

**TRIUNE GOD**

**By**

**T. John Mathew**

**Bible Study Centre**

**Mannuthy. P. O, Thrissur-680651**

**Kerala, INDIA**

**[Rights reserved by the Author]**

## CONTENTS

- **PREFACE**

- **CHAPTER 1. GOD OF THE BIBLE**

1. Explanation of Trinity
2. 'Unreasonableness' of Trinity
3. Limitations of Human Comprehension
4. One God, Three Persons
5. Appearance of God in Human Form

- **CHAPTER 2. REVELATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT**

1. The Functioning of Trinity
2. God the Son
3. The Word
4. "Both me and my Father"
5. "the Father in me"
6. "Christ...God blessed forever"
7. "all the fullness of the Godhead"
8. "Thy throne, O God, is forever"
9. "the great God...Jesus Christ"
10. The Alpha and the Omega
11. The Creator of the Universe
12. "the Amen...the beginning of the creation of God"
13. The true God and Eternal Life
14. The Lord of Sabbath
15. Jesus Christ [Jehovah] in the Old Testament
16. The Son of God
17. "Father Greater than I"
18. The only-begotten Son of God
19. "This day have I begotten thee"
20. The Firstborn
21. Jesus' Name Pentecostalism

### • CHAPTER 3. GOD THE HOLY SPIRIT

1. Personhood of the Holy Spirit
2. Deity of the Holy Spirit
3. Divine Attributes in the three Persons
4. The word 'Trinity'

### • CHAPTER 4. MISTRANSLATIONS AND MISINTERPRETATIONS

1. Mistranslations
2. Misinterpretations
3. The Finite and the Infinite
4. 'Wisdom' in Prov: ch: 8
5. 'Today' in Luke 23: 43
6. Satan's temptation of Jesus Christ
7. "Great Teacher"
8. "Knoweth no one"
9. "Let us make man in our image"
10. "the beginning of the creation of God"
11. "This day...begotten thee"
12. "the firstborn of all creation"
13. "...the head of Christ is God"
14. Unacceptability of the NWT

### • CHAPTER 5. CONSEQUENCES OF THE REJECTION OF TRINITY

1. Rejection of Immortality
2. Distortion of Resurrection
3. Jesus Christ—an Incarnation of Michael?
4. Disrespect to the Lord's Supper
5. The Number 144000
6. Strange Beliefs and False Predictions
7. Failure to Understand Truth

### • CHAPTER 6. QUESTIONS

## PREFACE

The Bible is the only book in the world, which tells us that there is only one God and that this one God is: God the Father, God the Son And God the Holy Spirit. This concept has given rise to many controversies; some have argued that this is an unreasonable idea, which originated as result of misunderstanding and misinterpreting the Word of God. Interpretations aimed at proving that Jesus Christ is not God and that the Holy Spirit is not a person, but is just the active force of God have appeared since the third century. However, in the 20th century a great effort was made by some people to support these 'interpretations' by a 'translation' known as the "New World Translation." The fourth chapter of this book cites certain typical examples of these interpretations and translations with a view to enabling the readers to evaluate their 'reliability.' It is a fact that those who make an in-depth study of the Bible find it impossible to support either this translation or the interpretations that necessitated it.

The purpose of this book is to induce students of the Bible to study the Word of God carefully and truthfully and come to their own conclusions. It is true that this is so designed as to prove that the concept of Trinity is perfectly biblical. Several arguments and interpretations questioning the validity of Trinity are examined here and readers are provided with sufficient analytical data to find out what is right and what is wrong. As the author, I believe that the arguments put forward in support of Trinity are perfectly reasonable and that all the major arguments challenging the validity of Trinity are proved to be erroneous. It is acknowledged with gratitude that Dr. C. J. Joseph, Pattikkad, Trichur has helped me with the necessary information about the correct meanings of the Hebrew and Greek words referred to in this book.

It is hoped that this book will clear the doubts of those who find it difficult to come to a definite conclusion with regard to the concept of Trinity. They are likely to come across answers to unanswered questions and questions which cannot be answered by those who mistranslate and misinterpret the Word of God. I acknowledge with deep gratitude that it was the great interest my late parents [Mrs. Rachel John & Mr. T. K. John, Thyparampil, Narakathani, Ezhumattoor, Tiruvalla] showed in biblical scholarship that led me to develop the habit of studying scriptural passages in depth, which I hope, will be recognized as the most important characteristic of this book. The books they collected and handed over to me have made an invaluable contribution to the preparation of the study materials and books of the Bible Study Centre, Mannuty. I pray that the Omnipotent, Omnipresent and Omniscient God of Truth may enlighten the hearts of all who love truth and prove the ideas discussed here a blessing to them. I praise the Lord for enabling me to prepare this book, thus serve the cause of truth and glorify the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Trichur  
5th January 2006

T. John Mathew.

## CHAPTER 1

### GOD OF THE BIBLE

The first sentence of the first book of the Bible is, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.” This sentence gives everyone who reads this Book from the beginning, an idea of its scope, which extends into the infinities of Time and Space—the eternity of the past and the boundless beyond that encompasses the universe. The first words, “In the beginning God” takes the reader to the beginning of ‘beginningless’ Time and to what God Who transcends both Time and Space has done. There is no other book in the world, the scope of which is so immense and so relevant to man. That is why it is said that the Bible is the Book of books. It is humanly impossible to compose a book, the scope of which is so vast and so beyond our capacity for comprehension; no man has ever attempted to write a book of this sort because human imagination is incapable of handling facts and ideas of the sort described in this book. As we have noted, the first sentence of this book suggests that it is the revelation of God and not something man has discovered. In this Book of 66 books containing 929 chapters and 31173 verses, we come across the expression, “Thus saith Jehovah” or its equivalent, more than 2000 times. The claim that God is the true author of this book is proved by the accurate fulfillment of the prophecies it contains, the accuracy of scientific truths it refers to incidentally and above all, the style of its narration and the love of truth and justice revealed in its contents.

The fact of divine authorship of the Bible means that we human beings have no right to tamper with either its text or ideas. It is our duty to accept them as they are. Even if it seems to us that a certain idea in this book is wrong scientifically or historically what we should consider is that that is the truth in spite of it being beyond human comprehension; because it is stated by the God of Truth.

It is in the light of these facts and principles that we should try to understand the statements and doctrines in the Bible. What we find in it is God’s self-revelation to which nothing can be added. So Theology, unlike the other branches of human knowledge is the proper understanding of nothing but and nothing more than what God has revealed to us through His Word. And we have to consider every idea in this Book sacred in the sense that we have no right to modify it in any manner by our interpretations. Interpretations should be made with a view to magnifying what is there in the Scripture, not with a view to inserting our ideas into it or deleting from it those ideas, which we do not like or we do not understand. Bearing in mind these guiding principles of studying the Bible let us examine the concept of Trinity and find out whether it is in accordance with the teachings and ideas in the Old and New Testaments.

According to those who believe in Trinity the Bible makes it clear that there is only one God, that Christ is God and that the Holy Spirit also is God. The idea that God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit [see Matt: 28:19—20] together constitute one God existing as three distinct Persons is referred to

by the term Trinity or Triune God. [All the verses quoted in this book are taken from the Standard Edition of the Holy

Bible Newly Edited by the American Revision Committee in A. D. 1901 and Printed and Distributed by the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, Inc. Brooklyn 1, N. Y., U. S. A., which has been publishing the literature of Jehovah's Witnesses. It may be noted that Jehovah's witnesses cannot question the authenticity of this translation to which they had no objections when they printed and distributed it. The reason for using this translation in this book in preference to their New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures is explained in chapter 4].

## **Explanation of Trinity**

The Bible does not explain how three different persons can be one and the same. We do not find any perfectly suitable example in our material world to explain this idea. The fact that the Bible contains this 'unreasonable idea' is proof that it was not human wisdom that inspired the prophets and apostles to write this Book. What the Bible presents to us is not a god with three heads; if it were so, it would just be a foolish idea borrowed from some mythology. What the Bible presents to us is the one and only God Who exists as three Persons the essence of each of Whom is the same. This is a unique idea found only in the Bible. An example, which may to a certain extent explain this concept, is this: If we take water in three different glasses of different colours and shapes, we will see that they are different in respect of appearance and shape, but are the same with regard to their content. Another example, which also may help us to understand this truth is the same source of electricity that illumines three different bulbs of different colours; these bulbs are different from one another with regard to their appearance and properties; but with regard to what illumines them, they are the same. To the question how three persons can be one, the answer can be given by the example of three interlocking rings like those representing the five continents on the Olympic Flag; each of these is a perfect ring in itself; but it passes through the others and lets the others pass through it, causing each one to be inside the other two and the other two inside each one; thus the three rings constitute one entity; but at the same time they are separate rings and are different from each other. Similarly we may say that the omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent Universal Spirit [God] Who 'fills heaven and earth' [Jere: 23:24] exists as three different Persons—God the Father [invisible Person Who is in heaven], God the Son [visible Person Who came into the world to redeem mankind from sin], and God the Holy Spirit [the invisible Person Who now dwells in the hearts of believers and strengthens them]; these three Persons are one and the same in essence, but are different with regard to personhood and functions.

## **'Unreasonableness' of Trinity**

There are many who think that this concept of Trinity is untrue because it is quite 'unreasonable.' The followers of Islam find it very difficult to think that one God exists as three Persons; their question is, "How can one be three and three be one?" It is possible to give them satisfactory explanation with the help of their own sacred book, the holy Koran, in which we read, "And when We gave unto Moses the Scripture and the Criterion {of right and wrong}, that ye might be led aright." [Surah 2: 53] and " Lo! We did reveal the Torah [Old Testament of the Bible], wherein is guidance and a light, by which the Prophets who surrendered [untoAllah] judged the Jews, and the rabbis and the priests [judged] by such of Allah's Scripture as they were bidden to observe, and thereunto were they witnesses." [Surah 5: 44]. Thus the holy Koran accepts the authority of the Old Testament as the inspired Word of God and therefore the followers of Islam are bound to accept the revelations about God in it. And we are going to see that according to the Old Testament there is only one God and this one God exists as three Persons. But before examining the relevant passages in the Old Testament it is desirable to determine whether it is the Word of God or human reason that we should accept as our guide to truth. If we find that the human faculty of reason is not as good a guide as the Word of God in our search for truth, we should be reasonable enough to accept the statements in the Word of God as true instead of modifying them with interpretations that seem to be more reasonable than divine revelations.

## **Limitations of human comprehension**

We ought to bear in mind that the limitations of our faculty of reasoning have made it very difficult in the past, to comprehend certain realities as they are: Though Copernicus, and later Galileo pointed out that the Ptolemaic theory of the universe was wrong and the earth is actually revolving round the sun, instead of the sun revolving round it, the people of their age considered this idea most unreasonable; as a result, Galileo was persecuted for uttering this incomprehensible truth, which was considered blasphemous nonsense. But as time passed, the incomprehensible truth the scientists uttered, became comprehensible. Another truth, which remained incomprehensible until the age of Galileo is that, the earth is hanging in empty space; it was recorded in the Bible probably before B. C. 1500, "He stretcheth out the north over empty space, And hangeth the earth upon nothing"[Job 26:7]. The idea that the earth remains hung in empty space was extremely incomprehensible to the ancients. So no one dared even to think of the meaning of this verse. All 'intelligent' men believed that if an object was suspended in empty space, it would surely 'fall down.' And different theories were formulated with a view to explaining how the stars are prevented from 'falling down' from the sky: It was explained by the ancient Greeks that the Titan Atlas, son of Iapetus and Clymene, was holding up the pillars of the huge sphere of the sky with the stars stuck on its inner surface, and thus preventing the heavenly bodies from falling down; in ancient India it was explained that Ananthan, the king of serpents, was supporting the earth

upon its thousand heads and thus preventing our globe from falling down. People found these explanations quite 'reasonable' and 'convincing'. For thousands of years, until Galileo invented the telescope, these were considered 'unquestionable truths', because people could

comprehend them easily. But today we know that the 'incomprehensible' Biblical idea of the earth hanging in empty space is the one that is true and that this idea is true about all heavenly bodies, while the 'comprehensible' ideas, millions believed in, for millenniums, are nothing but foolishness. This historical fact proves that it is quite reasonable to believe the 'unreasonable truths' of the Bible and it is really unreasonable to accept seemingly comprehensible ideas in preference to the revelations of the Word of God. We can legitimately expect that the incomprehensible truths in the Bible will become fully comprehensible to us one day, when we stand before God.

## **One God, Three Persons**

The Bible tells us that there is only one God. We read, "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Jehovah"[Deut: 6: 4]; "I am Jehovah, and there is none else; besides me there is no God"[Isaiah. 45: 5]; "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God,

be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen."[1.Timothy.1:17]; "Thou believest that God is one, thou doest well."[James 2: 19]

We have to note that in the very first sentence of the Bible this one and only God of the Holy Book reveals Himself as One Who is more than one Person. We read, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" [Genesis.1: 1]. In this sentence, the Hebrew word 'Elohim' translated 'God' in English is a common plural noun [Singular: 'El' or 'Eloh'; Dual plural: 'Elohayim'] indicating grammatically that it refers to three or more persons. But the verb translated 'created' is singular, indicating that its subject 'Elohim' is singular; but the fact is that it is plural. Thus in the first sentence of the Holy Bible there is something that looks like a 'grammatical error' when we view it in the context of English grammar. The real reason for this apparent error is that the one God of the Bible has the unique characteristic of being more than one Person and yet remaining only one in essence.

If it is argued that the plural 'Elohim' is used in order to convey the idea of respect, that argument will be valid only if we find that this practice is followed wherever this Hebrew word for 'God' is used. But we see that this is not done. When Jesus on the Cross cried to God the Father, the word He used was 'Eli' [Elohi] the singular of 'Elohim' in Aramaic, meaning 'my God' [Matt:27:46; Mark 15:34]. The writer of Genesis also could have used this noun in the singular as Jesus did. But we find that he chose to use the noun in the plural and the verb in the singular. There must be sufficient reason for this writer to use a uniplural noun to speak about God in the first sentence of this divinely inspired book. The subsequent writings in the Old Testament and the revelations in the New Testament explain what was the need of this uniplural noun in the first sentence of the Holy Book.

