

A while back a Jehovah's Witness came to my door and after a long discussion, left me with a booklet entitled: *Should You Believe in the Trinity?* What follows is a response to the points made by that booklet. While some comments may not make sense without the booklet in front of you, this should provide you with ample biblical evidence on the doctrine of the trinity.

The individual who came to my door mentioned to me that he carried a King James Bible, and so I will use this version whenever I quote scripture. The New World Translation that they also use is very inaccurate and written only to support their beliefs. It has no basis in the original languages, but rather is a paraphrase written to solve some of the problems the church was facing. You cannot accept this translation when working with them, or you will find it very difficult to accomplish anything.

The rest of this document is written as a first person letter to a Jehovah's Witness:

It is important to recognize that I agree with you that God is Jehovah. Many Hebrew words are used to refer to God. The Hebrew word that I believe you translate to Jehovah (and the King James Version does on a few occasions) is YHWH.

First I want to clarify the doctrine of the Trinity; just to be sure that you understand the case I am making. I believe the Bible teaches the doctrine of the Trinity quite clearly, even though it does not specifically use the term. Specifically the Bible teaches that God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit all are one being, although three distinct persons. To quote *Should You Believe in the Trinity* "The doctrine says that the three are co-equal, almighty, and uncreated, having existed eternally in the Godhead." It is perhaps a difficult concept to grasp, but I think you will see that scripture is quite clear on this matter. Everything that follows is written by me. I have spent a tremendous amount of time writing this letter to you, and I do ask that you read all of it.

Let me start by saying that there is only one God. Scripture makes this clear (my comments are in {brackets}):

Deut. 6:4 Hear, O Israel: The LORD {YHWH} our God {elohim} is one LORD {YHWH}:

Is. 43:10 Ye are my witnesses, saith the LORD {YHWH}, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no God {el} formed, neither shall there be after me.

1 Tim. 2:5 For there is one God {theos}, and one mediator between God {theos} and men, the man Christ Jesus;

This one God, Jehovah, is the only God. He is eternal, no God will be formed after him, and none existed before him. God claims certain titles for himself, and himself alone:

Is. 44:6 Thus saith the LORD {YHWH} the King of Israel, and his redeemer the LORD {YHWH} of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God {elohim}.

Is. 48:12 Hearken unto me, O Jacob and Israel, my called; I am he; I am the first, I also am the last.

Ex. 3:14 And God {elohim} 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.

I don't think we have any points of disagreement thus far. Several Hebrew and Greek words refer to God. The most common Hebrew words are YHWH and Elohim. Theos is a Greek word. The NWT may translate some or all of these Jehovah, and I don't have a problem with that. God also claims certain titles for himself, such as "I am the first, and I am the last," "I AM," and "I AM THAT I AM." Additionally, these titles indicate his nature. "The first and the last" would indicate that there is no one greater than he, no one has existed before or after God, as he is the first and the last. "I AM" is basically a way of saying "I BE" or "I exist" with no boundaries.

God the father, Jehovah, is a distinct person. I think we would both agree on this as well.

2 Pet. 1:17 For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

You may find this translated "Jehovah" in the NWT, I am not sure. So we can agree that the scriptures indicate that God the father is in fact, Jehovah God.

With that in mind, let's move on to Jesus, God the Son. Let's look at a passage in Hebrews (again King James Version, but I think you will find the NWT does not differ much)

Heb. 1:1 God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets,

Heb. 1:2 Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;

{Who is the subject here? The Son.}

Heb. 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;

Heb. 1:4 Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.

Heb. 1:5 For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?

Heb. 1:6 And again, when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.

Heb. 1:7 And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire.

Heb. 1:8 But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom.

{Who is the subject here? The Son.}

Heb. 1:9 Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

{Who is the subject here? The Son.}

Heb. 1:10 And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:

Heb. 1:11 They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment;

Heb. 1:12 And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.

{Who is the subject here? The Son.}

I think it is easy to see that this passage refers to the Son. Now lets look back at Psalm 102:

Ps. 102:1 A Prayer of the afflicted, when he is overwhelmed, and poureth out his complaint before the LORD {YHWH}. Hear my prayer, O LORD {YHWH}, and let my cry come unto thee.

Who is the subject here? Jehovah (YHWH).

Ps. 102:12 But thou, O LORD {YHWH}, shalt endure for ever; and thy remembrance unto all generations.

Who is the subject here? Jehovah (YHWH).

Ps. 102:19 For he hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary; from heaven did the LORD {YHWH} behold the earth;

Ps. 102:20 To hear the groaning of the prisoner; to loose those that are appointed to death;

Ps. 102:21 To declare the name of the LORD {YHWH} in Zion, and his praise in Jerusalem;

Ps. 102:22 When the people are gathered together, and the kingdoms, to serve the LORD {YHWH}.

