinitarians who have the wrong mind set and choose to believe that from everlasting or ancient of times means no beginning. But this is not what is being said at all.

If you read Micah 5:2 with open eyes you will see that it informs us that Christ has an origin and was brought forth a long time ago. It also uses the Hebrew word “Olam” as Proverbs 8:23 and has the same translation issue. The phrase “goings forth” in the KJV implies an origin of course and why the NIV used the word “origins.”

Micah 5:2 KJV “But you, Bethlehem Ephratah, though you be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of you shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.”

Micah 5:2 NIV “But you, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though you are small among the clans of Judah, out of you will come for me one who will be ruler over Israel, whose origins are from of old, from ancient times.”
So when does this verse say the pre-existence of Christ was? According to the meaning of the word “Olam”, it means before “ancient times”, “from eternity”, “from everlasting”, “before time was”, “the days of eternity”, “from the beginning” and “before the earth was” which all mean the same thing. Before all things were created. Having no beginning is in total conflict with Him having an origin as this verse also states.

**John 1:1 - In the Beginning**

Consider now John 1:1 “(a) In the beginning was the Word, (b) and the Word was with [the] God, (c) and the Word was God.”

The Word was in the beginning, the beginning of what? It has to be the beginning of something. Was it the beginning of this world? Was it the beginning of the creation of the angels? Whichever beginning you place it at, it has to be the beginning of something.

Many Trinitarians use this to say that Christ always was, and had no beginning. But again, that is not what the verse says. Also the Word with has to mean something. The Word was “with” God. They cannot be the same being, or one could not be with the other. As John 1:2 NIV says, “He [Jesus] was with God in the beginning.”

The proper rendering of John 1:1 into English from the original Koine Greek text continues to be a source of vigorous debate among Bible translators, and especially the phrase the Word was God (c). The first verse of John's Gospel says that God's Son Christ Jesus, being referred to as the Word here, was with God in the beginning, (a+b). **John 1:1b does not say that the Messiah is God but was with [the] God. It is important to note that the word [the] exists in the Greek text but was left out by translators as they thought it read wrongly, but it is actually correct and has purpose.** Here is the original Greek text for (1b).

One can better understand John 1:1 by using the same grammatical structure but with different subjects such as Adam and Eve for example. “In the beginning was the woman, and the woman was with [the] human, and the woman was human.” Adam is “the human” and the woman is Eve, but Eve is also human by nature but Eve is not “the human” in identity. They are two separate persons. Look at this again with this perspective in mind. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with the Deity, and the Word was Deity.” The Word, the Son was with the supreme Deity the Father, and the Word was Deity in nature. But the Son was not “the” Deity, the Son was not “the” Father, yet the Son has the Father's divine nature by inheritance. The Word has the same God quality, the same divine nature and the same God-ness as His Father. Thus Jesus was with God in the beginning, but is not “the” God the Father but God by inheritance and nature being the Son.

So what is the beginning mentioned in John 1:1? Verse three reveals it was the beginning of all created things.

John 1:3 states, “All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made.” This verse has two direct statements being that Jesus preexisted and created all things and that all things were made through Him, and without Him nothing was made that was made. Did you notice that John said that not only were all things made through Him but also that without Him nothing was made. **Therefore Jesus could not have been one of the created things.**
Paul also confirms what John wrote, “For by Him all things were created.” He continues with even greater clarity to make sure that we understand what he means by all things. “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:” Colossians 1:16.

If Jesus created all things then He could not have been one of the created things. Paul adds the following just so there can be no mistake about this fact. “And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.” Colossians 1:17.

John, 24 - Before the World Was 17:5

The next two verses are self-explanatory and once again consistent with all Scripture. They reveal that the pre-existence of Christ was before the world was or before the foundation of the world. In other words, once again, before the beginning of all things being created. Don't forget that God existed before the beginning of all created things as He had no beginning.

John 17:5 “And now, O Father, glorify you me with thine own self with the glory which I had with you before the world was.”

John 17:24 “Father, I will that they also, whom you have given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which you have given me: for you lovedst me before the foundation of the world.”