In Gen: 1: 26 we read, “And God said, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness ...’” In this sentence, the words ‘us’ and ‘our’ indicate that the God they refer to, is One Who is more than one Person; otherwise ‘me’ and ‘my’ would be used. It has been argued that God said these words to someone whom He had created before starting the creation of the universe. Let us assume that this argument is right. Then we have to say that since God said to His first creation “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, it was in their images and after their likenesses that God and His first creation made man. And this should be the statement in the verse that follows; but Gen: 1: 27 is:

“And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him;” This means, if our assumption is right, God after creating man with the help of His first creation in the images and likenesses of both of them, ‘lied’ that it was only in His own likeness and image that man was made. Not only that, hiding the role of His first creation in the task of creating man, and grabbing for Himself all the credit for this great accomplishment, God said it was He {not He and His first creation} who made man. Thus God refused to give any recognition to His ‘first creation’s contribution’ to the creation of man. This leads us to the conclusion that God is ‘unjust and untruthful.’ After receiving ‘invaluable help’ from His first creation in making man, and after making man in the image and likeness of this first creation also, this God ‘claimed’ man was made in His image and after His likeness only! Isn’t this a very ‘ignoble behaviour’ on the part of God? Is he really ‘Almighty’? If He were, would He need the help of His first creation to perform the task of creating man? It is to these conclusions and questions that we are driven by the assumption we have made. No sensible person can agree with them; then how can we say that the assumption leading to them is right? We cannot but say that it is absolutely unreasonable to argue that it was to some already created being that God said, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness:” If there were an iota of truth in this idea, Gen: 1:1 should be, “In the beginning God created the one who was to help Him in His creative work and then, with his help created the heavens and the earth.” Since this is not what we read in the Word of God, there is no room for imagining that God sought the help of some already created being in the work of creating man. We ought to be truthful enough to understand that it was to Himself that God said the words, “Let us make man in our image” and accordingly He created man in His own image. Since God said ‘us’ referring to Himself, it is evident that this one God is more than one Person.

The verse, “And Jehovah God said, ‘Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil’ [Gen: 3: 22] makes it abundantly clear that Jehovah God is a God in Whom there is more than one Person, because it is impossible to say “one of us” if “us” does not mean more than one. [If it is argued that God said these words to a certain creation of His, that argument cannot be considered reasonable because it is not mentioned to which created being God said these words. If there had been a created being to whom God had spoken these words, the name of that being would have been mentioned here, as in the Word of God it is always the practice to state who speaks, who is spoken to and what is spoken. Nowhere in the account of creation, or anywhere in the whole Bible do we come across the creation of a being with which God discusses his dealings with humanity. So it would be totally baseless to say that it might be to some created being in heaven that God said these words].

“Come, let us go down, and there confound their language” [Gen: 11: 7] is an exhortation that somebody makes to somebody else; it cannot be made where there is only one person. Answers to the

questions, “Who said, ‘Come’? and ‘To whom was it said’? make it clear that there was one or more to say ‘Come’ and there was one or more to hear ‘Come.’ Thus the presence of more than one Person is unquestionably evident here. There is nothing in this verse, which suggests that God said these words to someone created by Him; the One or Ones Who hears these words do have the status and abilities of God; otherwise They would not be involved jointly in the work mentioned here. From

the context of this verse [Jehovah said these words when He saw men building the City and Tower of Babel and thereby preventing the scattering of population] it is clear that God made this exhortation to Himself, indicating that He is not a single Person. Since ‘Elohim’ is the common plural and not the dual plural, the number of persons it refers to cannot be less than three. Thus we come to the conclusion that there are at least three Persons in the one God revealed in the opening chapters of the book of Genesis.

The opponents of Trinity argue that the word ‘Elohim’ is used in the Old Testament for speaking about false gods and even of men and therefore it is not reasonable to consider the grammatical structure of a sentence in which this word is used, as a proof of Trinity. This argument raises the question: Is it the real Omnipotent, Omniscient, Omnipresent and only God or some false god who is spoken of in Gen: 1: 1? If the answer of the opponents of Trinity is that it is some false god like Baal who is spoken of in Gen: 1: 1 that answer amounts to saying that the Bible is not the Word of God and that there is no reference in this book to the true God Who is the creator of the universe. If the true Almighty God is someone other than the creator of the universe who is spoken of in Gen: 1: 1, that ‘God’ is nowhere spoken of in the Bible and we have to conclude it is only false gods who are spoken of in this book. Not even those who disbelieve the Bible will come to this conclusion. Everyone admits that it is the true God of the Bible Who is spoken of in Gen: 1: 1. The argument in support of Trinity based on the grammatical structure of Gen: 1: 1 cannot be disputed as long as this fact is admitted.

However, it is desirable to find out what has prompted the opponents of Trinity to argue that it is unreasonable to put forward an argument in support of Trinity on the basis of the grammatical structure of Gen: 1: 1. Those who raise this objection ignore the fact that most words in any language have not only their normal meanings but also their particular meanings in particular contexts: For example we know what is the normal meaning of the word ‘devil’; but in the sentence, “I know him; he is a devil” the context shows that it is not a real devil but a human being who is spoken of. Similarly we know what the word ‘beast’ means; and we also know that it is not in this normal sense, but in the sense of ‘Antichrist, the man of sin’ that this word is used in Revelation 19: 19—20. Words convey their normal sense when they are used without reference to particular contexts; whenever they are used in particular contexts, they convey particular meanings. Particular contexts and figures of speech can ascribe particular meanings to most words; but this does not in any manner affect the normal meanings of words: For example, the normal meanings of ‘heart’ and ‘stone’ do not undergo any change as a result of our using them in a particular context and saying, “He has a heart of stone.” It is a linguistic fact that whenever the normal sense of a word is modified by a particular context or a figure of speech, both the normal sense of the word and the modification effected are easily noticed and understood. It is in accordance with

this linguistic fact that we find Elijah referring to the false god 'Baal' by the word 'Elohim.' We read in 1. Kings 18: 27, "And it came to pass at noon, that Elijah mocked them, and said, Cry aloud; for he is a god [Elohim]; either he is musing, or he is gone aside, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth and must be awaked." The context makes it evident that it is in an ironical sense that Elijah refers to Baal by the word 'Elohim.' Though for the prophets of Baal, he was 'Elohim,' for Elijah he was only a false god. [If he had considered him Elohim in the true sense, he would not have killed those prophets]. The use of 'Elohim' by Elijah in an ironical sense in a particular context cannot mean that the word has lost its normal sense or that it is impossible to understand where and when it is used in its normal sense.

In this manner it can be shown that all the verses cited as examples of 'Elohim' having 'various meanings' do not prove anything other than the fact that the normal sense of this word, like most other words in language, can be modified by particular contexts and that in the absence of any particular modification of meaning by any particular context the word conveys its normal sense. Since in Gen: 1: 1, there is neither any particular context as we find in 1. Kings 18: 27 or 11: 33 nor the use of any figure of speech, it is clear that 'Elohim' is used there in its normal sense. Whatever is the sense in which a word is used in a sentence, the grammatical structure of that sentence and the sense of that word are in harmony with each other; this is a basic linguistic fact. The true meanings of a sentence and the words used in it are to be understood in the light of the grammatical structure of that sentence; it is most unreasonable to think that the meanings of a word and the sentence it belongs to are to be understood in the light of the grammatical structure of some other sentence in which that word is used in a different context. No sensible person will argue that this is how meanings of words and sentences are to be understood. So it is most unreasonable to argue that the meaning of 'Elohim' in Gen: 1: 1 should not be examined in the light of the grammatical structure of that sentence and we should not use the finding as an argument in support of Trinity. If this 'objection' is to be considered reasonable, it has to be proved that the meaning of a word is to be understood, not by examining its context and structure of the sentence it belongs to, but by examining its use in a different context in a different sentence having a different grammatical structure. As it is impossible to do this, it is impossible to find fault with the examination of the grammatical structure of Gen: 1: 1 and the meaning of the word 'Elohim' and the argument in support of 'Trinity' put forward on the basis of that examination.

## **Appearance of God in Human Form**

We read in Exodus 33: 17—23 that it is not possible for man to remain alive, seeing God in all His glory. However we read about God appearing to Abraham in human form; we are told, "And Jehovah appeared unto him by the oaks of Mamre, as he sat in the tent door in the heat of the day; and he lifted up his eyes and looked, and lo, three men stood over against him: and when he saw them, he ran to meet them from the tent door, and bowed himself to the earth, and said, My lord, if now I have found

favor in thy sight, pass not away, I pray thee, from thy servant:" [Gen: 18: 1—3] It is to be noted here that we are not told, "Jehovah and 'two other beings' appeared unto Abraham." To the question, "Who appeared unto Abraham?" the answer is,

"Jehovah." To the question, "Who did Abraham see?" the answer is, "three men." So, to the question, "Who were those three men?" the answer cannot but be, "Jehovah." Thus we see that those three men were Jehovah and Jehovah was those three men. This means, it was as three men that Jehovah appeared to Abraham in human form. To the question why Jehovah appeared to Abraham as three men instead of one man, what is the answer? The only reasonable answer is that Jehovah God is one God Who exists as three Persons.

We find Jehovah telling Abraham about the wickedness of the people of Sodom: "Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous; I will go down now, and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me; and if not, I will know" [Gen: 18: 20—21]. We learn from Gen: 18: 33 that the Person Who said these words did not go to Sodom; instead it was the other two Persons, described as 'angels' in chapter 19: 1 Who went to Lot's house. When we consider that all these statements are true, we cannot but say: Jehovah told Abraham that He would go to Sodom; accordingly He went there; it was two 'angels' who went there; Jehovah was those angels and those angels were Jehovah. If it is argued that the 'angels' were not Jehovah we will have to say that Jehovah did not keep His promise to Abraham, which amounts to declaring that God lied to His 'friend' about going to Sodom. The only conclusion we can arrive at, is that the Person Who talked with Abraham was Jehovah and the 'angels' who went to Lot's house also were Jehovah, even though they were different Persons. This means the three Persons Who appeared to Abraham were in essence, one and the same Jehovah God. The fact that it was as three Persons in human form this God appeared to Abraham, is an important proof that the one God of the Bible exists as three Persons, which is the concept of Trinity.

It has been interpreted that the two men who went to Sodom were in fact two angels sent by Jehovah to that city and that it is incorrect to conclude Jehovah went there. We read in Heb: 13: 2, "Forget not to show love unto strangers; for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." It is quite reasonable to conclude that this is a reference to Abraham's entertaining the 'three men' by the oaks of Mamre. The description of these men as angels by the writer of the Hebrews is regarded as conclusive proof that they were no more than true angels and not Jehovah.

In order to justify this interpretation, it has been argued that Jehovah's sending angels on His behalf fulfilled His promise to Abraham that He would go to Sodom; or we can think that Jehovah by exercising His ability as the omnipresent and omniscient God saw what happened in Sodom and in that sense 'went' there without actually going there. But we have to note that what Jehovah said to Abraham was, "I will go down now, and see..." [Gen: 18: 21]. These words of Jehovah rule out the possibility of His sending someone else on His behalf out of question. The argument that it was in the sense of Jehovah being omnipresent that He said to Abraham about going to Sodom is quite unreasonable because Jehovah in His capacity as the omnipresent God was already there in Sodom and there was no need for

Him to go there. [It may be noted here that it was in His capacity as a righteous judge who punishes the guilty only after verifying evidence, that Jehovah wanted to go to Sodom]. Therefore the only reasonable conclusion is that in keeping with His promise to Abraham Jehovah did go to Sodom and the two angels who reached Sodom according to Gen: 19: 1 were Jehovah. Now quite naturally the question arises: If it was Jehovah Who came to Sodom, why is He referred to as 'two angels' in Gen: 19: 1 and why is the same wording used in Heb: 13: 2? Let us find out whether there is an answer to this question in the Word of God.

When we examine the narrative style of the different books of the Bible we see that persons are often spoken about in two ways—as they actually are and as they are seen to be. The Holy Spirit might have done this in order to give a full, comprehensive understanding of the persons concerned, their circumstances and the people around them. As an example first let us examine the reference to Joseph in Luke 2: 33 and 2: 48; in both these verses Joseph is referred to as the father of Jesus. However, it is clearly stated in the first chapter of this Gospel that it was after Virgin Mary conceived Jesus that Joseph became her husband; so it is factually incorrect to refer to Joseph as the father of Jesus. But after the marriage of Joseph and Mary they lived together; after the birth of Jesus, Mary had children by Joseph; everyone who knew their family thought that Joseph was the father of all those children including Jesus; that is why we read in Matt: 13: 55--56, "Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us?" and in Luke 4: 22: "...Is not this Joseph's son?" The fact that it was a normal and happy family life that Joseph and Mary led is further made clear by Mary's words, "Son, why hast thou dealt with us? behold, thy father and I sought thee sorrowing" Luke 2: 48.

[The context is Mary and Joseph searching for their 'missing son' and finding him finally, at the Temple]. We see that Joseph was looking after Jesus as one of his own children in obedience to the divine instruction he had received [Matt: 1: 20]. The statement in Luke 3: 23, "And Jesus himself, when he began to teach, was about thirty years of age, being the son {as was supposed} of Joseph..." proves this fact beyond all doubt. Thus it was seen that Joseph was the father of Jesus. That is why we find Mary referring to her husband as the father of Jesus. We do not consider that Mary's description of Joseph as the father of Jesus contradicts the scriptural truth that Jesus is the Son of God and He cannot have an earthly father.

Just as the Word of God has stated what Joseph actually was and what he was seen to be, the Holy Spirit has stated what the three men who appeared to Abraham actually were [Gen: 18: 1—2 & 18: 20—21] and what they were seen to be [Gen: 19: 1]. Since the two men who went to Sodom conveyed to Lot the divine message of judgment upon the city, they acted as, and were seen to be messengers [angels] of God. That is why they are referred to as angels. In the book of Judges also we come across the same sort of description. We read, "And Jehovah looked upon him, and said, "Go in this thy might, and save Israel from the hand of Midian" [Jud: 6: 14]. In this verse we see that it was Jehovah who spoke these words to Gideon. But in the verses 11 & 12 it is stated that the speaker was "the angel of Jehovah." This identification of Jehovah with "the angel of Jehovah" is to be explained in the light of the fact that Jehovah is spoken about here in both ways—as He actually is and as He was seen to be [angel carrying a

divine message]. So we can conclude that the descriptions of Jehovah as “three men” in Gen: 18: 2 and as “two angels” in Gen: 19: 1 are quite right and reasonable.

The question whether it was in actual human form that Jehovah appeared to Abraham can be answered easily. We read in John 1: 32 that the Holy Spirit descended as a dove out of heaven and abode upon Jesus. This is proof that God can take any form He pleases; so it is quite reasonable to believe that it was as three human beings possessing all human faculties that Jehovah appeared to Abraham. [However this does not mean Jehovah became ‘three men’ as a result of this appearance, as also the Holy Spirit did not become a dove as result of descending upon Jesus in that form. What we have to understand is that God, whose face men cannot see and live {Ex: 33: 20} appeared before His ‘friend’ in a suitable form to tell him what He was going to do]. Since it was as three men instead of only one man that Jehovah appeared to Abraham by the oaks of Mamre, it indicates that Jehovah, the God of Abraham is One Who exists as three Persons.

It may be noted that there is no means of ascertaining which Person in the Triune God stood before Abraham and which Persons went to Sodom. As we, human beings cannot unveil what God has chosen not to reveal, it is futile and unwise guessing it.