Who is the subject here? Jehovah (YHWH). My reason for continuing to ask this question is to make clear that this psalm is entirely about Jehovah.

Ps. 102:23 He weakened my strength in the way; he shortened my days.

Ps. 102:24 I said, O my God {el}, take me not away in the midst of my days: thy years are throughout all generations.

Ps. 102:25 Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands.

Ps. 102:26 They shall perish, but thou shalt endure: yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed:

Ps. 102:27 But thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end.

These last two verses should look very familiar. That's because they are the same things ascribed to the Son in Hebrews! Look again at the last three verses we looked at in Hebrews, which were referring to the Son. It is a quote of the passage from the Psalms talking about Jehovah, only in Hebrews it is talking about the Son. Jesus is Jehovah. Scripture is making that point, not me.

- Heb. 1:10 And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:
Heb. 1:11 They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment;
Heb. 1:12 And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.

Again, feel free to look up these verses in the NWT.

I think this is pretty good evidence that Jesus is Jehovah, but the Bible provides a lot more evidence for this fact than just one reference.

- Rev. 22:12 And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.
Rev. 22:13 I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.
Rev. 22:14 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.
Rev. 22:15 For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.
Rev. 22:16 I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.

Jesus identifies himself as "Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." This is a direct claim to be God, as this is exactly how God describes himself in the verses we looked at earlier (IS 44:6 and 48:12). How could there possibly be two beginnings and two ends? That simply does not make sense. The only way Jesus can be the beginning and the end and Jehovah can be the beginning and the end is if they are one and the same.

If there is any doubt or wonder if something changed between the old and new testaments, look how God describes himself one chapter earlier in Revelation:

- Rev. 21:5 And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write: for these words are true and faithful.
Rev. 21:6 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.
Rev. 21:7 He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son.

Another scripture that points to the Trinity is Colossians 2:9:

- Col. 2:8 Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.
Col. 2:9 For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

Another indication that Jesus is Jehovah is that he commended worship of himself, something that would be strictly forbidden unless he is God.

Ex. 20:3 Thou shalt have no other gods before me.

John 20:28 And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God.

John 20:29 Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.

When Thomas worshipped Jesus, instead of rebuking him, as he would have done were he not God, he commends him for it. Now we get to the verse we discussed at my doorstep. As you can see, at this point, it's almost elementary because I have shown through other scriptures that Jesus is indeed Jehovah God, but I will address it anyway.

John 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

Let's talk Greek. There are several reasons that show that the correct translation is in fact, The Word was God. (1) Colwell's Rule - When a predicate nominative appears before a form of the verb "to be," that noun is to be taken as definite, even though it has no definite article. This is precisely the construction we have in John 1:1. Literally this would read "God was the Word." Complex? Yes. More on this later, when I address the booklet *Should You Believe in the Trinity?*

(2) Use of Anarthrous Nouns in General - One need not even appeal to Colwell's Rule to understand why Theos appears without the article (the a). Anarthrous nouns are used to stress the Quality or Character of the noun in question in Koine Greek. This passage teaches that Jesus is of the quality or Character of divinity. Again, complex, but when we are debating the fine points of Greek grammar, it's not going to be simple.

Thus, according the rules of Greek translation, the proper translation is indeed "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." The word used for God is Theos, which is translated with a capital G; the exact phrase is Theos en Ho Logos. Or, word for word in English, God was the Word.

But there are plenty of verses that make this same point besides this one, as I've already shown.

John 5:16 And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day.

John 5:17 But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.

John 5:18 Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.

Jesus equated himself with God in a clear enough manner that the Jews sought to kill him. I find it interesting that this statement and response is located right before a verse you mentioned to me:

John 5:19 Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise.

You read this to say that Jesus needs God's permission to do something, I read it to say that Jesus and God are the same, and thus they work together, not apart. Again, while this verse on its own may not convince you, there is a great deal of evidence that Christ claimed to be God. How could he be perfect if he claimed things that weren't true?

John 8:57 Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?

John 8:58 Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.

John 8:59 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.

Ex. 3:14 And God {elohim} 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.

If there is any question whether or not Jesus was claiming to be God with this statement I think it is cleared up by the reaction of the Jews, who attempted to stone him for his words.

John 10:26 But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you.

John 10:27 My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me:

John 10:28 And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand.

John 10:29 My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.

John 10:30 I and my Father are one.

John 10:31 Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him.

Once again, the Jews attempted to stone him for this statement.

John 10:32 Jesus answered them, Many good works have I showed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me?

John 10:33 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.

They clearly understood that Jesus was claiming to be God. How could he make such a claim if he was not and still be perfect?