Colossians 1:15-17 - First Born Over all Creation

And what about Colossians 1:15-17 “Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: 16 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: 17 And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.”

According to the Bible Jesus Christ was begotten, which literally means born, and before anything was created and long before God sent Him into the world. (John 3:16-17; 18:37; Colossians 1:15; Hebrews 1:1-9 and 1 John 4:9) The Bible does not tell us how Jesus was begotten but God wants us to know that He is His Son who He loves very much. Jesus said, “For as the Father has life in himself; so has he given to the Son to have life in himself.” John 5:26. According to His own testimony, Jesus is the only begotten Son of God and literally received life from His Father.

This is what Paul explained in regards to Christ, “Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature.” Colossians 1:15 KJV. Note that the latter part of this verse in the KJV is a bit misleading and should have been translated as “He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation.” Colossians 1:15 NKJV. Some use this verse to say that Christ Himself was a created being. But such an interpretation is contradicted elsewhere in Scripture such as John 1:1-4 and Colossians 1:16-17.

*****Thus we see that Paul is telling us that Christ was “Begotten First or Born Before all creation because all of creation was created by Christ through His Father.”

“And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ.” Ephesians 3:9.
For Adventists: “The dedication of the first-born had its origin in the earliest times. God had promised to give the First-born of heaven to save the sinner.” — (E.G. White, DA, p. 51)

Thayer's Greek Lexicon says, “Christ is called, firstborn of all creation, who came into being through God prior to the entire universe of created things.” Barnes New Testament Notes on Colossians 1:15 says, “the word firstborn - pro-tot-ok'-os - properly means the firstborn child of a father or mother.” Jamieson, Fausset and Brown Commentary says, “Begotten (literally, 'born') before every creature.” Matthew Henry's Commentary states “He was born or begotten before all the creation, before any creature was made;”

For Adventists: “Christ is “the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature; 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.” The first chapter of Colossians will wonderfully enlighten the mind as to the truth as it is in Jesus.” — (E.G. White, ST, Nov. 15, 1899)

The Bible refers to Christ as God's Son at least 120 times. Forty seven times using the phrase “Son of God.” Regarding the genuineness of Christ's Sonship, He is called “the only begotten” five times, “the firstborn” three times, “the firstbegotten” once and God's “holy child” twice. Four verses say He was “begotten” prior to His incarnation so this cannot be applied to His birth on Earth as some have chosen to believe. Four verses say that He “proceeded forth from,” “came out from” or “camest forth from” the Father. The evidence on this subject is overwhelming. Christ truly is the literal begotten Son of God who was brought forth from the Father before all creation. The example verses below with the help of the Thayer dictionary reveal that Jesus was born of the Father before the world was, then much later, He came into the world (incarnated, took on humanity), born as flesh and blood.

Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon
G1831 - To come forth from physically, arise from, to be born of.
G2064 - To come from one place to another.

John 8:42 “Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, you would love me: for I proceeded forth [G1831] and came from God; neither came [G2064] I of myself, but he sent me.”

John 16:27-28 “For the Father himself loveth you, because you have loved me, and have believed that I came out [G1831] from Mary as some have chosen to believe. Four verses say that He “proceeded forth from,” “came out from” or “camest forth from” the Father. The evidence on this subject is overwhelming. Christ truly is the literal begotten Son of God who was brought forth from the Father before all creation. The example verses below with the help of the Thayer dictionary reveal that Jesus was born of the Father before the world was, then much later, He came into the world (incarnated, took on humanity), born as flesh and blood.

John 17:7-8 “Now they have known that all things whatsoever you have given me are of you. 8 For I have given unto them the words which you gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out [G1831] from you, and they have believed that you did send me.”

****So Paul reveals that Christ created all things and His pre-existence was before all things were created. But he also reveals that Christ was born from God and hence His personality has a beginning. We know that Christ existed before the beginning of all things being created and that the Bible reveals in many ways that cannot be avoided that Jesus was brought forth from the Father and is the only begotten Son of God. The moment you claim that the personality of Christ had no beginning, then you deny that Jesus is the Son of God. And if you deny the Son of God then you have no means of entering the kingdom of heaven. And if you deny Jesus is the Son of God then you also
deny the one true God is the Father. Hence you deny the Father and Son which John called antichrist.*****

1 John 2:22-23 “Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: but he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also.”