## CHAPTER 2.

### REVELATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

It is the New Testament that unveils the mystery behind the author of Genesis using the common plural 'Elohim' in order to speak about the one and only God. Just before His ascension Jesus told His disciples, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you;" Matt: 28: 19—20. These words of Jesus make it clear that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit together have only one 'name'. We know that one name usually signifies one person;

The phrase, "in the name of" ought to be followed by a word signifying only one thing or person. But here we find that it is followed by "the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" Thus we see that according to Matt: 28: 19—20 "the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" together constitute an entity, which is grammatically treated as a singular noun. However we see clearly that this 'singular' entity does contain three Persons: the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. This means these three Persons are one; that is why they are treated as a singular noun. In other words, the grammatical structure of the words of Jesus in the Great Commission reveals that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are the three Persons in 'Elohim' the one God of the Bible.

#### The Functioning of Trinity

In our world it is seldom possible for three persons to have the same opinion about anything. The will of three persons can seldom be the same. The reason is that three persons in the world can never be one. The God of the Bible, Who is One, but exists, as three Persons cannot have any difference of opinion among them; they cannot have more than one will. They can have only one will because they are one even while existing as three different Persons. A close examination of Jesus' prayer to the Father on the eve of His crucifixion reveals this fact. He prayed, "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless not my will, but thine be done"[Luke. 22: 42]. It was quite natural for Jesus as the Son of Man to feel the desire that that cup, which is crucifixion, should be removed. But He did not pray, "Father, remove this cup from me." His real will was that His natural will to avoid crucifixion should not be done; instead, His Father's will to suffer it, should be done. We find Him accepting the Father's will perfectly, without any hesitation and submitting Himself to the horror of crucifixion. That Jesus was perfectly willing to be crucified in accordance with the Father's will is stated in the verse, "he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross"[Phil: 2: 8]. Jesus rebuking Peter for saying that He should not suffer death [Matt: 16: 21-- 23] proves it beyond all doubt that His

will was the same as His Father's. The fact that His will was not different from the Father's, even though it was quite natural for Him to have a will opposed to it, can be explained only by the concept of Trinity; it is because of the oneness of the Father and the Son that they had the same will when it was quite natural for the Son to have a different will. [The prayer of Jesus, "Father, if thou be willing... not my will, but thine" made it very clear that it was perfectly as the Son of Man, with all human feelings, emotions and sensibilities, that He suffered death on the cross and that He, as the last Adam and representative of the human race {1.Cor: 15: 45}, was perfectly obedient, unlike the first Adam, to the will of God].

The perfect and eternal unity of will among the three Persons of the Triune God is further illustrated by Jesus' words, "Put up again thy sword into its place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. Or thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and he shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels? How then should the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be"? [Matt: 26: 52--54]. Jesus said these words to Peter when he drew out his sword and struck the slave of the high priest. These words mean that if Jesus had prayed to the Father even for an unscriptural deliverance from crucifixion, that prayer would have been answered. We find several verses in the Gospel according to John, which state that God the Father sent Jesus into the world in order that He might suffer death and thus become propitiation for the sins of humanity. And we see that if Jesus had prayed that He might be saved from the hands of His tormentors, it would have become necessary for the Father to send His angels and save Him from death. This means if it is necessary to consider either the Father or the Son to be superior to the other, it is the Son who has to be considered superior because His prayer has to be accepted by the Father even if it happens to be against His will. Thus we see that it is impossible for the Father to have a will different from the Son's; we have already seen that the Son's will cannot be different from the Father's; this means the will of the Father and the will of the Son are always the same and that it is so, because they are one in essence, while existing as two Persons.

The fact that it was in accordance with the will of the Son and the Father that the Holy Spirit came into the world is clear from Jesus' words, "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may be with you for ever" [John 14: 16] and "He shall glorify me; for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you. All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine; therefore said I, that he taketh of mine, and shall declare it unto you"[John: 16: 15]. The functioning of the three Persons of the Godhead is always complimentary, as it is evident from the manner in which God the Father sent God the Son into the world to suffer death on the cross and redeem mankind from sin and God the Holy Spirit came into the world after the ascension of Jesus Christ, to build the Church.

It is because of the oneness and the consequent perfect unity of will among these three Persons that there has not been, there is not, and there will never be any possibility of any discord between them while carrying out their plan for the eradication of sin and evil from the universe and the establishment of the new Heaven and the new Earth. The concept of Trinity makes the possibility of any disharmony between the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit nonexistent. Thus we see that it is the idea of Trinity implicitly mentioned in many a verse and explicitly stated in Matt: 28: 19—20 that explains what God is, what He was, what He has done and how He accomplishes His plans and purposes about mankind and the universe.

## **God the Son**

There are several verses in the Bible, which either directly or indirectly prove the fact that Jesus Christ, referred to, as the Son in the Gospel according to John, is God. Some of them are mentioned below:

### **The Word**

We read in John 1: 1, "In the beginning was the Word, and the word was with God, and the Word was God" and in verse 14, "And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us."

It is evident that the 'Word' who became flesh and dwelt among the apostles is none other than Jesus Christ. Since this 'Word' was God it is clear that Jesus Christ is God. When we substitute 'the Word' by 'Jesus Christ,' we get, "Jesus Christ was with God and Jesus Christ was God. In these words the apostle John makes a very emphatic statement about the Deity of Jesus Christ. The statement that 'the Word' [Jesus Christ] was there in the beginning makes it clear that there is no possibility at all, for thinking about Jesus Christ as a creation. The opponents of Trinity argue that instead of "and the Word was God" it should be translated, "and the Word was a god." In no authentic translation do we find this done; it is clear that this is a mistranslation made with a view to justifying the contention that Jesus Christ is not God. However, this mistranslation provokes the questions: If Jesus Christ was 'a god,' who are some of the other 'gods' like Him, Who is the 'Mighty God' and 'Everlasting Father' [Is: 9: 6]? What proof is there in the Bible to show that Jesus Christ is one among several 'gods'? Those who say that Jesus Christ is not God, but He is 'a god' have the obligation to answer these questions. It is impossible to answer them; it means, the translation, "and the Word was God" is quite right and Jesus Christ is God.

### **"Both me and my Father"**

The verse, "...but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father" [John 15: 24] means that by seeing Jesus the Jews actually saw both Jesus and the Father. This cannot but mean that in Jesus we see the visible expression of the invisible Father, Who though a different Person, is the same as Jesus in essence. In no other way can we understand the meaning of this verse. If Jesus were actually a creation of God, it would be said that by seeing him one could see, not the Father, but a creation of His. Since one saw the Father when one saw Jesus it is clear that both Jesus and the Father are one and the same in essence. [There are some people known as Jesus name Pentecostals, who say that Jesus and the Father are not two different persons; they deny Trinity saying that Jesus is the only Person in the Godhead; however their argument is shown to be wrong very clearly by the words, "both me and my Father" in this verse. The word 'both' would not be used if there were not two Persons. Their argument that the Holy Spirit is not a Person, but just the active force of God is refuted in the chapter: God the Holy Spirit]

## **“the Father in me”**

In John 14: 9—10 we read, “Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; how sayest thou, Show us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me”?

This verse means that when Philip saw Jesus, the Father became visible to him. The fact that Jesus is “the image of the invisible God” [Col: 1: 15] makes this idea clearer; it is the Son who reveals the Father; without the Son the Father is invisible and it is the Father who is in the Son; that is why the prophet Isaiah describes the birth of Jesus in the words, “For unto us a child is born.... and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace” [Isaiah. 9: 6]. That it was the Everlasting Father Who became visible through the child Jesus, establishes the Deity of Jesus beyond all possible doubt.

## **“Christ...God blessed forever”**

We read in Rom: 9: 5, “whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed forever, Amen.” In this verse it is clearly stated that Jesus Christ is the blessed God.

## **“all the fullness of the Godhead”**

In Col: 2: 9 we read, “for in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.” That in Christ there is the Godhead, the fullness of the Godhead, and all the fullness of the Godhead bodily is the most emphatic statement establishing the Deity of Christ. How can a person say that the One in whom there is all the fullness of the Godhead [Deity] bodily is not God? The fact of Christ’s equality with God stated clearly in Phil: 2: 6 is another unambiguous proof of this truth. [Both these verses are mistranslated in the NWT]..

## **“Thy throne, O God, is forever”**

In Heb: 1: 8 we read, “but of the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;” here the Father Himself addresses the Son, “O God.” This verse is another undeniable proof of the deity of Jesus Christ. [See also, chapter 4: Mistranslations and Misinterpretations].

“the great God...Jesus Christ” The words, “...appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;” {Tit: 2: 13} also bring out this truth, as Jesus is described here as the great God. [“.glorious

manifestation of the great God and of {the} the Saviour of us, Christ Jesus..” is mistranslation, which changes the meaning of the verse].

## **The Alpha and the Omega**

We read, “I am the Alpha and the Omega, saith the Lord God, who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty.” [Rev: 1:8] and “Fear not; I am the first and the last, and the Living one; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive forevermore, and I have the keys of death and Hades.” [Rev: 1:17—18] and “Thus saith Jehovah... I am the first, and I am the last; and besides me there is no God” [Isaiah 44: 6]. In these verses we find that the description, “the first and the last” applicable only to the Almighty God is applied to Jesus Christ. It proves that Jesus is God, as the disciple Thomas, repenting of his lack of faith confessed, “My Lord and my God” [John 20: 28]. It is to be noted that Jesus would have ‘corrected’ Thomas if there had been any error in what he said.

## **The Creator of the Universe**

Heb: 1: 8--10 reads, “but of the Son he saith...Thou, Lord, in the beginning didst lay the foundation of the earth, And the heavens are the works of thy hands:” Gen: 1: 1 is, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.”

That in Heb: 1:10 the Father describes the Son as the creator of the heavens and the earth and that it is God Who is this Creator according to Gen: 1:1 proves the Son is God, the great Creator; this adds to the immensity of evidences establishing the Deity of Jesus Christ.

## **“the Amen...the beginning of the creation of God”**

In Rev: 3:14 Christ is described as “the Amen...the beginning of the creation of God,” It has been argued, this means “Christ is not God; instead He is the first creation of God”. We know that the verse, “The fear of Jehovah is the beginning of knowledge” [Prov: 1: 7] means, the fear of God is the cause that results in the acquirement of knowledge; it does not mean that the fear of God, in itself is a part of knowledge. Similarly, “the beginning of the creation of God” means, ‘the One Who is the cause of the creation of God’; this becomes clear when we read Col: 1: 16, “in him were all things created...all things have been created through him, and unto him.” Moreover, the name ‘Amen’ by which Jesus is referred to here has the meaning, “[the God] of truth” as we read in Isaiah 65:16. So, ‘the Amen...the beginning of the creation of God’ means ‘the true God...Who started the creative work of God.’ It is quite unreasonable to think that the phrase, “the beginning of the creation of God” means “first among the creations.” If that were the meaning, the plural of ‘creation’ would certainly be used; the singular, ‘creation’ would not be used. The singular, ‘creation’ is used here, because what is meant is ‘ the creative work of God,’

not individual creations. When 'beginning' is followed by a plural noun [e.g. 'This beginning of his signs did Jesus in Cana of Galilee...' John 2: 11] it has the meaning 'first one among'; when it is followed by a singular noun, as in, "the beginning of knowledge", it means the cause. So the description of Jesus as 'the beginning of the creation of God proves that He is the Cause of the creation of God [Creator].

That Jesus is referred to by the name Amen is very significant; the literal meaning of this word is: True, Trustworthy, It is so, and So be it etc. In other words, when Amen is used as a name of Jesus, it cannot but mean that He is the expression of the verb Be as a living person. The verse, "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" [Ex: 3: 14] shows that the Almighty God also, is the same expression of the verb Be as a living person; because it is nothing but the meaning of Be that we find in the expression 'I AM.' The fact that both Jehovah God in the Old Testament and Jesus Christ in the New Testament are expressions of the idea of Be as living persons proves that they are the one and the same God. In short, the name Amen, signifying Jesus Christ is clear proof that He is God, the very same I AM Who revealed Himself to Moses. [This was the reason why Jesus said to the Jews, "Before Abraham was born, I am." John 8: 58]

## **The true God and Eternal Life**

The description of Jesus Christ as "the eternal life, which was with the Father and was manifested unto us" [1. John. 1: 2] means that He is the very source of life in the universe and therefore He is God. How can One Who is the source of life and Who imparts life to His creations be something other than God? If Jesus Christ were a creation of God, He would be described here as, "the eternal life, which was created by the Father." The wording "the eternal life, which was with the Father" emphasizes the fact that Jesus Christ is not a created being and that He was always with the Father; as long as the Father was there, He too was there with Him. This verse makes it clear that the 'eternal life,' the manifestation of which is Jesus Christ was there eternally with the Father and therefore there can be no question of His being a creation. [If the life in Him had a beginning, He would not be described as 'the eternal life,' meaning the very source of eternal life. The eternal life of believers has a beginning, as it is received from its source, Jesus Christ]. The declaration at the end of this epistle, "And we know that the Son of God is come... This is the true God, and eternal life." [1. John. 5: 20] makes it absolutely impossible to have any doubt about the Deity of Jesus Christ.

## **The Lord of Sabbath**

There are some other facts also, which assert the Deity of Christ: We read that Jesus is 'lord of the sabbath' [Mark 2: 28]; we know that the Sabbath was God's commandment [Ex: 16: 23; 20: 8—11]. Since Jesus is the lord of God's commandment, He cannot be one who is less than God; this means He is the God Who instituted the Sabbath. When Jesus said to the man sick of the palsy, "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven," He was accused of blasphemy, because only God has the authority to forgive sins. [Matt: 9: 2—6]. It was because Jesus was God that He exercised the authority of God. We

read, “yet to us there is one God, the Father...and one Lord, Jesus Christ...”[1. Cor: 8: 6]. Since Jesus is the one Lord we are to obey, He is the Supreme Authority in the universe and therefore He cannot but be God. [Since the Father is God, He also is the Supreme Authority; this means the Father and Jesus Christ are one and the same in essence. And if at all, for the sake of argument, one of them is to be considered superior to the other, it is Jesus Christ Who is to be considered superior because He is the one Lord, meaning, He is the One we should obey most.].

## **Jesus Christ [Jehovah] in the Old Testament**

We read in Mal: 3: 1, “Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: saith Jehovah of hosts.” That the messenger referred to here is John the Baptist is evident from the words of his father Zacharias, “Yea and thou, child... shalt go before the face of the Lord to make ready his ways;”[Luke 1: 76]. This means the One before Whom John the Baptist prepared the way [Jesus Christ] is the same as the Jehovah of hosts mentioned by Malachi. The verses: Isaiah 40: 3 and Matt: 3: 3 also tell us the same thing and lead us to the same conclusion. In Joel 2:32 we read, “...whosoever shall call on the name of Jehovah shall be delivered.” Quoting this verse, apostle Paul says, “Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord [Jesus Christ] shall be saved” {Rom: 10: 13}. Thus Paul identifies Jesus Christ with the same Jehovah spoken of in the Old Testament.