John 10:34 Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?

John 10:35 If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken;

John 10:36 Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?

John 10:37 If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not.

John 10:38 But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him.

How could Jesus be in the father if he was not God?

As one more point, the scriptures often show that Jesus has the attributes of Jehovah God.

Jesus is self existent: John 5:26

Jesus is Unchangeable: Hebrews 1:10-12; 13:8

Jesus is Eternal: John 1:1; 8:58; 17:5; Col. 1:17; Heb. 1:2

Omnipresent: Matt. 18:20; 28:20; John 3:13; Eph. 1:23; 4:10; Col. 3:11

Omniscient: John 16:30

Incomprehensible: Matt. 11:25-27

This list is far from comprehensive. Consider one example of Jesus' omniscience in Matthew:

Matt. 9:2 And, behold, they brought to him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed: and Jesus seeing their faith said unto the sick of the palsy; Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee.

Matt. 9:3 And, behold, certain of the scribes said within themselves, This man blasphemeth.

Matt. 9:4 And Jesus knowing their thoughts said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?

Matt. 9:5 For whether is easier, to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and walk?

Matt. 9:6 But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house.

Here Jesus knows the thoughts of others, and responds to those thoughts. Even a perfect man could not possibly know what others are thinking, only an all-knowing God knows our thoughts. There are many more examples of this in the Gospels.

Simply put, the Deity of Christ is much more than a "fanciful teaching" or a belief that has no basis in scripture. There is no way to read all of these passages and come away believing anything other than the fact that Jesus is the Almighty God. C.S. Lewis once said that someone who did what Jesus did and said what he said was either a raving lunatic, on the level of a man who claims he is a radish, or exactly what he claimed to be: Almighty God. We must either dismiss him or worship him; there is no in-between.

The third person of the Trinity is the Holy Spirit. Once again, my belief that the Holy Spirit is God comes only from the scriptures, nowhere else.

Acts 5:3 But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land?

Acts 5:4 Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.

Acts 5:5 And Ananias hearing these words fell down, and gave up the ghost: and great fear came on all them that heard these things.

Ananias lied to the Holy Spirit, and Peter told him “thou has not lied unto men, but unto God.” Ananias dropped dead in response! Certainly he did not doubt the words of Peter.

The Holy Spirit frequently speaks and acts as a distinct person. For example, if we look further in Acts we see the Holy Spirit speak to Philip:

Acts 8:29 Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot.

And futher on, to others:

Acts 13:2 As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.

Acts 13:3 And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away.

Acts 13:4 So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus.

Acts is not the only book in which the Holy Spirit acts or is spoken of doing something:

John 14:25 These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you.

John 14:26 But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.

John 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:

The spiritual gifts which manifest themselves in the lives of Christians comes directly from the Holy Spirit.

1 Cor. 12:11 But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.

Heb. 2:4 God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?

Thus the spirit has a will, and a will is a characteristic of a person. Isaiah considers the Holy Spirit to be Deity as well:

Is. 48:16 Come ye near unto me, hear ye this; I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I: and now the Lord GOD, and his Spirit, hath sent me.

If the Spirit were merely an expression of God, why would he be singled out?

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

2 Cor. 3:18 But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.

Just as the scriptures show Jesus to have the attributes of God, so they do with the Holy Spirit:

The Holy Spirit is:

Eternal: Heb 9:14

Omnipresent: Psalms 139:7

Omniscient: 1 Cor. 2:10-11

The Holy Spirit is involved in the works of God:

Creation: Gen 1:2; Psalms 104:30

Incarnation: Matth. 1:18, 20; Luke 1:35

Resurrection: Rom. 1:4; 8:11

Salvation: Rom. 8:1-27

Thus we see that the Holy Spirit is indeed a distinct person, and is also God. This brings us to the fact that scripture consistently shows us God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, and yet makes it very clear that there is only one God.

Is. 45:22 Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else.

Thus we are left with the clear evidence that God is not simple. God is one, and yet exists in three persons, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. It is not the easiest doctrine to understand, but it is essential to truly understanding God. All analogies to the Trinity eventually break down, but let me give you one anyway: If I took a pot of boiling water and dropped ice cubes in it, I have a pot of water in three forms, Solid, liquid and gas. Each of these has distinct attributes, and is easily identifiable as different from the others, and yet all are water.

I encourage you to think about these things clearly with your own mind. You will find that the doctrine of the Trinity is not just “an invention of the catholic church” but indeed is a foundational belief held all through scripture.

John 8:31 Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed;

John 8:32 And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

Do not take these words of Jesus lightly. Pursue the truth! Study the scriptures and see what they hold. You will find that God is waiting for you to discover the truth.