For Adventists: Ellen White wrote, “Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. ... He who denies the personality of God and of his Son Jesus Christ, is denying God and Christ.” — (E.G. White, RH, March 8, 1906)

So what denies the personality of God and His Son which is denying God and Christ? Her husband explains, “Here we might mention the Trinity, which does away [with] the personality of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ,” — (James White, RH, December 11, 1855)

*****So claiming that Jesus had no beginning and has always existed alongside the one true God destroys their personality. God is no longer a Father and Jesus is no longer a Son. There is in fact no Scripture that says Christ had no beginning or has always existed. To the contrary, Scripture states He does have a beginning. And to state the obvious one more time, He cannot be the Son of God if He has always existed without beginning. Produce one Scripture that specifically says Christ had no beginning or that Christ has always existed. It simply does not exist. It can only be implied by eisegesis.*****

Revelation 22:13 - The Alpha and Omega

Some claim that the words Alpha and Omega found in Revelation 1:8, 21:6 and 22:13 means that Christ is without beginning or end. But to begin with, a beginning is the origin of something and an end is the termination of something as already seen. Many Christians have the wrong concept of the word beginning in Scripture. Remember that God had no beginning and has always existed. The “Alpha” is the “first” letter of the Greek Alphabet and hence is the “beginning” of the Alphabet, and “Omega” is the “last” letter of the Greek Alphabet and hence is the “end” of the Alphabet. So these terms are simply referring to the beginning and to the end of something, but what? Let's not read into anything or make assumptions but just look at what Scripture does say and what the use of these words meant to the Jews.

*****Note that every single verse with a reference to the Alpha and Omega without fail follows a reference to the second coming of Christ and the “end” of the world. This is obviously not a coincidence. Also, the phrase “which is, and which was, and which is to come” in Revelation 1:8 means Christ exists now, has pre-existed in the past and exists in the future when He comes again. Christ created this world and brought about its beginning, and He will be there in its end at His second coming and will bring about its destruction. Thus Christ is the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end.*****

Revelation 1:7-8 “Behold, he cometh with clouds: and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen. 8 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 21:1-6 “And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. ... 6 And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely. 7 He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be
his God, and he shall be my son. 8 But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.”

Revelation 22:12-14 “And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. 13 I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. 14 Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. 15 For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.”

*****Note also that the last two passages while speaking of the end immediately reveal that those who keep the Commandments get to eat of the tree of life, and that the sorcerers, whoremongers, murderers, idolaters and liars perish. Note how Revelation 21:7 references Revelation 2:7 below, which in turn references Revelation 22:14 in regards to those who get to eat from the tree of life, which are those who keep the Commandments of God.*****

Revelation 2:7 “To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.”

So we find a reference to the end of this world and the second coming of Christ before the words in question while directly after these words are two more things that happen directly after the end. That is too much evidence to be coincidental. And since we are at the end of the Bible and dealing with the end, then that is why these verses only refer to the “end.” So if the “end” is referring to the end of this world then the “beginning” obviously refers to the beginning of this world, which we find in the beginning of the Bible such as Genesis 1:1 and references to the first chapter of Genesis.

*****So everything we have looked at so far reveals that these verses are referring to the second coming of Christ and the end of this world where the faithful who kept the Commandments of God get to eat from the tree of life while others perish. Note Clarke's Commentary on Revelation 1:8 and how these words were used and understood by the Jews. Did they see these words to mean that Christ has always existed and is God? This of course would also contradict Proverbs 8 that says Christ was brought forth and so would not be possible anyway.*****

Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible. Adam Clarke, LL.D., F.S.A., (1715-1832)

“This mode of speech is borrowed from the Jews, who express the whole compass of things by א aleph and ר tau, the first and last letters of the Hebrew alphabet; but as St. John was writing in Greek, he accommodates the whole to the Greek alphabet, of which Α alpha and Ω omega are the first and last letters. With the rabbins נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ נ Neelaw had tau,” expressed the whole of a matter, from the beginning to the end. So in Yalcut Rubeni, fol. 17, 4: Adam transgressed the whole law from aleph to tau; i.e., from the beginning to the end.