It is stated in Isaiah 45: 21--25 that every knee shall bow before Jehovah; we read in Phil: 2: 10—11 that it is Jesus before Whom every knee should bow. This also proves that Jesus Christ is the very same Jehovah of the Old Testament, in the sense that He is in Jehovah and Jehovah is in Him.

## **The Son of God**

### **Meaning of the term**

There are many verses in the New Testament that describe Jesus Christ as the Son of God. And there are about eighty verses that describe Him as the Son of Man. Thus we see that Jesus is both the Son of God and the Son of Man. It is necessary to understand the exact sense in which God the Son is referred to by each of these terms.

The description of the virgin birth of Jesus Christ makes it clear that the term ‘Son of Man’ does not mean ‘one born of a man’; the meaning is something else. The fact that Jesus suffered death on the cross on behalf of the whole of humanity and that He is given the title ‘the last Adam’ [1.Cori: 15: 45] enables us to understand that the term ‘Son of Man’ means ‘One who represents the human race.’ In other words, as the redeemer of mankind, Jesus became the Son [Representative] of the human race or the ‘Son of Man.’

The term 'Son of God' also has to be understood in its proper sense; the birth of a son in our human context involves the physical relationship between a man and a woman; in this context a son has both a father and a mother. With regard to the 'Son of God' we see that He has only a Father. [Only as the Son of Man did Jesus have a mother— Virgin Mary]. Since as the Son of God Jesus Christ has only a Father, the meaning of the term 'Son of God' is not to be understood in the human context. The meaning of the expression 'Son of Man' indicates what 'Son of God' actually means; that meaning is 'The One Who represents or reveals God.' It was in this sense that the Jews understood the meaning of this term; they accused Jesus of blasphemy, because He said, "I am the Son of God"[John: 10:36]. They said to Him, "thou, being a man, makest thyself God." [John: 10:33]. This proves that according to the Jews, 'Son of God' means God or One Who has the authority to stand in the place of God. This is made very clear in John 5: 18 where we read, "For this cause therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only brake the Sabbath, but also called God his own Father, making himself equal with God." Thus we see that the Jews' understanding of the meaning of this term justifies our conclusion that it means 'One Who reveals and represents God.' There is reason for using the title 'Son' as the most suitable term for conveying the idea of the right to represent and reveal another person. In the days of monarchy, it was usually a son who would inherit his father's throne. The son's right to the father's throne implied that he was the one authorized to stand in the place of his father. The idea of the son's right to represent the father in his absence justifies the use of the term 'Son of God' as the most suitable term for conveying the idea that Jesus Christ came into the world revealing and representing God the Father Who is invisible to us.

We read in John. 10: 30 that Jesus said He and the Father are one and in verse 36 we find Jesus explaining that the Jews had rightly understood His words meaning that He is the Son of God. This means it was not about any unity of opinion between the Father and Him, but about their oneness in essence and about the Father being in Him that He referred to by saying that He and the Father are one.

In John 10: 17—18 we read that Jesus said, He was laying down His life, of Himself, and that He had the power to take it again. Jesus' words, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" [John 2: 19] also expresses the same idea that He had the power to rise from the dead. In Acts 2: 24 we read that it was God Who raised Him up from the dead. The absence of contradiction between these statements is explained by the fact that whatever is done by the Father is considered to have been done by the Son, because they are one and the same in essence.

## **" Father Greater than I"**

To the question, " If the Father and the Son are one, how can the Father be greater than the Son as stated in John 14: 28?" the answer to be given is found in Phil: 2: 6—8 and Heb: 2:9—10: The Son, 'existing in the form of God', in order to carry out the work of redemption, without holding on to His equality with God, made Himself a little lower than the angels, emptied Himself, and took the form of a servant and died on the cross, obeying the will of the Father. It was in this sense that Jesus pointed out that the Father was greater than He. It is clearly stated that it was as a result of leaving 'the form of God'

[Phil: 2: 6] that Jesus emptied Himself and came down to this level. That Jesus had equality with God before He took this 'form of servant' is evident in His prayer to the Father, "And now, Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" [John 17:5] and also from the phrase, "existing in the form of God" mentioned above. It is also to be noted that the divine principle [attribute] is "to count each other better than himself" [Phil: 2: 3]. In obedience to this principle the Son considers the Father greater than Himself and the Father considers the Son greater than Himself; that is why the Father says to the Son, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; And the scepter of uprightness is the scepter of thy kingdom" [Heb: 1: 8]. The reason for describing the Father as King [Ps: 10:16; 29: 10] and Lord, [Ezek: 20:3] while describing the Son as King of Kings and Lord of Lords, [Rev: 17: 14; 19: 16] also, is to be explained in the light of this principle. It is to be noted that Jesus Christ considered the Holy Spirit greater than Himself when He let Himself be led up of the Spirit into the wilderness [Matt: 4:1]; the declaration in the Word of God that "every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven" [Matt:12: 31] amounts to the Father and the Son agreeing that the Holy Spirit is greater than They. Thus we see that each Person in the Godhead considers the other greater than Himself; and this divine attribute always ensures the oneness of their will.

## **The Only Begotten Son of God**

As applied to Christ, this term is used five times in the New Testament. It is used in Heb: 11: 17 referring to Isaac, son of Abraham, though in fact Isaac was not the only begotten son of Abraham. It is the Greek word Monogenes that is translated "Only begotten" in English. It was thought that this word was derived from Gennao, which means, "beget, produce" etc. But it is now known that it was from another Root Genos, meaning "kind or class" that this is actually derived. So the correct translation of Monogenes is "the only one of his kind" or "unique." John 3: 16 ought to be read, "For God so loved the world that He gave His unique Son..."[not 'only begotten' Son]. The translation "only begotten Son" does not convey the idea in the original text correctly. If we accept that as the correct translation we will have to prove that Isaac, described as 'the only {begotten} son of Abraham' [Gen: 22: 16], but who actually had an elder brother and many younger brothers born of his father Abraham, had no brothers at all, which is impossible. We have to understand that the expression "Only begotten Son of God" actually means, "Unique Son of God." It indicates the uniqueness of the relationship between God the Father and God the Son. In the human context a son can never be as old as his father; but both God the Father and God the Son are Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last [Isaiah 41:4; Rev: 1: 17]. In the human context the will of a son can be different from the father's; but that of God the Father and God the Son can never be different. Thus the relationship between God the Father and God the Son is unique in more than one respect; that is why God the Son is referred to as the unique [only begotten] Son of God. The word 'begotten' also needs explanation; it is given below:

## **“This day have I begotten thee”**

It has to be noted that in the verse, “Jehovah said unto me, Thou art my son; This day have I begotten thee” [Psalm: 2: 7], the word ‘beget’ does not mean ‘create.’ If we say that it means ‘to create’ we will have to say, “God created Adam; Adam created [begat] Cain, Abel and Seth; Seth created [begat] Enosh; Enosh created [begat] Kenan” etc. But we cannot say that Adam, Seth and Enosh were creators and they were like God; thus we see that it is unreasonable to think that ‘beget’ means ‘create.’ It is not an activity of creation that is referred to in the verse, “This day have I begotten thee.” The verses, “Abraham begat Isaac; and Isaac begat Jacob; and Jacob begat Judah and his brethren;” [Matt: 1:2] and “... through Abraham even Levi, who receiveth tithes, hath paid tithes; for he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchizedek met him” [Heb: 7: 9—10] help us to understand the meaning of ‘beget’ correctly. Since Levi, even before he was conceived in his mother’s womb was there in the loins of his great grandfather Abraham, we have to understand that the whole of humanity was created when Adam was created and that through the process of begetting all those created in Adam have been and will be given visible shapes and appearances. Thus we see that ‘create’ means ‘bring into existence’ whereas ‘beget’ means ‘bring into visible shape and appearance.’ So it is quite incorrect to think that the verse, “Thou art my son; This day have I begotten thee” means that there was a time when the Son was created. This verse in fact refers to that activity of God the Father expressing Himself or becoming visible through the Son. “This day” is the answer to the question, “When did the Father begin to express Himself through the Son?” The verses, “[The Son] Who is the image of the invisible God” [Col: 1: 15] and “[Melchizedek], King of Salem, which is, King of peace; without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually,” [Heb:7:2—3] help us to understand the meaning of ‘This day’. We see in these verses that the Son Who has ‘neither beginning of days nor end of life’ has been serving as the image of the invisible Father since the time He was the Son. To the question, “how long has He been the Son?” the answer is, He has been the Son ‘without beginning of days.’ Therefore “This day” in Psalm:2: 7 means the time ‘without beginning of days’ that is, the timeless eternity of the past or the day which has no yesterday. So we have to understand that the verse “This day have I begotten thee” means God the Son has been the image of God the Father since the beginning less beginning and that the word ‘beget’ is not used in it as a synonym for ‘create.’ [If we assume that ‘beget’ means ‘create’ we will have to say that even animals like pigs are great creators].

## **The Firstborn**

The literal meaning of ‘the firstborn’ is ‘the one who is born first’; however this is not always the sense in which this word is used in the Bible. The reason for this can be understood by examining certain scriptural as well as linguistic facts. There are several passages in the Old Testament that refer to the practice of the firstborn being set apart for God. And we see that the firstborn had certain special rights, which are referred to by ‘birthright’ in Gen: 25:27—34. The prevalence of this situation of the firstborn

enjoying greater importance than the other children led to this term acquiring the meaning 'greatest.' A word acquiring additional meanings in this manner is a very common linguistic phenomenon. For example, think of the meaning of the word 'Samaritan': literally it means 'one belonging to Samaria; but Jesus' parable of the Good Samaritan has given this word a quite different meaning—a very kind hearted person. This acquired meaning has in fact eclipsed the original meaning, which is almost forgotten now. In the case of the word 'firstborn' also we observe the same linguistic phenomenon— the word being used with the meaning it has acquired as a result of the age-old practice of the firstborns enjoying privileges over, and the respect of, others.

We read about Jesus Christ in Col: 1: 15, "who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation" and in Rom: 8: 29, "...he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren:" It is not difficult to find out the exact sense in which the term 'firstborn' is used in these verses. We find that this term is used for speaking about Ephraim who was actually the younger son of Joseph: ["..I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn." Jer: 31:9; "And Israel stretched out his right hand, and laid it upon Ephraim's head, who was the younger, and his left hand upon Manasseh's head, guiding his hand wittingly; for Manasseh was the firstborn" Gen: 48: 14]. That God declared Ephraim the younger brother to be the Firstborn is a fact we have to consider while determining the sense in which this term is used in different contexts. We read in Psalm. 89: 27, "I also will make him the firstborn, the highest of the kings of the earth." This verse indicates that the 'firstborn' is the one who occupies the highest position. Since one can be made the 'firstborn, the highest of the kings' we have to understand that in the Bible 'the firstborn' is a designation signifying the idea of highest position or authority over others; it is not a mere word indicating the time of a biological event. That is why we find that God has described Israel as His son, His firstborn. We read, "And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith Jehovah, Israel is my son, my firstborn: and I Have said unto thee, Let my son go, that he may serve me; and thou hast refused to let him go: behold, I will slay thy son, thy first-born" [Ex: 4: 22—23]. Here we see this word used in both senses: In the description of Israel as God's first-born, the word is used in the sense of considered great by God, [having been chosen by God], while in the phrase, "thy son, thy first-born," the word is used in its ordinary literal sense [born first]. When we look at the context in which this word is used we can easily understand, in which of the two senses it is used. Thus in the verse, "the church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven"[Heb: 12: 23], it is clear that the word means 'great ones in the eyes of God', not 'those who are born first', because it is unscriptural to think of a 'church' formed on the basis of the time of birth of its members. We have to bear these facts in mind while examining the verses in which the term firstborn is used for describing Christ.

The clause, "that he [Christ] might be the firstborn among many brethren"[Rom: 8: 29] means that Christ is included in the 'brethren' because the word 'among' is used there; but in the phrase "[Christ] the firstborn of all creation," instead of 'among' the word 'of' is used. This means Christ is not among all creation; but He is something [the firstborn] of it. 'The firstborn of all creation' means 'the Lord of all creation.' This is explained in the following verse: "for in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him

all things consist”[Col: 1: 16—17]. Since Christ was before all [created] things and all [created] things have been created through Him, He is the firstborn [Lord] of all those created things. This is what the phrase, “the firstborn of all creation” in Col: 1: 15 means. And this idea is fully in agreement with the concept of Trinity.

We read in Rev: 1: 5, “Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead.” In this verse also ‘firstborn’ is used in the sense of ‘the greatest;’ Jesus is the greatest of all who have suffered death because He suffered death willingly and gained victory over it; He is the only One Who had the power to lay down His life and had the power to take it again [John 10:18]. What makes the resurrection of saints possible is the resurrection of their Lord and Saviour [1.Cori: 15: 20—21]. For these reasons He has been described as the firstborn of the dead.

Thus we see that the term ‘firstborn,’ is always used for speaking about Jesus Christ in the sense, ‘the Lord of’ or ‘the greatest,’ except in the context of His virgin birth [Luke 2: 7]. We have to note that ‘firstborn’ never means ‘first-created;’ because birth refers to the activity of making visible what God has already created, as illustrated by the example of Levi being in the loins of Abraham before he was born [Heb: 7: 10]. For speaking about the activity of creation, it is some other word that is always used; for example we read, “For Adam was first formed, then Eve” [1. Tim: 2: 13]. Here ‘formed’ is used in the sense of ‘created.’ Since ‘born’ is never used in the Word of God in the sense of ‘created,’ it is most unreasonable to think that the phrase, “the firstborn of all creation” means, ‘the first one among the created things;’ it really means, ‘One Who has authority over all creation.’[It may also be noted that interpreting ‘the firstborn of all creation’ in Col: 1: 15 to mean ‘the first creation of God’ contradicts the verse that follows it immediately. In that verse it is stated that it was Christ Who created all things in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible. How can the Creator of all things be the first one among His own creations?]

If, for the sake of argument, we assume that ‘firstborn’ always means ‘born first’ and ‘born’ means ‘created,’ what should be the correct meaning of the expression, “the firstborn of all creation”? ‘Firstborn of Pharaoh’ [Ex: 11: 4] means the first one born of [created by] Pharaoh; similarly the ‘firstborn of all [every] creation’ must mean ‘the first one born of [created by] every creation [creature]; that is, according to this interpretation, Christ should be, ‘the first one born of’ [‘created by’] every creature’ on earth! What a ridiculous interpretation! If we do not admit that ‘the firstborn of all creation’ means ‘the Lord of all creation,’ this is the ridiculous conclusion we come to.