I believe I have answered many of the questions raised in *Should You Believe in the Trinity?* However, I will go through it section by section to make sure that I have covered all of your questions.

Should You Believe It?

This section basically details the doctrine of the Trinity and serves as an introduction. Of course, I would answer this question with a resounding “YES!”

How is the Trinity Explained?

The primary point here is that the doctrine of the Trinity is confusing, and the question is asked “would God be responsible for a doctrine about himself that is so confusing that not even Hebrew, Greek, and Latin scholars can really explain it?”

To that I have this answer: God is not limited by our ability to understand him. The general person’s inability to understand in detail the laws of physics does not make them false. God is not “making up doctrine” at all! What we are talking about is truth revealed through scripture. The Trinity is difficult to understand. Perhaps this is why there is not simply one verse saying “God is a Trinity” because that would be misunderstood. Instead, through the entire revelation of scripture it is revealed that God is a tri-une God.

Is It Clearly a Bible Teaching?

The first paragraph reads: “If the Trinity were true, it should be clearly and consistently presented in the Bible. Why? Because, as the apostles affirmed, the Bible is God’s revelation of himself to mankind.” I agree with this statement, and have shown you how the Bible does, in fact, present the Trinity clearly and consistently.

The Catholic Encyclopedia is cited repeatedly in this section. It’s important to remember that the Catholic Encyclopedia is not scripture. The statement is made that “no single term by which the Three Divine Persons are denoted together.” The word Trinity is not used in scripture, however, the word Elohim is a plural pronoun, as I mentioned on our doorstep, and the three are most often referred to as God. When a specific person is involved, then they are mentioned by name. If the three are one, why would it be necessary to create another word? We are not talking about three separate gods, but One God, in three persons.

A mention is made that there is no evidence of the Trinity in the old testament. They cite a few sources; however, I will again defer to scripture:

Gen. 1:1 In the beginning God {Elohim} created the heaven and the earth.

Gen. 1:2 And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep.
 And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

As I mentioned earlier, Elohim is a plural pronoun. Additionally, in verse two we already see the Holy Spirit in action! Why mention it if it was merely an expression of God?

Gen. 1:26 And God {elohim} said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

Gen. 2:7 And the LORD {YHWH} God {elohim} formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

Again we have evidence of plurality in the Godhead, and yet the Bible is clear there is only one God. A Triune God. Notice that in 1:26 God (plural) says “let us make man” and then in 2:7 YHWH elohim, Jehovah God created man.

The next mention is several sources claiming that the new testament does not expressly detail the doctrine of the Trinity. Again, I agree the word “Trinity” is not used; however, I think this is a “straw man” argument. The word “pornography” is not used in the bible either, but I think few would disagree that the Bible teaches against it. Illegal drug use is considered a sin by most. Why? Well, among other things it is destructive to your body, the temple of the Holy Spirit. So while not specifically spelled out, the doctrine is still there, is it not?

Regardless of whether or not the word “Trinity” is used, or a chapter exists detailing the doctrine, the doctrine is so interwoven in scripture that such a chapter is unnecessary! Do not confuse “does not contain an explicit doctrine of the Trinity” with “does not contain the doctrine of the Trinity.”

Finally the question is asked whether this doctrine was taught “explicitly” by the early church. I would argue that in the early church, there was no confusion over the matter of Jesus being God, because he was recently here, and people watched the miracles and heard his claims. Likewise they had seen the impact of the Holy Spirit on the church, and had no question that he was God. It wasn't until time faded memories that there arose confusion on this matter, and towards the end of the 4th century it became necessary to clear up some confusion.

Next the views of the Ante-Nicene fathers are brought up. Citing them when they are so clearly at odds with scripture seems odd to me. For example, Justin Martyr is quoted as saying that Jesus was an angel who is “other than the God who made all things” and yet in John 1:1-3 clearly refutes this:

John 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.
John 1:2 He was in the beginning with God.
John 1:3 All things came into being by Him, and apart from Him nothing came into being that has come into being.

No matter how you translate John 1:1, you cannot argue that Jesus was the one who created all things (1:3). Incidentally, how could Jesus be created if he created all things? It is impossible, or he would have created all things except himself, which was created by God. For him to have created all things, he must not be created. To not be created, he must be God.

The watchtower has done an interesting thing regarding the early church fathers here. If you go back and read the writings, you will see that in actuality, most of these individuals believe in the trinity in one form or another. Justin Martyr, for example, teaches that the father and son are like two torches. Separate, and yet they share the same fire. Tatian, a disciple of Justin Martyr, taught that the “holy logos” was always there, was part of the father, but when he spoke the creation, the word jumped into action.