Ibid., fol. 48, 4: Abraham observed the law, from aleph to tau; i.e., he kept it entirely, from beginning to end.

Ibid., fol. 128, 3: When the holy blessed God pronounced a blessing on the Israelites, he did it from aleph to tau; i.e., he did it perfectly.”

*****So as the Jews understood on the meaning of these words, from the beginning and first book of the Bible to the end and last book of the Bible, Jesus encompasses all things.
Thus the Jews who actually knew the meaning of these words disagree with the claim made by Trinitarians. The beginning and the end referred to in these passages is the beginning of this created world, while the end is the second coming of Christ and the end of this world, when a New Heaven and Earth are created. Christ brought about the beginning of this world and He also brings about its end. Barnes Commentary on Revelation 22:13 also confirms what Scripture reveals in this respect.

**Albert Barnes’ Notes on the Bible. Albert Barnes (1798-1870)**

“The idea here is, that he will thus show that he is the first and the last - the beginning and the end. He originated the whole plan of salvation, and he will determine its close; he formed the world, and he will wind up its affairs.”

For Adventists: “even from Genesis to Revelation. Christ is the Alpha, the first link, and the Omega, the last link, of the gospel chain, which is welded in Revelation.” — (E.G. White, 10MR, 171.1). “He is the Author and Finisher of our faith, the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.” — (E.G. White, 1888, 783.2)

The author of Hebrews illustrates another way that Jesus is the Alpha and Omega. “Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith.” Hebrews 12:2. Barnes Commentary relates this to the Alpha and Omega also.

**Albert Barnes’ Notes on the Bible. Albert Barnes (1798-1870)**

“The author and finisher of our faith - The word “our” is not in the original here, and obscures the sense. The meaning is, he is the first and the last as an example of faith ... The word “author” - ἀρχηγὸν archēgon - (marg. beginner) - means properly the source, or cause of anything; or one who makes a beginning. ... The phrase “the beginner of faith,” or the leader on of faith, would express the idea. He is at the head of all those who have furnished an example of confidence in God, for he was himself the most illustrious instance of it. ... The word “finisher” - τελειωτὴν teleiōtēn - corresponds in meaning with the word “author.” It means that he is the completer as well as the beginner; the last as well as the first. ... “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, the first and the last.” The word does not mean that he was the “finisher” of faith in the sense that he makes our faith complete or perfects it - whatever may be true about that - but that he occupies this elevated position of being beyond comparison above all others. Alike in the commencement and the close, in the beginning of faith, and in its ending, he stands pre-eminent.”

Considering these verses in Revelation that state the beginning and the end are referring to the creating and beginning of this world, consider now Genesis 1:1, John 1:1-3 and Hebrews 1:10.

**Genesis 1:1** “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” [The Beginning]

**Compare with:**

**Revelation 21:1** “I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away;” [The End]

**John 1:1-3** “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. 2 He [Jesus] was with God in the beginning. 3 Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made.”

**Hebrews 1:10** “And, You, Lord, in the beginning have laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:”
So these verses do not reveal Christ to be without beginning but that He pre-existed before all things were created in the beginning of this world. The use of the word beginning in this respect is consistent throughout Scripture.

Did Christ have an Origin or just His Personality?

Consider the following. If we could travel at a septuagintacentillion \(10^{513}\) times the speed of light in any one direction, would we ever find the end of the universe, like perhaps a wall with a sign saying this is the end? And if so, what would be on the other side of that wall? And what existed before Christ created this universe and all things through His Father? Was it nothing? And how long did nothing exist for if that was the case? It would have to be forever! And what about God, when did He begin to exist and who created Him? The answer is that there was never a time He did not exist and hence could never have been created. He is God and has always been and so is without beginning! And what about the Son of God who was born of the same substance of God? The same applies.