Further, those who argue that ‘firstborn’ means ‘created first’ have to say that according to Ex: 4: 22—23, it is the people of Israel {not anybody or anything else}, who were created first [even before the heavens and the earth were created] by God, because they are the firstborn of God. In short, failure to admit the truth that ‘the firstborn of all creation’ means, ‘the Lord of all creation,’ drives one to unimaginably ridiculous conclusions; our examination of the relevant verses has proved that it is as Creator that Jesus Christ is the Lord of the Universe, the Firstborn of all creation.

## **Jesus' Name Pentecostalism**

Though most of those who disbelieve the concept of Trinity deny the deity of Jesus Christ, there are some, known as Jesus' name Pentecostals, who say that Jesus is God and that the 'name' of the Father as well as the 'name' of the Holy Spirit is the same as Jesus and therefore neither the Father nor the Holy Spirit is a different Person from Jesus. Their denial of Trinity results in the denial of Personhood both to the Father and the Holy Spirit. They say that Christian baptism ought to be "in the name of Jesus" only and not "in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" as Christ commanded. They say that "in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" actually means "in the name of Jesus" and that the Apostles baptized those who believed in Jesus, "in the name of Jesus" only. A brief examination of their main arguments is given below.

## **Objection to the Wording in Jesus' Commandment**

Jesus' name - Pentecostals [JNPs] admit that Jesus commanded His disciples to administer baptism "in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" [Matthew 28: 19—20]. Justifying their beliefs they say that this wording actually means, "in the name of Jesus." If they were sincere in making this assertion, they should not object to using either of these wordings; they should approve of both. But instead of saying that either of these wordings can be used, they say that the wording in Jesus' commandment should not be used and the other wording, which they claim to be its equivalent, must be used. If the 'equivalent' is acceptable, shouldn't the 'original' be much more acceptable? But to them the 'original' is unacceptable, while its 'equivalent' is acceptable! Their disapproval of the wording in Jesus' commandment proves that they do not actually consider "in the name of Jesus" the equivalent of "in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit." The real reason for their objection to the wording in Jesus' commandment is obvious: it implies the concept of Trinity, which they do not believe in. It is in order to declare their unbelief in Trinity that they oppose the wording in Jesus' commandment and say that in its place its 'equivalent' should be used. And their opposition to the use of the wording in Jesus' commandment arising from their unwillingness to accept the idea of Trinity is proof that this wording clearly establishes the biblical concept of Trinity.

## **Wording Used by the Apostles**

An examination of Acts 19: 1—6 throws light on the wording that the apostles used while administering baptism. This passage tells us that Paul, in an effort to find out whether the disciples at Ephesus were really Christian believers, asked them if they had received the Holy Spirit when they believed ['having believed' that is, as a result of believing]. They replied that they had not even heard that there was a Holy Spirit. This reply made Paul ask them, "Into what then were you baptized?" The meaning of this question is obvious: There is a baptism which enables one to hear about the Holy Spirit and it was not that baptism that these believers had received. According to Paul if it was Christian faith that these

disciples had had and if it was Christian baptism that they had received, they would surely have heard of the Holy Spirit. That they had not even heard there was a Holy Spirit proved that it was not Christian baptism that they had received. The implication in Paul's question that they would have heard of the Holy Spirit if they had received Christian baptism proves that it was with the wording in Jesus' commandment "in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" that Christian baptism was administered by the apostles in those days. In no other way can we explain Paul asking the Ephesian believers what their baptism was if their baptism had not enabled them to hear about the Holy Spirit. Paul's question to these believers makes it amply clear that Christian baptism in apostolic days would surely make a person hear about the Holy Spirit, because in those days it was administered "in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit."

## **John's Baptism of Repentance and Christian Baptism**

We are told that the Ephesian believers were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus when Paul explained to them that John's baptism of repentance was not enough and that they should believe in Jesus. Here the wording, "baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" is used by the Holy Spirit in order to distinguish clearly between Christian baptism and John's baptism of repentance. We can understand that "baptism in the name of Jesus" in the book of Acts is an expression indicating this fact of Christian baptism being different from John's baptism. It meant "baptism in accordance with the commandment of Jesus." We have no reason to think that the Apostles deleted certain words from Jesus' commandment and modified it. Just as it is right to refer to a joint account with a bank in the names of three persons, by mentioning only the name of the one with whom the speaker is more familiar, there is nothing wrong in referring to the baptism "in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" by the words "baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus" because it was Jesus Who instituted this baptism. "Baptism in the name of Jesus Christ" in the book of Acts is an abbreviation of "baptism in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" used in view of the desirability of brevity and the need to distinguish between John's baptism and Christian baptism; it is not the denial of the wording in Jesus' commandment or its substitution by another wording.

## **Personhood of both the Father and the Son**

The JNPs believe that Jesus Christ is God and that it is not right to describe Him as God the Son, because He is not called the "Eternal Son of God." Is there any need to say that the Son of God is 'Eternal'? Even though there is no need to say so, it is clearly stated in Hebrews 7: 3 that He is "without beginning of days or end of life," that is, "Eternal." The JNPs are reluctant to describe Jesus as "the Son of God"

probably because those words prove the personhood of both the Son and the Father, just as the words 'wife' prove the personhood of 'husband' and 'child', the personhood of 'mother'.

There are several passages in the New Testament, which prove that Jesus Christ, the Son of God and God the Father, though the same in essence, are two different Persons. In Matthew 3: 17 we read that immediately after the baptism of Jesus, a voice was heard from the heavens, "This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased." The basic principles of grammar demand that the words, "This is ... Son" should be understood as referring to one person and the words, "My" and "I" to another person. Without throwing our knowledge of Language and Grammar to the winds it is not possible for us to say that this verse does not refer to two persons—the Son and the Father.

There are plenty of passages in the New Testament that prove the personhood of the Father; a few of them are mentioned below:

#### 1 Thess: 1: 1

The phrase, "the Holy Spirit in Peter and John" means that Peter and John are two different persons; then it is clear that the verse, "the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" means that God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ are two different persons.

#### John 15:24

Here we read, "...but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father." The use of the word 'both' before 'me' and 'my father' proves beyond all doubt that they are two different persons.

#### Matthew 6: 9

Here we find Jesus asking His disciples to address their prayer to their heavenly Father. If the heavenly Father had no personhood different from that of Jesus, would this instruction be given? Would Jesus ask His disciples to pray rather to a non-person than to a person—Himself?

#### John 16: 23--24

The instruction Jesus gives to the disciples is that they should pray to the Father in His [Jesus'] name. If the Father is not a different person would this instruction make any sense?

John 3: 16

In this verse Jesus Christ refers to Himself as the 'only begotten' [unique] Son of the Father. If the Father were just the divine nature of Jesus, how would He be the Son of this 'divine nature'? It is very clear that the Father Who loved the world to such an extent as to give His son for it is definitely a person and the Son Whom He gave is another person.

1 Timothy 1: 17

In this verse, "Now unto the king eternal, immortal, invisible,, the only wise God,..” the word 'invisible' indicates that it is God the Father Who is spoken about. How can one say that God the Father, the only wise God is not a person?

Col: 1: 15

This verse, “[Jesus Christ] Who is the image of the invisible God [the Father]” states that the Person of Jesus Christ is the image of the Father; if the image of a thing is a person, how can the thing it reveals or represents be less than a person?

In short, we see that there are many verses in the Bible that clearly reveal the fact that God the Father and God the Son [Jesus Christ] are two different persons, though they are the same in essence. It is really very unfortunate that the Jesus' name Pentecostals are unwilling to understand this truth and that they do not hesitate to utter the nonsense that 'the man Jesus always viewed the Spirit of God Who lived in him [Son of God] as the Father in heaven'. [If the Spirit of God Who lived in Jesus was both the 'Son of God' and the 'Father' are we to understand that the 'Son' is the 'Father' and that both being the 'Spirit' neither of them has personhood and therefore there is no God Who has personhood? The interpretations of the JNPs lead one to the most unreasonable and ridiculous conclusions. The deity and personhood of the Holy Spirit, which they deny, are described in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER 3

### GOD THE HOLY SPIRIT

#### Personhood of the Holy Spirit

There are several verses in the Bible, which clearly prove the Personhood and Deity of the Holy Spirit. A few of them are examined here:

It is stated in 1. Cor: 2:11 "For who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him? Even so the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God." Since knowledge is something that can be possessed only by a person, the one who knows the things of God, the Holy Spirit cannot but be a Person; in fact the very word 'Spirit' signifies the idea of personality. When a person dies and his spirit leaves his body; we say that he is no more. Only as long as his spirit remains in his body, do we consider him a person. This proves that the essence of person is spirit and presence of 'spirit' means presence of 'person.' So the very term 'Holy Spirit' expresses the idea that this Spirit is a Person. Further, it is impossible to attribute holiness to a mere force; invisible forces like electricity and magnetism are neither holy nor unholy. Holiness is attributed to the Spirit of God because He is a Holy Person.

The grammatical structure of the clause, "the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God," shows that it means, "no one knows the things of God, except the one, who is the Spirit of God." Since, "none...save" means, "no one except the one," the Holy Spirit referred to here, is described as one, that is, a person. Thus the grammatical structure of 1. Cor: 2: 11 declares that the Holy Spirit, no doubt, is a Person; in no way can this proof of the Personhood of the Holy Spirit be refuted.

We read in Gal: 5: 22 that "the fruit of the Spirit is love," This means that the Holy Spirit serves as a source of love and He inspires love in the believers' hearts. A lifeless force can never produce love in one's heart; the fact that the Holy Spirit urges believers to love one another is proof that He is a Person.

We see in John 16: 7—13 "...for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you. And he, when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin...Howbeit when he, the spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth: for he shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak: and he shall declare unto you the things that are to come."

Jesus here describes the Holy Spirit as the Comforter Who would guide His disciples after His ascension. He describes Him as a Person Who would 'hear' and 'speak.' And it is the personal pronoun 'he' that is used for speaking about Him. What further evidence is required to prove that the Holy Spirit is a Person?

The Holy Spirit is described in Acts 28: 25 as a person who speaks through a prophet; this means the Holy Spirit is certainly a Person, because one who speaks, expressing thoughts cannot but be a person; a mere force can never think or express thoughts in words.

We read in Acts 13: 4 "So they, being sent forth by the Holy Spirit, went down to Seleucia;" and in Acts 16: 6 "And they went through the region of Phrygia and Galatia, having been forbidden of the Holy Spirit to speak the word in Asia;" The Holy Spirit in these verses is seen as an instructor who advises the apostles to go to a place and not to go to another place. If He were not a person how would He be able to do this?

The Holy Spirit is described as a teacher in Neh: 9:20["Thou gavest also thy good Spirit to instruct them"] and Luke 12:12 ["for the Holy Spirit shall teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say"]. Can a teacher who instructs other persons be a mere force? The fact that the Holy Spirit is a teacher proves His personhood beyond any doubt.

We read in Eph: 4:30, "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, in Whom ye were sealed unto the day of redemption" and in 1. Thess: 5:19, "Quench not the Spirit." If the Holy Spirit were a mere force it would be impossible to grieve Him. That He can be grieved is proof of His personhood It is stated in John 6: 63, "It is the Spirit that giveth life." The giver of life, who is the source of life, cannot but be a living person, the living God Himself.

All these verses prove that the personhood of the Holy Spirit is an irrefutable scriptural truth.

## **Deity of the Holy Spirit**

About the prophecy of Isaiah, it is recorded in Acts 28: 25, "Well spake the Holy Spirit through Isaiah the prophet unto your fathers..." This proves that the Old Testament prophecies were in fact the words of the Holy Spirit as stated in 2.Peter 1:20—21.The quotation in Acts 28: 26—27 is taken from Isaiah 6: 9—10, where it is stated to be the voice of the Lord [God Almighty]. Thus the quotation in Acts 28: 26—27 is the words of the Holy Spirit as well as the words of God Almighty. The voice of the Lord [Jehovah] is the voice of the Holy Spirit. This means the Holy Spirit is God.

We read in Acts 5: 3—4 "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Spirit, and to keep back part of the price of the land? ... "thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." It is clearly stated here that lying to the Holy Spirit means lying to God. That means the Holy Spirit is God.

We are told, "Therefore I say unto you, Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven"[Matt: 12:31]. This means, of all sins, it is the one against the Holy Spirit that is most serious; this fact in itself is quite sufficient to prove His deity. That the

sin against the Holy Spirit is described in this verse as 'blasphemy' proves His deity all the more certain because

'blasphemy' means speaking or writing about God in an abusive or irreverent manner; speaking ill about anyone other than God is not referred to by the term 'blasphemy.' The use of this word in this verse is a clear proof that the Holy Spirit is God.

The verse, "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches" is repeated many times in Rev: chapters 2 & 3. There are also, several other verses in the other books of the Bible, which describe the Holy Spirit as a speaker. It is a simple unquestionable truth that one who speaks is a person, and since what this Person speaks is the Word of God, it is clear that this Person [the Holy Spirit] is God.

Thus we have come across several verses in the Word of God which prove that the one and only God, the Creator of the universe, the One Who is the first and the last, exists as three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—in essence the same, in

functions different, in form equal, each viewing the other greater than Himself and in respect of attributes also equal, as shown below.

## **Divine Attributes in the Three Persons**

We can see that each Person of the Godhead possesses all the divine attributes, which are listed below:

### **Eternality**

Ps: 90:2, "Even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God." [God the Father] Rev: 1:17--18 "I am the first and the last, and the Living one; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of death and of Hades." [God the Son]

Heb: 9: 14... "Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God..." [God the Holy Spirit]

### **Omnipotence**

Matt: 19: 26 "And Jesus looking upon them said to them, With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible." Gen: 17: 1 "...Jehovah appeared to Abram and, and said unto him, I am God Almighty;" [God the Father]

Matt:28: 18 "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth." [God the Son]

Gen: 1: 1—2 "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth... and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Rom: 15:19 "... in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of the Holy Spirit" [God the Holy Spirit]

## **Omniscience**

Jere: 17: 10 "I, Jehovah, search the mind, I try the heart, even to give every man according to his ways, according to the fruit of his doings." [God the Father]

Rev: 2: 23 "...and all the churches shall know that I am he that searcheth the reins and hearts: and I will give unto each one of you according to your works." [God the Son]

Acts 11: 28 "And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the Spirit that there should be a great famine all over the world: which came to pass in the days of Claudius." [God the Holy Spirit]

## **Omnipresence**

Jere: 23: 24 "Can any hide himself in secret places so that I shall not see him? Saith Jehovah. Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith Jehovah" [God the Father]

Matt:18: 20 "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." [God the Son]

Ps: 139: 7 "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?" [God the Holy Spirit]

## **Holiness**

Rev: 15: 4 "Who shall not fear, O Lord, and glorify thy name? For thou only art holy; for all the nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy righteous acts have been made manifest." [God the Father]

Acts 3:14 "But ye denied the Holy and Righteous One, and asked for a murderer to be granted unto you, and killed the Prince of life; whom God raised from the dead;" [God the Son]

Acts 5:3 "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Spirit, and to keep back part of the price of the land?" [God the Holy Spirit]

## **Truthfulness**

Ex: 34: 6: "...Jehovah, a God...abundant in loving kindness and truth;" [God the Father]

John 14:6 "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life:"[God the Son] John 16: 13 "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth:" [God the Holy Spirit]

## **Love**

1.John 4: 8 "He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love." [God the Father]

1.John 4:19 "We love, because he first loved us." Eph:5: 25 "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church,..."[God the Son]

Gal: 5: 22 "But the fruit of the Spirit is love..."[God the Holy Spirit]

## **Communion**

1.John 1: 3 "...that ye also may have fellowship with us: yea, and our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ:" [God the Father and God the Son]

2.Cori: 13: 14 "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all." [God the Holy Spirit]

## **The Word 'Trinity'**

We have examined the relevant verses in the Word of God, which are necessary for a clear understanding of the concept of Trinity. It is true that the word 'Trinity' is not found in the Bible; but we find in it what this word signifies. This word was coined because the idea it represents is there in the Bible. It is clearly stated in the Word of God that there is only one God; this one God has been there ever since the beginningless beginning; He is the Alpha and the Omega [the first and the last]; He is God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit, Who are three Persons and are One, having the same will, same attributes and same plan and purpose about the universe. What this only God has revealed about Himself is true, though a full understanding of it is beyond our comprehension; the revelation of Trinity, a unique idea unimaginable without divine inspiration, stands out in the Book of books as the unquestionable proof of the fact that it is THE WORD OF GOD that will not pass away even after heaven and earth pass away [Matt: 24:35].