Irenaeus is difficult to read to support any viewpoint, as his writing is mostly just scripture. However, since the watchtower teaches that scripture doesn't support the Trinity, they would take Irenaeus' comment about God and assume it not to mean a tri-une God. Clement of Alexandria is considered a heretic by most early church fathers because he changed his mind so often. In fact, you could probably quote Clement having arguments for the Trinity as well as against, because he basically just wrote down what he was thinking about.

Tertullian's views are actually fairly represented, although further investigation reveals that he believes the Trinity is co-equal, although not co-eternal. Hippolytus' quote could apply to a tri-une or not tri-une God equally. The watchtower adds the comment about the "created prehuman Jesus." Origen actually taught the Trinity, but viewed it a little different, in that he taught that the spirit came out of the son who came out of the father.

While many of the teachers are misrepresented by this booklet, even if they were not, do not confuse the era in which these teachers taught to automatically make them right. There were already false teachers when Peter, Paul & the rest of the disciples were founding the church!

2 Pet. 2:1 But false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will also be false teachers among you, who will secretly introduce destructive heresies, even denying the Master who bought them, bringing swift destruction upon themselves.

A "history" of the doctrine of the Trinity follows. Again, I will make the point that the doctrine of the Trinity is not something that is "made up" but rather something that is truth revealed through scripture. The comments about the councils is interesting, and shows a total lack of understanding of the historical context. The councils developed to "nail down" the beliefs of the church regarding areas such as the Trinity. At that time, there was a large movement towards a belief in Modalism. Modalism is the belief that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit were simply one God appearing in three different forms. As a result, many of the councils worked hard to clarify that the Father, Son and Spirit were in fact, separate persons.

A point is made that a pagan, Constantine, may have had a role in developing the doctrine by intimidating the church bishops. This is simply not the case. While Constantine was present, his primary role was to insure that the proceedings kept moving. The bulk of the argument was not whether or not Jesus was God, but rather over the use of two different phrases "Homoousion" meaning "of one substance" or "Homoiousion" meaning "of like substance." The debate centered over the fact that "of one substance" might be used to support Modalism.

There were many other early church fathers who are not quoted by the booklet who taught the Trinity. Gregory of Nissa, Cyrius of Alexandria, Gregory of Nazianzus, Photius, John of Damascus. Augustine even wrote a book titled "The Trinity."

Finally the Athanasian Creed is discussed, and how it probably was not written by Athanasius, and how it was not known by the Eastern Church until the 12th century. While the Creed was indeed probably not written by Athanasius, it agreed with his teaching and thus bears his name. The watchtower is misleading saying that the Eastern Church did not know of the creed until the 12th century. In fact, the

creed was one of the primary points fought over between the Eastern & Western churches. The Eastern Church did not hold to the creed and the Western church did. Interestingly, what concerned them was not the idea of a Trinity, but rather a fine point of whether or not the Spirit proceeded from the Father and Son, or just the Father.

A discussion follows of Trinitarian beliefs of other religions. My concern is with truth, not with other religious systems, but I will say that many of the beliefs of Christianity are emulated by other religions worldwide. The one difference is that we have a risen savior. We have the truth.

They ask the question again at the end of this section of why didn't God's prophets teach this doctrine. I have shown repeatedly that this doctrine is woven all through scripture, and reject the argument that it is "new" and developed in the last 2,000 years.

What Does the Bible Say About God and Jesus?

The question is asked "If people were to read the Bible from cover to cover without any preconceived idea of a Trinity, would they arrive at such a concept on their own? Not at all." I disagree. I think the concept first enters in the very first chapter of Genesis, and as you read through scripture from end to end, you would realize that God is manifested as three persons because of the scriptures (and many more) I have already shown you.

In the section titled "God is One, not Three" they quote Isaiah 45:5 "I am Jehovah, and there is no one else. With the exception of me there is no God." I would agree. But I have also shown you how Hebrews and Psalms collaborate to show that Jesus is Jehovah. That is because God is one tri-une God.

A discussion of the use of Elohim continues under "not a plural God" and I would agree that Elohim is there to denote the majesty of God. However, part of the majesty of God is his tri-une nature. To use a plural noun with a singular verb would be the best way to communicate the Trinity would it not? To use all plurals would, as they state, imply three gods, which is not the doctrine of the Trinity. An argument is made that others are referred to as Elohim, such as Moses, but none of those in which the title is used have any divine nature. Only the three persons of the Trinity have divine nature, as scripture teaches.

Under "Jesus a Separate Creation" there is a discussion of Colossians 1:15, the "firstborn of all creation" This is a passage that is widely misinterpreted. Jesus is being spoken of as an heir, similar to what you see in Genesis 43:33, Jer. 31:9 etc. If you read on to verse 16 you quickly see that "by him all things were created" which precludes him being created if he created all things.