Since Christ is the same substance of His Father, then everything He consists of had no beginning. So His divinity had no beginning, His makeup; His nature had no beginning as it all came from the Father. So in principle, everything Christ is had no beginning. If you trace Christ back you will have to go through the Father and you will never get to a beginning. But His personality as the Son of God began when He was brought forth by His Father. This principle is brought out in Scripture many times. So in effect it was only the personality of Christ that had a beginning. These are the mysteries of God and things our mind cannot possibly comprehend.

For Adventists: “In arguing the perfect equality of the Father and the Son, and the fact that Christ is in very nature God, we do not design to be understood as teaching that the Father was not before the Son. It should not be necessary to guard this point, lest some should think that the Son existed as soon as the Father; yet some go to that extreme, which adds nothing to the dignity of Christ, but rather detracts from the honor due him, since many throw the whole thing away rather than accept a theory so obviously in harmony with the language of Scripture, that Jesus is the only begotten Son of God. He was begotten, not created. He is of the substance of the Father, so that in his very nature he is God; and since this is so “it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell.” Col. 1:19… While both are of the same nature, the Father is first in point of time. He is also greater in that he had no beginning, while Christ's personality had a beginning.” — (E.J. Waggoner, ST, April 8, 1889)

The pioneers studied and prayed earnestly together with Ellen White and she frequently went into vision and a clear explanation was given to the Scriptures they had been studying together. So the pioneers were in harmony on the main issues of doctrine. Thus Ellen White collaborates what Waggoner said above. “The Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of the Father, is truly God in infinity, but not in personality.” — (E.G. White, MS116, December 19, 1905)

So what about the following Scriptures. Do the first two verses contradict the last? Absolutely not.

John 14:28 “You have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If you loved me, you would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I.”
1 Corinthians 11:3 “But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.”

Philippians 2:6 “Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.”

The word greater in John 14:28 refers to position but not in nature in the same way it does with a man and a woman or even a father and son. In 1 Corinthians 11:3 we see that the head of the woman is man. Does this mean the husband is a superior being to his wife? The answer is obviously no. She is a human being just as the man is and they are equal in nature. So the husband is greater than his wife only by position. The same applies to a father and son. The father is greater by position due to age and hence authority. And so the father is greater in that he was first. The same applies to our Heavenly Father and His Son. The Father is greater by position in that He was first, but not greater by nature and hence form as Philippians 2:6 states.

For Adventists: As the husband of Ellen White stated in regards to the Father and Son, “The Father was greater than the Son in that he was first.” — (James White, RH, January 4, 1881)

*****So we observe the same concept of being equal in nature, but Christ submitted Himself to the Father as He was greater in that He was first being His literal Father. So we find in these verses the principle of headship and submission established by God as displayed both in marriage and in the Godhead. So these Scriptures in fact also reveal that God is the literal Father of Christ and that Christ is the literal Son of God. And as Waggoner, Ellen White, James White and Scripture reveals, that means Christ came after the Father being the Son.*****

**Conclusion**

Everything that Christ consists of had no beginning; His divinity had no beginning, His makeup, His substance all had no beginning as it came from the Father. So in principle, everything Christ is had no beginning. If you trace Christ back you will have to go through the Father and you will never get to a beginning. But His personality as the Son began when He was brought forth by His Father. So in effect it is only the personality of Christ that had a beginning.

As Christian book author Ellen White wrote, “The Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of the Father, is truly God in infinity, but not in personality.” — (E.G. White, MS116, December 19, 1905). “The dedication of the first-born had its origin in the earliest times. God had promised to give the First-born of heaven to save the sinner.” — (E.G. White, DA, p. 51). “The Eternal Father, the unchangeable one, gave his only begotten Son, tore from his bosom Him who was made in the express image of his person, and sent him down to earth to reveal how greatly he loved mankind.” — (E.G. White, RH, July 9, 1895)

Christ was the first born over all creation. Meaning He was born before ALL THINGS as Paul wrote in Colossians 1. **This is what Christ pre-existed before. All things!** Many Christians have the wrong idea of words like self-existent and pre-existence which are words not found in the Bible but are used by many including Ellen White. And like Scripture, we need to be careful not to misunderstand what Ellen White is saying which so many easily do but to line up ALL that she wrote to understand what she was saying. Because while she uses these phrases, she also states that Christ was the first born of heaven, tore from the bosom of the Father, and that while He is God in infinity, she says His personality had a beginning. She
reveals that He was brought forth from the Father before all things were created and quotes Proverbs 8 on this.