Unfortunately, some people with a desire to bring down the infinite wisdom and knowledge expressed in the Word of God to the level of human comprehension have mistranslated and misinterpreted several passages in the Scripture. A few instances of this are mentioned in the next chapter in order to point out how improper handling of the Word and often prejudices, can lead us into very serious errors.

## CHAPTER 4.

### MISTRANSLATIONS AND MISINTERPRETATIONS

#### Mistranslations

A few typical instances of the several mistranslations made in the context of the ‘incomprehensibility’ of Trinity are given below. First the translation of the Standard American Edition [SAE] of the Revised Version of the Bible [1901] printed and distributed by the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, Inc. Brooklyn 1, N. Y., U. S. A. is given; then the corresponding mistranslations found in the ‘New World Translation’ or ‘The Kingdom Interlinear Translation [KIT] of the Greek Scriptures’ distributed by Jehovah’s Witnesses today, is given. In brackets, the error in the text of the mistranslation is indicated. The differences between the two translations can be explained by the fact that the doctrines advocated by these people compelled them to publish a new ‘Translation’ in support of their teachings.

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

KIT: “In {the} beginning the Word was, and the Word was with God, and the Word was a god.” [‘God’ is substituted by ‘a god,’ meaning, Jesus Christ is not God.]

2. SAE: Col: 1: 16—18. “for in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or

be principalities or powers; all things have been created through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.”

KIT: “because by means of him all {other} things were created in the heavens and upon the earth, the things visible and the things invisible, no matter whether they are thrones or lordships or governments or authorities. All {other} things have

been created through him and for him. Also, he is before all {other} things and by means of him all {other} things were made to exist, and he is the head of the body, the congregation. He is the beginning,

the firstborn from the dead, that he might become the one who is first in all things;" [The word 'other' is added four times, in order to give the impression that Christ is part of creation]

3. SAE: Heb: 1:8 "but of the Son he saith, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever..."

KIT: "But with reference to the Son: God is your throne forever..." [The attempt to create the impression that the Son is not addressed 'God' results in the mistranslation meaning that God the Father serves as the throne for God the Son, which is a very unscriptural and nonsensical idea. In fact this mistranslation has thrown all arguments against the Deity of Christ into the bottomless pit of unreason and proved what the translators of KIT and NWT have attempted to disprove. See question no: 35 in the last Chapter of this book].

4. SAE: Gal: 6: 18 "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brethren, Amen."

KIT: "The undeserved kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ be with the spirit you show, brothers. Amen. [By paraphrasing 'spirit' as 'spirit you show' the idea of the personhood of spirit is obscured.]

5. SAE: 1.John 4: 1. "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God..."

KIT: "Beloved ones, do not believe every inspired expression, but test the inspired expressions to see whether they originate with God..." [By paraphrasing 'spirit' as 'inspired expression' the personhood of 'spirit' is kept hidden.]

## **Misinterpretations**

The attempt to disprove the Biblical concept of Trinity has resulted in not only mistranslations but also several misinterpretations. It can be seen easily that most of these misinterpretations have arisen from the effort to tailor divine revelations to suit human 'wisdom.' Before passing on to the examination of a few typical misinterpretations let us examine how undesirable it is to measure the infinite with the finite:

## **The Finite and the Infinite**

Those who study Mathematics are aware that the rules governing the finite are not applicable to the infinite; the total sum of any number of infinities make up only one infinity though it may sound

unreasonable according to the rules concerning finite numbers; we should bear in mind the fact that the rules of our finite arithmetic are not

applicable to the infinite Almighty God Who fills heaven and earth [Jere: 23: 24], Who is the first and the last [Isa: 48: 12] and Who thus transcends infinite space and infinite time. However, it is quite natural on our part to feel the unwise desire to apply the rules of our finite intelligence to the how and why behind great scriptural truths expressing the infinite wisdom of God. The resultant effort has led many to disregard the divine revelations in the Bible and 'interpret' several passages in the Word of God according to their own wisdom. This has given rise to many misinterpretations of the Word of God; a few of them have already been discussed; it is desirable to point out a few more and show that failure to accept scriptural statements as they are and view them in the light of other relevant verses leads to several unreasonable and even ridiculous conclusions. A few of the typical examples of these misinterpretations are given below.

## **1. 'Wisdom' in Proverbs ch: 8**

It has been 'interpreted' that 'Wisdom' referred to in the 8th chapter of the book of Proverbs tells us about Jesus Christ. Verses like, "When there were no depths, I was brought forth" [Prov: 8: 24] are considered proof that Jesus Christ is a created being. When we examine all the verses that refer to 'wisdom' in this chapter we find that it is in the feminine gender that this word is used. So if we ascribe personhood to 'wisdom' it should be referred to as a woman, not as a man. This means, if 'wisdom' in this chapter were actually Jesus Christ, when He took human form, He should have been born not as a man, but as a woman. But it is an undisputed fact that it was as a boy that Jesus was born. So it is clear that Jesus cannot be the 'Wisdom' that is referred to in this chapter. The book of Proverbs, as a whole emphasizes the importance of wisdom; in this particular chapter we find this virtue being personified; but there is no justification for seeing a real 'Person' in a personification, which is nothing but a figure of speech in language aimed sometimes, at making certain ideas very clear and effective. Even if we assume that 'wisdom' refers to a real person in this chapter, that person has to be a woman if that interpretation is to agree with the grammar of the sentences; so it cannot refer to Jesus Christ. Further, what is stated in this chapter is that God possessed her [wisdom], not 'created' her [see verse 22, in which the word 'barah' meaning 'created' is not used, instead, 'qanah' meaning 'possessed' is used]; this means there is no way to make a point that 'wisdom' is described here as a creation of God and this creation is Jesus Christ. [Those who say that 'wisdom' was a creation of God, have to admit that before God created it, He had no 'wisdom' and it was without wisdom that He started the work of creation!]. We ought to understand that 'wisdom' is an inherent quality of God and that God imparts it to those who fear Him [Prov: 1: 7] and there cannot be a question of creating it as a special being. It is most unreasonable to imagine that emphasizing the value and importance of wisdom in the 8th chapter of Proverbs by employing the figure of speech of personification means the description of some creation of God; saying that this creation must be Jesus Christ amounts to adding fantasy to unreason.

## . 2'Today' in Luke 23: 43

The verse, "And he said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise" [Luke 23: 43] is the reply that Jesus gave the repentant robber who requested him, "Jesus, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom." That man did not expect to have the experience of salvation immediately; He expected to have it only in future, when Jesus would establish His kingdom. But Jesus told him that he would have that experience that very day itself, immediately after his death; it was in order to convey this idea to him that Jesus said, "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Jehovah's Witnesses believe that at death human beings cease to exist as persons. In order that the words of Jesus may not contradict their teaching, they have changed the position of the comma after thee by placing it after Today. Their translation is, "Truly I tell you today, You will be with me in Paradise [not now, but in future]." This mistranslation provokes the question, "If Jesus had not said, "I tell you today," would the repentant robber have thought that it was the previous day or the next day that Jesus spoke to him those words?" In order that they may not have to answer this uncomfortable question, it has been 'interpreted' that that man believed in Jesus on a day when it was 'amazing' to believe in Him and this amazement made Jesus give special emphasis to 'Today.' If that man's faith was 'amazing,' it was not the day of his faith, but his faith itself, which should have been emphasized; we do not find anything in the Word of God pointing out that Jesus attributed any special significance either to that day or to that man's faith. In fact we find sufficient reason to think that there was nothing 'amazing'

about that man's faith; we read, "Now the centurion, and they that were with him watching Jesus, when they saw the earthquake, and the things that were done, feared exceedingly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God" [Matt: 27: 54]. This means, the events that happened on that day, beginning with the fall of darkness at noon were such that one would feel induced to believe in Jesus; therefore it was not at all 'amazing' on the part of the repentant robber to believe in Jesus on that day. The context of Jesus' words makes it clear that He said "Today" in order to let the repentant man know that He would begin to enjoy the benefit of salvation the moment he died and left this world, much earlier than he hoped to have that experience. The unwillingness on the part of Jehovah's Witnesses to admit that the human soul exists in a conscious state after death has necessitated their denial of this truth by means of a very unreasonable mistranslation and an equally unreasonable misinterpretation. [There are seventy-four verses in the New Testament in which we find Jesus introducing an important truth via the expression, "Truly I tell you" or its equivalent; this {Luke: 23: 43} is the only instance among them, in which we find Jehovah's Witnesses changing the position of the comma in order to justify their misinterpretation. In all the other seventy-three instances they find no need for any misinterpretation and they permit the comma to remain in its proper position.]

## 3. Satan's Temptation of Jesus Christ

Jehovah's Witnesses argue that Jesus Christ was tempted of the devil after He had fasted forty days in the wilderness [Matt: 4: 1—11] and it is proof that He is not God. They argue that the verse, "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, and he himself

tempteth no man”[James 1:13] proves this. Let us look at what the apostle James has stated: He says, no one can tempt God with evil. What is the meaning of this statement? It simply means that it is impossible to tempt God with evil, because in Him there is perfect goodness and there is no trace of any evil in Him. If we say about a government official that he cannot be bribed, it means that if he is offered bribery, he will not accept it and he will never behave in a corrupt manner; it does not mean that he cannot be offered bribery. Therefore the sentence, “God cannot be tempted with evil” means that it is impossible to persuade God to do anything wrong or evil, because in Him there is perfect goodness. In fact this truth was proved when Satan tempted Jesus: Satan offered Him Lordship over all the nations of the world, if He fell before him and worshipped him. Jesus rejected this offer and rebuked him and thus proved that He could not be tempted with evil. The failure of Satan to tempt Jesus with the evil offer of authority over all the kingdoms of the world just serves as yet another proof that Jesus is God. The effort to make out that the sentence “God cannot be tempted with evil” means what it actually does not and the attempt to prove that it does not mean what it actually does, is just another proof of the prejudiced thinking of those who deny the Deity of the Son of God.

#### **4. “Good Teacher”**

We read in Mark 10:17, “And as he was going forth into the way, there ran one to him, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Teacher, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?” And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? None is good save one, even God.”

Jehovah’s witnesses argue that the reply given by Jesus means that He lacks the perfect goodness of God and therefore He is not God. We have to note that Jesus did not tell that man that he had made a mistake by calling Him good. He pointed out that God is the only one Who is really good; He said so in order to bring out what that man thought about Him. He asked that rich man to sell whatever he had and give it to the poor and then follow Him. If he had considered Jesus God he would have acted accordingly; but he did not like to become a true disciple and he went away. Thus it was proved that that man did not recognize Jesus as God and did not consider Him truly good; he was unlike Peter and Andrew who considered Jesus good in the true sense of the term and gave Him the honour due to God, by obeying Him perfectly and following Him after leaving their nets.

[Matt: 4:18—20]. Jesus’ question to this rich man was in fact intended to prove whether he truly considered him the Son of God The incident described here proves that those who attach great value to their worldly possessions cannot obey the will of God. What is disproved here is not the Deity of Jesus, but the man’s hope that He could please God on his own terms, keeping intact all his possessions.

If in response to Jesus’ reply, that man had said that he felt sorry for using a word [good] ascribing deity to Him and if Jesus had endorsed that statement, it would have been reasonable to argue that Jesus Himself denied His deity. Since that was not what happened here, it is quite unreasonable to argue that the words of Jesus meant that He is not God. Those who argue that Jesus meant He was not as good as God, have the obligation to point out in what respect{s} He lacked this goodness. Pontius Pilate, who

ordered the crucifixion of Jesus, testified to His perfect goodness before passing his orders [John 18:38]. Even the false witnesses who were brought in, to testify against Him did not succeed in finding fault with Him [Matt: 26: 59—60]. The only accusation the Jews could bring against Him was that He claimed to be the Son of God and thus made Himself equal with God [John 5: 18; 19: 7]. His enemies had nothing else to accuse Him of; this is proof of His absolute goodness. Further, we read about Him that He is the One Who knew no sin and was made to be sin on our behalf [2.Cori: 5: 21]. Thus, judging by the principle that God is the only One Who is perfectly good, we come to the conclusion that Jesus cannot but be God because even His enemies failed in their attempt to find fault with Him. So the argument that Jesus lacked in goodness and therefore was not God is just a misinterpretation of Mark 10: 17 and it is a repetition of the futile attempt made by the chief priests and the council of the Jews two thousand years ago, to find evidence of some guilt on the part of Jesus.