The passage of Proverbs 8 is discussed, speculating (incorrectly) that "wisdom" is Jesus. In fact, the poetry of Proverbs 8 is talking about wisdom in general and stating that God has always had wisdom. They try to use this assumption of Jesus as a master carpenter and relate it back to the "let us make man in our image" of Genesis 1:26. They say "most scholars agree" but conveniently don't name any of them. I think that most scholars would disagree that the poetic "wisdom" in Proverbs 8 is Jesus.

Could God be Tempted?

This is another popular question. To understand how Jesus could be legitimately tempted we have to look at Philippians 2:5-8:

- Phil. 2:5 Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus:
Phil. 2:6 Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:
Phil. 2:7 But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:
Phil. 2:8 And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

Jesus took on the form of a servant, and was able to be wholly man as well as wholly God. In times like the temptation, he was wholly man. He could not, however, sin.

- John 5:19 Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise.

For Jesus to sin, the father would have had to sin as well, which is impossible.

The next section is titled “How Much was the Ransom?” and discusses 1 Timothy 2:5&6:

- 1 Tim. 2:5 For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;
1 Tim. 2:6 Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.

The argument is made that Jesus is distinct from God here, and he is distinct from God the Father, just as he is distinct from fallen man. Jesus’ perfect humanity is indeed what was sacrificed on the cross, but God the Son did not die. He raised himself from the dead

- John 10:18 No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.

Only God has the power to raise the dead, and Jesus clearly states that he rose himself from the dead. How could he do this if he wasn’t Jehovah? The perfect human died, the perfect God rose himself from the dead.

The question is asked how Christ can be “only begotten” and be God. This relationship is used to separate Jesus from us who are called sons of God. Jesus is the only begotten Son because he is the only Son that is without beginning, that has, as he stated repeatedly:

- Rev. 22:13 I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.

Jesus has always been, and will always be, as will the entire Godhead.

Finally in Was Jesus Considered to be God they refer to Jesus being called the Son of God, but not God the Son. Again I would point to Jesus’ multiple claims to be God (and the reactions of those Jews that

heard it) and state that if he was not God, he was not perfect, and if he was not perfect, he did not atone for our sins, and if he did not atone for our sins, we are lost.

Is God Always Superior to Jesus?

Again the (incorrect) claim is made that Jesus never claimed to be God, despite the scriptural evidence to the contrary. Much is made of Jesus submitting to the father, but submitting does not imply a different status. In Ephesians 5 it is clearly articulated that the man is the head of the household. And yet the man and wife are both told to “submit to one another out of reverence for Christ” Does this submission suddenly make the man not the head of the household or less than his wife? Of course not.

The section on Jesus being distinguished from God is not anti-Trinitarian at all (or at least the verses cited are not) as God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit are all distinct persons.

God’s Submissive Servant again treats Jesus’ submission to the will of the father as proof that they are not equal. In every relationship, someone has to take a lead role. In the Godhead, that role is left to the father, just as Jesus had his role and the Spirit had his role. Those roles do not change equality of Deity.

The same argument is stated again, but the statement is made that Jesus had to die to atone for our sins (true). The humanity of Jesus had to die. But Jesus raised himself from the dead, as he indicated he would:

- John 2:18 Then answered the Jews and said unto him, What sign showest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things?
- John 2:19 Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.
- John 2:20 Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days?
- John 2:21 But he spake of the temple of his body.
- John 2:22 When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.

Jesus says “I will raise it up” in this passage. In Acts 2:24 (The verse cited in the book) it says that God raised Jesus from the dead. Either Jesus is God, or Jesus is a liar, and therefore not perfect. Which is it? Jesus is God the Son, and raised himself from the dead as he promised.

The statement is then made that other prophets had the ability to perform miracles. There are, however, two things that Jesus did that only God can do. First is that he forgave sins.

Luke 7:48 And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven.

None of the prophets had the authority to forgive sins, only God can do that. Second was the miracle of the restoration of sight. While not impossible for someone else to do like forgiving sins, it was unique to Jesus in scripture. The gift of sight in the Old Testament is something that came only from God.

Ex. 4:11 And the LORD said unto him, Who hath made man's mouth? or who maketh the dumb, or deaf, or the seeing, or the blind? have not I the LORD {YHWH}?

Of these the most important is certainly forgiving of sins. Again, either Jesus was God or he blasphemed in claiming to be able to forgive sins. If he blasphemed, he sinned. If he sinned, he was not perfect.

In the section entitled "Jesus Had Limited Knowledge" Mark 13:32 is discussed, stating that if Jesus was fully God, there is nothing he could not know.

Mark 13:32 But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.

Jesus not knowing at this time was part of him taking on the form of a servant (Phil 2:7) and humbling himself. Scripture clearly indicates that Jesus in fact did know all things:

John 16:29 His disciples said unto him, Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb.