Colossians 1:15-17 “He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation. 16 For by Him all things were created that are in heaven and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers. All things were created through Him and for Him. 17 And He is before all things, and in Him all things consist.”

*****So Ellen White and Scripture reveals that the pre-existence of Christ was before ALL created things but this does not mean that He has always existed. And not forgetting that if He had, then He CANNOT be the Son of God.

Think about those words for a moment. Jesus is God's Son in the very real sense and meaning of these words. If we deny this then we deny the personality of the Father and Son and that is what the Apostle John and Ellen White called the spirit of antichrist. This is what Satan wants us to do and was his plan all along. Thus we need to be very careful that we do not fall into this trap.

And one might also ask. Why do some have this mindset that Jesus must be inferior or not God just because He is literally God's Son and was brought forth before the creation of all things? It does not change who He is or what He has done or that He is God's Son who loves us so much that He laid down His life for us. It also does not change His God nature or His divinity that He got from His Father by inheritance. It is Satan that tries to give us the wrong mindset here, sowing wrong thoughts into our mind that ultimately has many deny that He is the literal Son of God.*****

It is also often claimed that the non-Trinitarian belief denies the pre-existence of Christ, which as demonstrated previously is simply not true. The real problem exists by a belief in the trinity. An Adventist Christian author from the past said, “The great mistake of Trinitarians, in arguing this subject, is this: they make no distinction between a denial of a trinity and a denial of the divinity of Christ. They see only the two extremes, between which the truth lies; and take every expression referring to the pre-existence of Christ as evidence of a trinity.

The Scriptures abundantly teach the pre-existence of Christ and his divinity; but they are entirely silent in regard to a trinity.

The declaration, that the divine Son of God could not die, is as far from the teachings of the Bible as darkness is from light. And we would ask the Trinitarian, to which of the two natures are we indebted for redemption? The answer must, of course, be, To that one which died or shed his blood for us; for “we have redemption through his blood.” Then it is evident that if only the human nature died, our Redeemer is only human, and that the divine Son of God took no part in the work of redemption, for he could neither suffer nor die.

Surely, we say right, that the doctrine of a trinity degrades the Atonement, by bringing the sacrifice, the blood of our purchase, down to the standard of Socinianism.” — (J.H. Waggoner, 1884, The Atonement In The Light Of Nature And Revelation, p, 173)

Socinianism is the heretical tenets of Faustus Socinius, a 16th-century Italian theologian, denying the divinity of Christ, the existence of Satan, original sin, the atonement, eternal punishment, and explaining sin and salvation in rationalistic terms.
Scripture reveals the Father and Son created all things and that the pre-existence of Christ was before creation, that is, in the beginning, when all things were created by Him and through Him.

In finishing off I will leave you with this final thought for contemplation:

*****The Biblical non-Trinitarian belief does not deny the divinity or the pre-existence of our Lord and Saviour, but the trinity doctrine does have many serious implications such as denying the personality of the Father and Son and the Atonement to name just two leaving the person who believes this distorted view in a very precarious position without salvation or justification if they refuse to see the truth. OUCH!!*****

And so I pray that you would come to the knowledge of the truth being careful what you are hearing because the measure of thought and study that you give to the truth you hear will be the measure of virtue and knowledge that comes back to you and more besides will be given to you who hear.

Ephesians 4:13 (AMPC) 13 [That it might develop] until we all attain oneness in the faith and in the comprehension of the [full and accurate] knowledge of the Son of God, that [we might arrive] at really mature manhood (the completeness of personality which is nothing less than the standard height of Christ’s own perfection), the measure of the stature of the fullness of the Christ and the completeness found in Him.

May God richly bless you as you move forward in Christ
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