## **5. “Knoweth no one”**

We read in Mark 13: 32, “But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.” Jesus said these words to His disciples and made it clear that it is the Father Who decides when the present age should end and no one else knows anything about it. Jehovah’s Witnesses consider this proof that Jesus lacks omniscience, which means He is not God. If we assume that their argument is right, what shall we say about Jehovah God Who said to Abraham that He would go down to the city of Sodom in order to see and find out whether the people there were so great sinners as the cry of this city had indicated? [Gen: 18: 21]. Shouldn’t we say that ‘Jehovah was neither omniscient nor omnipresent and that was why He had to go to Sodom in order to find out’ what sort of people lived there? Will the Jehovah’s witnesses say that Jehovah lacks omnipresence and omniscience and He is not God? They ought to come to this conclusion if they think about this question in the same way as they think about the meaning of “But of that day or that hour knoweth no one...” When we examine the contexts of these passages we can understand what they do mean and what they do not mean:

The context of Mark 13: 32 is the end of the present age; the duration of each age is determined by God the Father; as Redeemer the duty of Jesus was to offer Himself as the perfect sacrifice for the remission of all the sins of mankind and to intercede before the Father for each one who believes in him. As the Redeemer or Saviour, Jesus did not know when the present age would end; this in no way means He lacks omniscience. A teacher who sets the question paper for the students of his class, may have to tell his son who is in that class, that he [as the boy’s father] does not know the questions; but this lack of knowledge is positional and contextual; it is not real; so also the ‘lack of knowledge’ on the part of Jesus about the time of the end of the present age is not something that means real lack of omniscience. What it means is that there are things which are to be done by the Father and kept secret from us until the proper time for their revelation comes; we are not to expect our Lord to know those things and reveal them to us now. It is misinterpretation to argue that Jesus Who said, “All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine” [John 16: 15] does not really know enough about the end of the present age. [If it

is argued that Jehovah God lacks omniscience and that was why He had to go to Sodom in order to know the truth about the people there, that also can be proved to be nothing but misinterpretation: It was as a righteous judge that Jehovah wanted to deal with the people of Sodom and Gomorrah; we find Abraham as an advocate pleading with Him for Lot and His family. God spoke to Abraham as a judge who pronounces the verdict only on the basis of reliable firsthand evidence. In order to emphasize the fact that the punishment of Sodom would be perfectly just, God spoke to Abraham in the legal context of examining evidence and then deciding the question of punishment. This does not mean that God Who heard the cry of Sodom in heaven was unable to see from heaven what happened there].

It is desirable to note also, the explanation given in Mac Arthur's Study Bible about why Jesus said that He did not know when the present age would end: "Jesus voluntarily restricted the use of certain divine attributes [Phil: 2: 6—8] when He became man. He did not manifest them unless directed by the Father [John 4: 34; 5: 30; 6:38]. He demonstrated His omniscience on several occasions [John 2: 25; 3: 13], but He voluntarily restricted that omniscience to only those things God [the Father] wanted Him to know during the days of His humanity [John 15:15]. Such was the case regarding the knowledge of the date and time of His return." [What Jesus meant was that the disciples

were not permitted to know the exact time of His return and as their Lord and Redeemer of mankind, He did not have that knowledge during His days on earth, as He voluntarily restrained Himself from having that knowledge which was not to be imparted to His disciples. This voluntary restriction was like Jesus' voluntary subjection to the laws of Nature and His practice of crossing the sea of Galilee by boat even though as the Lord of the laws of Nature He could walk on the sea if He so desired [John 6: 16—21]. .

We read in Heb: 5: 8 that Jesus 'learned obedience' by the things, which he suffered. Since the word 'learned' is used here, it has been argued that one who needs learning is not omniscient and therefore Jesus is not omniscient. This argument would be reasonable if the word learn were used in the sense of 'acquiring knowledge'; however, we find that the contextual meaning of 'learned obedience' is: 'proved that He was perfectly obedient.' So this argument is just a misinterpretation based on ascribing to the word a meaning, which is not permitted by its context.

Another argument questioning the omniscience of Jesus Christ is this: "We read in Rev: 1:1 'The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him to show unto his servants...' Since Jesus Christ had to receive this revelation from God, it is evident that He is not omniscient." It is to be noted that the revelation of Jesus Christ is in fact the Revelation of the Holy Spirit too; because we read in Rev: 2: 7, "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches." What we see is that the "Revelation of John" is the revelation of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. It is obvious that the contextual meaning of "which God gave him to show" is, "which God permitted [directed] him to show." It is most unreasonable to argue that Jesus Who spoke about the last judgment on several occasions when He was on earth [Matt: 11: 22; 12: 36; 16: 27], was unaware of the contents of the book of Revelation describing this judgment, until He was 'given' it to be shown to His servants. Thus we see that Rev: 1: 1 also does not support the contention that Jesus is not omniscient.

## **6. “Let us make man in our image” Gen: 1: 26**

The argument that God said these words to His first creation and that it was with the help of this ‘creation’ that He created man is examined in chapter 1.[See One God, Three Persons].

## **7. “...the Amen...the beginning of the creation of God” Rev: 3: 14**

It is argued that these words mean, Jesus Christ was the first creation of God. This is examined in chapter 2. [See God the Son].

## **8. “This day have I begotten thee” Ps: 2: 7**

The interpretation that the word ‘begotten’ means ‘created’ is examined in chapter 2. And it is proved to be a misinterpretation.

## **9. “the firstborn of all creation” Col: 1: 15**

It is argued that this verse means, Christ was the first creation of God. This is examined in chapter 2 and proved to be a ridiculous misinterpretation.

## **10. “the head of Christ is God” 1. Cor: 11: 3**

It is explained in chapter 2 that Jesus Christ came into the world to do the will of the Father and that this fact is to be viewed in the context of the oneness of the will of the three Persons in the Godhead. As our body obeys the will of our head, Jesus obeyed the will of the Father. Apostle Paul, explaining the need for women to have their heads veiled while praying or prophesying, points out that the head of every man is Christ and the head of the woman is the man and the head of Christ is God [1. Cor: 11: 3]. It has been argued that since God is the head of Christ, God is greater than Christ and Christ is inferior to God. We have to note that though there is difference between the body and the head with regard to functions, they are made up of the same matter. Therefore there cannot be any essential difference between Christ and the Father, even when we compare them with body and head. Those who argue that Jesus Christ is inferior to the Father in the light of this comparison have to admit that as the body and head constitute only one entity, Christ and the Father, together are only one God and that as the body is not made up of any matter inferior to that of the head, Christ and the Father, though different Persons, are the same in essence. Further, we have to note that both body and head exist together; the

body does not start its existence after the head has existed alone for a long period; the body can never be a creation of the head; so according to the comparison of God the Father to the head and Christ to the body, Christ has existed ever since the Father

has existed and Christ cannot be a creation of God. [In fact the comparison with body and head in this verse is intended, to emphasize the idea of perfect unity and oneness of will and not for conveying any idea of inferiority or superiority].

## **Unacceptability of the NWT**

The mistranslations and misinterpretations described above make it clear that a deliberate and concerted effort has been made to disprove the biblical concept of Trinity. Our examination of these erroneous translations and interpretations has proved that there are plenty of evidences in the Word of God, which enable every truthful student of the Bible to come to the conclusion that the one and only God revealed in this Book of books is God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit in Whose name every believer is to be baptized [Matt: 28: 19—20]. The more one examines this truth, the more convincing and the more irrefutable it becomes. It is true that in our world there are plenty of misinterpretations of the Word of God; each of them is proved to be erroneous and the truth is brought out when we begin to examine and analyze it in the light of the relevant verses and look at it in the right perspective. A close examination of the “New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures” published by Jehovah’s Witnesses proves that it can hardly be considered a translation in the proper sense of the term, as it contains many mistranslations and misinterpretations which seem to have been made with view to justifying a certain line of thinking. That is why it is not referred to as a reliable text in this book. It is hoped that the topics dealt with, the explanations given and the arguments put forward in this book are quite sufficient to find out what is right and what is wrong, when we hear various arguments challenging the concept of Trinity.

## CHAPTER 5

### CONSEQUENCES OF THE REJECTION OF TRINITY

Those who reject the concept of Trinity are found to believe in several ideas, which have no basis in the Word of God. The reason for this is the fact that Trinity is the most important theological revelation in the Bible and its rejection means in a sense, the rejection of everything in the Word of God. So it is quite natural on the part of the opponents of Trinity to reject other biblical ideas also and invent ideas and doctrines, which are most unreasonable and contrary to the Word of God. A few examples of the major unbiblical ideas and doctrines the opponents of Trinity believe in are mentioned below. They are intended to point out that rejection of Trinity serves as a gateway to a great world of untruths created by the One who opposes the God of Truth.

#### Rejection of Immortality

It is Jehovah's Witnesses who oppose the concept of Trinity most vehemently. Rejection of Trinity has led them to develop a whole system of beliefs according to which a person's soul is an inseparable part of the body, so that when one dies, there is no continued existence of one's soul [Make Sure of All Things, 1953 ed., pp.349—352]. But we see that the continued existence of the human soul after death is an unquestionable biblical truth stated very clearly in Luke 16: 19—31; 23: 30—43; Rev: 6: 9 ["...I saw underneath the altar the souls of them that had been slain for the Word of God,"]; 2 Cori: 5: 5—8 and Phil: 1: 19—24. The Jehovah's Witnesses believe that it is Satan who wants human beings to believe in the immortality of the soul [Let God Be True, 2nd ed. PP 74—75]. But the truth is just the opposite of this; Satan wants human beings not to think about life after death or punishment of the sinners; he wants them to lead a life without any thought of judgment after death; it is God Who wants men to understand that the soul is immortal and that it will have to stand before the judgment seat of Christ [2 Cori: 5: 1—8] or the great white throne [Rev: 20: 11—15]. Ecclesiastes 12: 7 clearly states that each person will be judged according to his {her} works both in obedience to and in defiance of God. In fact the immortality of the soul is one of the fundamental truths of the Bible. The opponents of Trinity [Jehovah's Witnesses] are unable to understand this truth.

## **Distortion of Resurrection**

According to Jehovah's Witnesses they will be 'recreated' from Jehovah's memory to inhabit His kingdom [Make Sure of All Things, 1953 ed. P. 311]. This teaching amounts to a rejection of the biblical teaching of the resurrection of the dead. According to the Scripture resurrection means, not recreation, but the return of the soul to its body [a new heavenly body in the case of saints]. This is made very clear in the verses: 1 Cori: 15: 39—54; Phil: 3: 20—21; Luke: 24: 36—43; 1 Thess: 4: 13—18; Luke 7: 11—17; John 11: 11—44; 1 Kings 17: 17—24 & Ps: 90: 3 ["Thou turnest man to destruction, And sayest, Return, ye, children of men"].

The opponents of Trinity are unable to accept this doctrine of resurrection in the Bible. It may be noted that they do not believe in the resurrection of Jesus Christ also. According to them, "our lord's human body was however supernaturally removed from the tomb. Whether it was dissolved into gases or whether it is still preserved somewhere as a grand memorial to God's love...no one knows" [The Time Is at Hand: P.29]. This teaching contradicts all the relevant biblical statements about the resurrection of Jesus Christ and especially the verses in John 20: 24—29 where it is clearly stated that the resurrected body of Jesus Christ was a material reality, which could be touched and felt and that it bore the marks of His crucifixion. It was probably the rejection of the biblical truth about the resurrection of the saints that necessitated the Jehovah's Witnesses' distortion of the resurrection of Jesus Christ amounting to a virtual denial of that fact.

## **Jesus Christ—an Incarnation of Michael?**

Jehovah's Witnesses' denial of the Deity of Jesus Christ has led them to believe that He is the incarnation of Michael the archangel and that He resumed this name when He ascended to heaven [Your Will Be Done on Earth P. 316—17]. Nowhere in the Bible do we come across any such statement; but Jehovah's Witnesses believe that this fantastic idea is biblical truth and it seems they do not need any scriptural support to believe what they are told to believe. [Is it not equally or more unreasonable to believe that Jesus was the incarnation of Gabriel? What is the justification for not believing that Jesus Christ was the incarnation of Gabriel or even some other angel?]

The scriptural truth is that the exalted office of Christ is unique. He has a more excellent name than that of angels and He is far greater than they [Heb: 1: 1—14]. The Bible sharply distinguishes between angels and Christ. But Jehovah's Witnesses have no difficulty in believing that what is not stated in the Bible is truth and what is stated in it is untruth!

## **Disrespect to the Lord's Supper**

Instituting what is known as the Lord's Supper Jesus Christ told His disciples, "...this do in remembrance of me"[Luke 22: 19]. It was in accordance with this commandment that the apostles and those who

joined them in the first century used to gather together for the breaking of bread [Acts 2: 46; 20: 7]. All who participated in this function ate the bread that was broken and drank from the cup in the same manner as the apostles did when Jesus instituted it. All who have accepted Jesus as their Lord and Saviour are expected to follow this apostolic practice today.

It is known that when Jehovah's Witnesses gather together for the breaking of bread the plate of bread and the cup of wine are brought before each believer; but all are so instructed that nobody eats the bread or drinks the wine. Only after the time for 'breaking of bread' is over that the bread becomes eatable and the cup drinkable. During the time specified for the 'breaking of bread' everybody is expected to say 'no' to what is offered to him. This practice is a hideous distortion of the Lord's commandment concerning the bread symbolizing His broken body and the wine symbolizing His shed blood. Jesus' commandment to everyone who believes in His atoning sacrifice is, "Take, eat" and "Drink ye all of it" [Matt: 26: 26—27]. The command of Jehovah's Witnesses is, "Don't take; don't eat" and "Drink none of you." It seems that Jehovah's witnesses want to practice exactly the opposite of what Jesus commanded.

The manner in which Jehovah's Witnesses 'break bread' is expressive of their contemptuous denigration of Jesus Christ. They not only defy the Lord's commandment, but also refuse to proclaim [as specified in 1 Cori: 11: 23—27] that the Lord's death is the only factor responsible for their justification and forgiveness of sins. Their observance of the Lord's Supper in a mocking manner proves that they have no respect at all for God or His Word.

## **The Number 144000**

Disrespect for God and His Word seems to have led Jehovah's Witnesses to develop an inclination to misunderstand even simple statements in the Word of God. For example we read in Revelation 7: 1—8 and 14: 1—5 about a total of 144000 servants of God—12000 each gathered from each tribe of Israel and sealed by the angels of God, standing before the throne of God and before the Lamb. The context shows that these faithful servants of God, who are Jews, suffer great persecution during the reign of Antichrist and that they do not at all belong to the present age of the church. Jehovah's Witnesses imagine that they are these 144000 'Jews'! They have formulated several other ideas also based on this wrong assumption. They are blind to the fact that the number 144000 has no relevance at all to people outside the twelve tribes of Israel mentioned in Rev: 7: 5—8.

## **Strange beliefs and False Predictions**

There are several other strange beliefs, which Jehovah's Witnesses consider true and biblical even though there is nothing in the Word of God that supports them. Their publications reveal that their

leaders predicted Armageddon in 1914, 1915, 1918, 1925 and in 1975 and all these predictions were proved false. However, even this repeated failure of their predictions has not opened their eyes to see the fact that theirs is a world of spiritual fantasies and untruths.

## **Failure to Understand Truth**

We have seen that the opponents of Trinity find it very difficult to accept as true several scriptural statements, which are very simple, clear and easy to understand, while they find it easy to believe in strange ideas, which have no basis at all in the Word of God. We may wonder these people are deliberately believing in falsehood and rejecting truth. However, a careful examination of the Word of God indicates that the inability to believe simple and clear scriptural truths can also result from a psychological aversion to truth, which can be caused by fear, love of evil, unwillingness to resist the devil etc. [Rev:

21: 7—8].