John 16:30 Now are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee: by this we believe that thou camest forth from God.

Jesus Continues Subordinate furthers the discussion about the role of the Son, and points out that he is distinct from the father. The point is made that when Stephen was stoned he saw God & Jesus, but not the spirit. The spirit was dwelling in the lives of the disciples at this point! Stephen would have been filled with the spirit during this time and would not have seen him. Passages from Revelation are cited, but no mention is made of Christ's claim to be the beginning and the end, the first and the last.

Jesus Never Claimed to be God. The point is reiterated that they believe Jesus never claimed to be God.

John 8:57 Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?

John 8:58 Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.

John 8:59 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.

Ex. 3:14 And God {elohim} 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.

If there is any question whether or not Jesus was claiming to be God with this statement I think it is cleared up by the reaction of the Jews, who attempted to stone him for his words.

John 10:26 But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you.

John 10:27 My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me:

John 10:28 And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand.

John 10:29 My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand.

John 10:30 I and my Father are one.

John 10:31 Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him.

Once again it is quite clear to his audience what he was claiming. I have given you other examples throughout this letter.

The Holy Spirit—God's Active Force

The main argument here seems to be that since the spirit isn't a human form, it can't be part of the Trinity. Instead, it is simply a force that God uses. They deny the fact (or try to reason away) that the spirit acts independently, and clearly has its own role in the Trinity. As I showed earlier, the spirit has a will, an ego, a persona. The spirit is a distinct member of the Trinity. If the Spirit were not a person, you could not "grieve" him, for how would you grieve an spiritual force? You cannot, you can only grieve a distinct person. A "spiritual force" such as described in this booklet could not have feelings and give directions. Only a fully distinct person can have feelings. That distinct person is the Holy Spirit, a part of the Godhead, and the third person in the Trinity.

Eph. 4:30 And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.

What About Trinity "Proof Texts"?

Three proof texts are cited in which all three members of the Trinity are listed together and are basically equal. Now they state that listing them together means nothing, when earlier they claimed that there was nothing explicit. They claim that listing the three together means nothing more than listing three anonymous names. Think about this rationally: Why would you baptize someone in the name of God the Father, the human son who died, and his spirit that he uses to get things done? It makes no sense! No, you baptize someone in the name of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit because you are baptizing them in the name of God. The word used in this verse (Matt. 28:19, a verse you quoted to me) for name is "onoma" which is a singular noun. In other words, there is one name for the Father, the Son & the Holy Spirit and that is Jehovah God. The tri-une perfect one and only God.

In each case, they take statements about each one "taken by itself" and use them to imply that the statements are false. I may say in one sentence that I have a blue automobile. In another sentence that I have a truck, and in a third sentence that it is a year old. Now, none of the sentences by themselves will tell you that I have a one year old blue truck, but taken together, you can see the whole picture. Certainly if we only had one of those three verses we wouldn't have a doctrine of the Trinity, but we have all of them, plus the magnitude more that I have mentioned previously in this letter.

The question is raised as to how Jesus could not have the Holy Spirit until he was baptized unless he wasn't God. Again, forgetting Philippians 2 where Christ humbled himself and took on the form of a servant.

An interesting statement is made about 1 John 5:7 "Scholars acknowledge, however, that these words were not originally in the Bible but were added much later" This is true and it is why no one uses this as a "proof text" for the Trinity. There are plenty of texts that make it clear without needing one to spell it out explicitly.

They attempt to refute John 10:30 mentioned above, but neglect to continue on to the end of the discussion where they again attempted to stone him. The Jews clearly understood what he meant.

They make the same mistake with John 5:18. Interestingly, they point out that Jesus says in verse 19 “the Son can do nothing by himself; he can do only what he sees the father doing” and conveniently leave off the rest of the verse:

John 5:19 Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise.

How could Jesus do whatever the father does unless he is God? It’s impossible for a man to do what God does. This was not left off accidentally, because it blows their argument out of the water. It was left off to be deceptive, in hopes that the reader wouldn’t look up the passage themselves and discover the truth.

Next up is the passage in Philippians 2. The context and point of this passage is that Jesus humbled himself, rather than seizing equality, denying his role. How could Jesus grasp equality with God unless he was God? Quite simply, that would be impossible. No created being, no matter how powerful or glorified, could ever be equal with God no matter how hard they tried. Jesus could have seized that equality and hung onto it, but instead choose to humble himself and take on the form of a servant. When the sin was atoned for, God the Father once again lifted him up to his place as an equal.