It is a fact that the denial of Deity to Jesus Christ is one of the fundamental teachings of Jehovah's Witnesses. When a person accepts this teaching, knowingly or unknowingly he denigrates the One Who is the Way, the Truth and the Life [John 14: 6]; he believes that the Creator of everything visible and invisible, is Himself a creation; he thinks that the One Who is the very source of all Life is not a giver of life, but a recipient of it; his failure to understand that the One Who is the source of all life in the universe cannot but be God, results in his failure to understand several other truths. Since he rejects the truth about the One Who is the Truth, the Spirit of Truth cannot guide or enlighten him; he comes fully under the control of the spirit of untruth and as a result, begins to feel a psychological aversion to all truths in general. Most probably it is this aversion to truth that makes Jehovah's Witnesses believe that the resurrected body of Jesus Christ was not a material reality, the wicked sinners do not have to suffer everlasting punishment in hell etc. It must be the reason why they turn a blind eye to verses like, "...to be cast into hell; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. For everyone shall be salted with fire" [Mark: 9: 47—49]. It seems that their aversion to truths in general has been expressed in areas like politics and science also. It is a fact that in most of the countries of the world people have the right to let a government continue for another term or to replace it by a new government through periodic elections. According to the predictions made by the leaders of Jehovah's Witnesses, Armageddon should have been fought and Christ should have established His kingdom on earth in the first quarter of the 20th century itself. In the context of the disappointment regarding this expectation, the Witnesses as a whole view with aversion the present political realities of the world and consequently refrain from exercising their right to vote during elections. An area in science in which their aversion to truth is expressed is the practice of saving lives by means of blood transfusion. They argue that this practice is wrong according to the Word of God and thus express their dislike for the scientific truths concerning the role of blood in the sustenance of life. [Since blood transfusion does not mean the soul of one person entering the body of another, it is impossible to prove that this practice is wrong according to the Word of God].

In short the consequences of rejecting the concept of Trinity are many; it leads one to reject almost all the major truths of the Bible; it even leads people not to accept political realities and sometimes, to act against scientific truths. It compels one to accept as infallible truths, false prophecies and nonsensical misinterpretations of the Word of God. But the most serious consequence of the rejection of Trinity is mentioned in John 5: 23, "... He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father that sent him." Describing the One in Whom dwells, "all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" as a creation and rejecting His Deity amounts to denigrating the Father and defying Him. Unfortunately those who reject the Deity of Jesus Christ are unaware that they are in fact rejecting indirectly the Deity of the Father and dishonoring Him and by so doing, are jumping into the jaws of eternal damnation. They claim that they have fellowship with the Father; but the truth about them is what Jesus said about the Jews ["ye say, that he {the Father} is your God; and ye have not known him; John 8: 54—55]. Rejection of Trinity thus leads not only to several theological errors but also to a total rejection of God and His Word and consequent eternal punishment in the lake of fire.

## CHAPTER 6

### QUESTIONS

The questions given below are intended to help the readers see how unreasonable the arguments put forward by those who question Trinity. If the opponents of Trinity write down the answers of these questions and then examine them truthfully, they will definitely come to the conclusion that the proofs of Trinity are indisputable and beyond question.

1. If it was to an already created being that God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness," are we to understand [a] That it was in the image and likeness of both God and this creation that man was created? [b] That Adam possessed the images and likenesses of both God and this creation? [c] That God, by not acknowledging the role of this creation in making man, unlawfully took all the credit for the creation of man for Himself? [According to Gen: 1: 27, it was in the image and likeness of none but God or in God's own image, that man was created].

2. If in the beginning God created another 'creator' to help Him do the work of creating the heavens, earth and man, why is this very important fact, the creation of a 'junior creator' not mentioned in the Bible? Why is nothing mentioned about the role of this 'great assistant' in Genesis? If it was this 'junior creator' who created the living beings on earth and the various things in the universe, why is it not mentioned in this book?

3. Is wisdom not an inherent virtue of Omniscient God? What logical justification is there to interpret the personification of this virtue in the 8th chapter of Proverbs as the description of the creation of a being not mentioned in Genesis?

4. Is not the use of the noun [subject] Elohim in the plural and its verb in the singular in Gen: 1: 1 consistent with the idea of Trinity revealed in the New Testament?

5. Why did Jehovah God appear to Abraham [Gen: 18: 1—2] as three Persons, instead of one? What was the need for doing so? If the one God Jehovah appeared to Abraham as three Persons, does it not indicate that it is as three Persons that Jehovah exists?

6. What should we understand from the fact that the Jehovah [the Person] Who spoke to Abraham in Gen: 18: 22 is different from the Jehovah [the other two Persons] Who went to Sodom according to Gen: 18: 21 & 19:1? What is the explanation for the Jehovah Who promised Abraham to go to Sodom being different from the Jehovah Who went there? Did Jehovah not go to Sodom as He had promised? Did He break His promise to Abraham?

7. In the absence of the concept of Trinity what is the grammatical justification for using the word name instead of names in the sentence, “Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit [Matt: 28: 19--20]?”

8. If it is right to say that Jesus Christ is a creation of God and if it is right to say according to John 14: 9—10 & 15: 24 that one who sees a creation of God actually sees God Himself, should we not say that by seeing even an animal, we are seeing God and that that animal and God are one? If Jesus Christ and God the Father are not the same in essence, how can it be correct to say that one who has seen Jesus has seen the Father?

9. Jesus told His disciples that the Jews had both seen and hated both Him and His Father [John 15: 24]. How did the Jews see the invisible Father when they saw Jesus only?

10. Jesus Christ is described as the “Everlasting Father” in Is: 9: 6; How can the “Everlasting Father” be a creation? By whom and when was the Everlasting Father ‘created’?

11. If Jesus Christ is not God, why did He not ‘correct’ Thomas when he addressed Him, “My Lord and my God”?

12. We read, “and the Word was a god” in John 1: 1, in the New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures. Does this mean that Jesus Christ was ‘a god’? When we say, “Peter was a disciple,” it means there were other disciples like him; if Jesus Christ is ‘a god’ it means He is one among a number of ‘gods.’ Who are these ‘gods’ among whom Jesus Christ is one? [A few examples will suffice]. What is the proof that He is one of these ‘gods’ and each of these ‘gods’, like Jesus, is ‘the Mighty God’ and ‘Everlasting Father’? [Inability to answer these questions will mean that Jesus Christ is not ‘a god’ among some ‘gods’ and that there is no ‘god’ like Him and that He is none but the true God.]

13. In no translation other than that of the opponents of Trinity do we read, “and the Word was a god.” In all major authentic translations we read, “and the Word was God”; what should we understand from this about KIT and NWT?

14. It is stated in John 1: 1 that Jesus, the Word {of God} was there in the beginning; how does the need of creating a thing or being arise if it is already there in the beginning? If a thing is there at the beginning, isn’t it an uncreated thing? If things already existing in the beginning have to be created, doesn’t God also have to be created? When can be, and when is to be, things already existing in the beginning created? [Those who say that Jesus Christ is a creation of God have to answer these questions].

15. It is stated in Heb: 1: 10 that Jesus Christ, the Son of God is the creator of the heavens and the earth; it is stated in Gen; 1: 1 that God is the creator of the heavens and the earth. Doesn't this mean that Jesus Christ, the creator of the heavens and the earth is God? What other logical possibility is there?

16. We see in Rev: 3: 14 that Jesus Christ is the Amen; the meaning of this word [the One Who is true or Trustworthy] is the same as the name of the Almighty God explained in Ex: 3: 14. If Jesus Christ is not God, why is He given the name Amen?

17. We read in Rev: 3: 14 that Jesus Christ is the beginning of the creation [not 'creations'] of God. When a singular noun follows beginning, as in 'The fear of Jehovah is the beginning of knowledge' [Prov: 1: 7], the word 'beginning' means the cause, or the one who causes, not 'first one among,' as in the expression, 'This beginning of his signs' [John 2: 11] where beginning is followed by the plural noun signs. How can it be proved that 'beginning' followed by a singular noun [creation] means 'the first one among' the plural [creations] of that singular noun? How can it be proved that 'beginning of creation' does not mean 'the cause of the creative work' or 'the one who causes the creative work'?

18. According to Mal: 3: 1 John the Baptist was to prepare the way before Jehovah; but we learn from the Gospels that it was before Jesus that John the Baptist prepared the way; doesn't this mean that Jesus is Jehovah? How can it be proved that it means something else?

19. According to Isa: 44: 6, the description "the first and the last" is applicable to God only. Then how can Jesus Christ, Who is the "the first and the last" [Rev: 1: 17] not be God?

20. Even in the Kingdom Interlinear Translation of the Greek Scriptures [published by Jehovah's Witnesses] we read about Jesus Christ, "This is the true God and life everlasting" [1. John 5: 20]. Thus, even those who deny the deity of Jesus Christ admit that He is the true God; then how can one say that Jesus is not God and that He is only a creation of God?

21. Are the words, 'beget' and 'create' synonyms? If they are, shouldn't we say that all the fathers like Adam, Seth and Enosh who 'begat' children are creators like God? If they are not synonyms, how can one say that the verse, "...Thou art my Son; This day have I begotten thee" [Ps: 2: 7] refers to the 'creation' of the Son?

22. Doesn't the term 'the firstborn of Pharaoh'[Ex: 11: 5] mean 'the first one born of Pharaoh'? If the term 'firstborn' is used in the same sense in Col: 1: 15, Christ must be the first one born of every creature on earth, because He is described as 'the firstborn of all creation [every creation]'. Is it reasonable to think that it is to the idea of birth that the word 'firstborn' in Col: 1: 15 refers to? If it is, how ridiculous the conclusion is!

23. Does the term 'firstborn' mean 'the one created first'? If it does, what is the meaning of the statement in Ex: 3: 22—23 that Israel is the firstborn of God? Does it mean that God created Israel before He created the heavens and the earth?

24. Since it is clearly stated in the Word of God that Israel is the firstborn of God, is it not evident that Jesus Christ is not the firstborn of God?

25. Since it is stated in Ps: 89: 27, "I also will make him my firstborn," and pointed out in Jer: 31: 9 that the second-born Ephraim is considered the true firstborn, is it not evident that 'firstborn' has some meaning other than 'the first among those born'? Can it be proved that 'the firstborn of all creation' in Col: 1:15 does not mean 'One Who has authority over all creation'?

26. Is it not proved from Matt: 26: 52—54 that the Father would accept whatever prayer Jesus made [even if that prayer was against the Father's will]? Doesn't this mean that it is for arguing that Jesus Christ is greater than the Father that there is justification?

27. It was Jehovah Who instituted the Sabbath; but we read in Mark 2: 28 that Jesus Christ is Lord, even of the Sabbath; can this not be justification for arguing that Jesus is greater than Jehovah?

28. We read that Jesus was able to see Nathanael under a fig tree, when He was physically away from him [John 1: 48]; we also read that Jehovah wanted to go to Sodom in order to know whether the people of that city were as wicked as the cry of it suggested [Gen: 18: 21]. Is this not reason for arguing that Jesus is greater than Jehovah with regard to omnipresence, because He could see an event without going to the place whereas Jehovah said He would go to the place in order to see the events there?

29. There are many verses in the Old Testament describing Jehovah as king [Ps:10: 16; 29: 10; 145: 1] and Lord [Ezek: 6: 3; 7: 2; 8: 1]. But the description of Jesus Christ is that He is the King of kings and Lord of lords [Rev: 17: 14; 19: 16]. Can it not be argued that the King of kings and Lord of lords [Jesus Christ] is greater than the King and Lord [Jehovah]?

30. It is stated in 1. Cor: 8: 6 that there is one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ; can it not be argued that Jesus Christ is the greatest Lord even in the presence of the Father and therefore He is greater than the Father?

31. It is stated in John 16: 15, "All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine;" If Jesus Christ lacks nothing that the Father has, how can it be said that the Father is greater than He? If the Father has Godhood how can the Son lack it?

32. We read in 2. Cori; 2: 11, "...the things of God none [no person] knoweth, save [the person], the Spirit of God." If the Spirit of God were not a person, the wording, "none [no one]...save [the one], the Spirit of God" would not be used. How can one say that the Holy Spirit is not a person when the grammatical structure of the sentence makes it clear that He is a person? What is the grammatical justification for thinking that the Holy Spirit is not referred to here as a person?

33. Jesus said that every sin and blasphemy, except those against the Holy Spirit would be forgiven [Matt:12: 31]. If the Holy Spirit were not a person, would it be possible to sin against Him? Can one sin against a mere force like Electricity?

34. If the Holy Spirit is not God, but a mere force, why is Ananias' lie to the Holy Spirit [Acts 5: 1—5] described as a lie to God? Should it not have been described as a lie to the 'force called the Holy Spirit'? Can we find an example of anyone saying a lie to a lifeless force or to anything other than a person?

35. We find God the Father addressing the Son "God" in Heb: 1: 8—10; does this not mean that the Son is [at least] as great as the Father? The New World Translation of this verse is, "...God is your [the Son's] throne for ever and ever..." If the Son [Jesus Christ] is King and the Father His throne, who is the greater one according to this translation, the 'King' or his 'throne'? If the 'throne' [Father] is God, can the 'King' [the Son] be less than God? [This mistranslation actually means that the Father is inferior to the Son as a throne is inferior to its occupant the King; it proves just the opposite of what the translators wanted to prove].

36. If death results in the destruction of both soul and body how can the statement, "I saw underneath the altar the souls of them that had been slain for the Word of God" [Rev: 6: 9] be true? Is this statement untrue?

37. If the body in which Jesus suffered crucifixion was supernaturally removed from the tomb, and if the resurrected body was a different one, how was it possible for the disciples to see the marks of crucifixion upon that new body? Where do we read that the crucified body of Jesus disappeared from the tomb and He got a new body, which could be touched and felt according to John 20: 24—29 and was a material reality?

38. If hell is a place where everyone will be salted with fire [Mark 9: 49] and there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth [Matt: 13: 42] how can it be correct to say that the wicked will cease to exist and will not suffer eternal punishment in hell? If eternal damnation of the sinners means their annihilation or non-existence, how can there be the state of their being salted with fire? Do things cease to exist when they are salted? If they don't, how do the wicked cease to exist when they are salted with fire?

39. Where is it stated in the Bible that Jesus Christ was the incarnation of Michael the archangel?

40. What should we understand about the validity of Jehovah's Witnesses' interpretations of the Bible and the prophecies in it when we view them in the light of the failure of their prediction of Armageddon five times—in 1914,1915,1918,1925, and 1975? Is it reasonable to trust the interpretations of a five time failed prophet?

41. If Paul did not mean that Christian baptism was administered in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, why did he ask the Ephesian believers what baptism they had received if it had not enabled them to hear the name of the Holy Spirit? [Acts 19: 1—6].

“He that is unrighteous, let him do unrighteousness still; and he that is filthy, let him be made filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him do righteousness still: and he that is holy, let him be made holy still. Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to render to each man according as his work is. I am

the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end...Yea: I come quickly. Amen: come, Lord Jesus" [Rev: 22: 11—20].