“I Am” is the next subheading. Some rather incorrect translations are brought out to try to prove a point, but once again the watchtower is guilty of twisting the truth. They claim that the context shows that the Jews wanted to stone Jesus, but he defended himself by saying that he was alive before Abraham was born. In fact, the order is exactly the opposite:

John 8:57 Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?

John 8:58 Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.

John 8:59 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.

AFTER Jesus states “I Am” the Jews wanted to stone him. Why does the author try to imply the order is the opposite? Simple. Jesus was claiming to be Jehovah God and the Jews knew it, hence they tried to stone him. Again this blows apart the Watchtower’s insistence that Jesus never claimed to be God.

Last up is the discussion of the John 1:1 passage. The watchtower first tries to claim that it doesn’t make sense for the Word to be both with God and God. If you deny the Trinity, it doesn’t make sense. If you accept the true tri-une God, then it makes perfect sense. Next the watchtower tries to imply that other translations agree with the NWT’s “the word was a god” by citing several translations that, frankly with the exception of the NWT, I have never heard of. I have included the translation of this verse from seven separate translations. As you can see, there is very little room for this to be translated differently.

King James Version:

John 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

New American Standard Version:

John 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

American Standard Version

John 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

Darby:

John 1:1 ¶ In [the] beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

Young's Literal Translation:

John 1:1 ¶ In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God;

New International Version

John 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

New Revised Standard Version

John 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

Original Greek:

en arch hn o logov kai o logov hn prov ton yeon kai yeov hn o logov

In beginning was the Word and the Word was with the God and God was the Word

(word for word translation)

Despite the rules of Greek Grammar, they change the end of the verse based on “this harmonizes with the rest of the Bible” or in other words, this harmonizes with what we believe. As I’ve shown, it does NOT harmonize with the rest of the Bible at all. It is interesting that they provide an example of where an “a” would be inserted that does not involve the same words and structure. In fact, this structure is not unique at ALL to John 1:1, but is in fact used many times in the New Testament.

Mark 12:27 He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living: ye therefore do greatly err.

John 8:54 Jesus answered, If I honour myself, my honour is nothing: it is my Father that honoureth me; of whom ye say, that he is your God:

Rom. 1:21 Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

You will notice that none of these verses is translated with “a god” but always with a capital God and no letter “a” tacked on. The NWT is simply wrong, done so in order to keep people from asking questions about the doctrine of the Trinity. If the Trinity is so “confusing” as claimed and “not in scripture” why would it be necessary to change a verse in order to hide it? It simply cannot be hidden, as you have seen by the many other passages pointing to the fact that Jesus is Jehovah God!

When discussing Colwell's rule, the watchtower again goes back to the "context of the entire Bible is that Jesus is not the Almighty God" when in fact, the context is that Jesus is God and the passage is translated correctly. Again, the watchtower is forced to go to the "it doesn't agree with what I'm trying to prove so it must be wrong" defense, which is no defense at all.

The watchtower completely ignores the fact that if Jesus is not God, he should have rebuked Thomas for worshipping him, not commended him. The scriptures are clear: If Jesus is not God, he is a lunatic, and we are lost.

The final two pages are conclusions, which I will address as follows:

The book *Should You Believe in the Trinity* is written to help members of the Jehovah's Witnesses to feel good about their doctrine denying the Trinity, and to hinder them in their quest for truth. The Bible clearly supports the Deity of Christ, and the Tri-une God. These doctrines are not "made up" and although they may be difficult to grasp, that does not make them untrue. Truth isn't always convenient and easy, just as the teachings of Christ aren't easy to follow. But they are absolute. The bulk of the arguments in this book boil down to "this disagrees with our belief, so it's out of context"

God does not call us to make excuses. He calls us to use our minds to bring glory to him.

Rom. 12:2 And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

It is time for you to seriously consider the things that I have presented to you, and to search the scriptures to see that they are true. It is also time for you to seriously consider your faith in the work and teaching of the Watchtower.

Deut. 18:21 And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the LORD hath not spoken?

Deut. 18:22 When a prophet speaketh in the name of the LORD, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the LORD hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.

The Watchtower claims to be a divine organization, and yet has repeatedly prophesied about events (most notably the end of the world) that have not come to pass. According to scripture, this makes them false prophets. Rutherford himself stated in 1920 "Therefore we may confidently expect that 1925 will mark the return of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the faithful prophets of old" and built the villa in San Diego known as Beth-Sarim to house the returning princes. These failed prophecies must not be taken lightly! In the Old Testament, if a prophet made one false prophecy he was to be put to death. Certainly he was not to remain in leadership. You must seriously consider why you would continue to follow the leadership of an organization who has repeatedly shown themselves to be false prophets. Rather than an organization that has shown itself repeatedly to be a false prophet, I choose to place my faith in the God of the bible and the truth that he proclaims through his book:

John 8:32 And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.