

Questioning the assumptions

Quite often, when we explore all the lexicons and the twisted theological arguments, things get complicated. Let us state that we only explore the complexity of theological arguments because we have studied them for ourselves and we have to discuss them to show how they do not add up.

But if you were to ask us what the Bible simply teaches, then we can assure you we do not need all these theological arguments to know who God is. A simple understanding of the Bible with abundant evidence is clear, yet with no lexicon, no guesswork, no lines to read between, no theologian, no Catholic tradition, nothing except you, the Bible, your God and the truth. The truth is not based on a few verses, nor on some pronouns and Hebrew or Greek words which few have access to. We can each take our Bibles in whatever language the Bible has been translated into, and wherever we are, we will all come to the same simple teaching of the Bible on this subject. We present the same below. Very very simple.

The simple point	Verses in simple obvious reading	Number of verses that agree on the same point (not exhaustive count of them)
Just One God, the Great Source of All (emphasis on ALL), the Father of All, who sits on the One Throne, The Father of Christ, the Almighty, the Most High, Jehovah.	Deuteronomy 6:4; Daniel 7:9, 13, 22; Malachi 2:10; Mark 12:32; John 17:3; John 201:17; Romans 3:30; Romans 15:6; 1 Corinthians 8:6; Ephesians 4:6; 1 Timothy 2:5; James 2:19; Revelation 4:2; etc. including parables and all symbolisms with just One God. Plus, all the thousands of times God is referred to as singular.	More than 10 times.
God the Father (of ALL) has an Only Begotten Son who is an express image of God Himself	<p>“Son of God” - stated 48 times. “His Son” – stated more than 25 times in the NT alone either directly or in parables and symbols referring to Jesus. “My Father” – 55 times in the NT alone “My Son” – more than 10 times in the NT alone And much more of the same.</p> <p>So, God is the one who has a Son, the one who sanctified His Son (John 10:36), and sent His Son (Isaiah 48:16; John 10:36), whom he gave life (John 5:26), gave everything His Spirit (John 3:34,35), gave a name (the name Jehovah, given by the Jehovah, Acts 4:12; Hebrews 1:4), gave a kingdom (Hebrews 1:8;), gave an inheritance (Hebrews 1:4), arranged a wedding for (Matthew 22:2), raised His Son from the dead (Hebrews 1:8), etc. The Son is just like His Father (Hebrews 1:3), he is our God (John 20:28), as an express image of God (Hebrews 1:3), etc. The Son is God (or divine) in the highest sense, because God the Father chose to place His full divinity on the Son (Colossians 1:19).</p>	More than 100 times.

Questioning the assumptions

	<p>God wants us to know He has an only begotten Son, but not how He begat a Son. That's none of our business, and He did not explain that to us.</p> <p>You can get all this without one single assumption except that words mean what words mean, which as very reasonable assumption without which languages would cease to communicate anything.</p>	
<p>God's has a Spirit (God is spirit, love, grace, all are his attributes, though they are spoken as individual persons as a manner of personifying speech and emphasis)</p>	<p>The Bible uses possessive statements about the Holy Spirit. "Spirit OF God" – 26 times/witnesses in the Bible "HIS Spirit" – 9 times/witnesses in the Bible "MY Spirit" – 12 times/witnesses in the Bible "Spirit OF Christ" – 2 witnesses/times in the Bible</p> <p>So could it be this simple, that the Spirit belongs to God, that God is the one who has the Spirit as His own, which he sends, gives, etc. as He sees fit, and that by that Spirit, he is present everywhere, as His own person/personality. God wants us to know that He has a Spirit, not what the nature of the Spirit is. Again, that's none of our business and He did not explain that to us.</p>	<p>More than 50 verses</p>

That's the simplicity of the Word of God.

Now let us look at the assumptions of the trinity doctrine and its reasoning, why we question them.

Questioning the assumptions

Verse	The assumption we see in interpretation	A simpler understanding of the verse
<p>1. Genesis 1:26 And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.</p>	<p>This verse does not say God is three as does Deuteronomy 6:4 (also 1 Corinthians 8:5, Ephesians 4:6, John 17:3) which clearly say God is one. However, some see three persons who make up God in this verse. The logic they use makes an assumption that the nature and identity of God can be found by reading between the lines of the words that God spake. We think this is going too far for it makes it as if man can read the thoughts of God without God's explicit statement. In other words, it is a dangerous thing to try to figure out what God is saying beyond what God has clearly stated. The Bible says God's thoughts are higher than man's thoughts therefore we can only rely on what is clearly stated with a "Thus saith the Lord". It is not possible, except by assumption, even in everyday life to determine the nature of one who speaking simply because the person uses plural terms such as 'us' and 'our' while talking to some audience. If the God who spoke these words was trying to imply that he is plural which God was He? Cannot be the Father, nor the Son, nor the Spirit because each is not the one who is plural, each is only a third of the plural.</p>	<p>It makes more sense that when God says 'us' and 'our' we find out, if possible, who he was speaking to. This verse does not tell us who God was speaking to. But it clearly tells us that the one who was speaking is God, not one of the persons of God, but God himself. In this case, God may simply have been talking to His Son and the angels. Yes, angels are also sons of God, in his image/character, and they were created before man. In simple terms, using the Bible alone, this verse simply tells us that God had an audience, and he was God Himself speaking. Anything beyond that is an necessary assumption.</p>

Questioning the assumptions

<p>2. Deuteronomy 6:4 Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD:</p>	<p>This verse has to be converted back to Hebrew before an argument can be made that it has something to do with a God who has three persons in Him. When converted into Hebrew, the Hebrew word Elohim is used to make a case. It is said the word is plural. Because the word is plural, then God was speaking in plural terms. If he spoke in plural terms, that means he was implying that he has three persons in him.</p> <p>This logic is hard to even see how one can come up with a reasoning so flawed, built on several assumptions. Why should we assume that God is implying something? How do you know what God can assume when you do not know God's thoughts? Why assume that God does not want to simply state clearly something as important as who he is? How do we know when God is implying or not, if we do not already know what can be implied by God?</p> <p>Is there somewhere where the Bible explains how God speaks, that if it is a plural it has a certain implication? Or did Moses explain the use of Elohim? Was the word Elohim chosen by God or by the person who was writing, presumably Moses? On what basis, and is there a precedent in the Bible where a word is used only in terms of its plurality but not its full meaning? Why does this reasoning avoid the full meaning of the word Elohim in plural, which is gods, implying polytheism? Can God, the best communicator, use words in such a confusing way such the word Elohim which is plural with a singular 'is', i.e. to say, "gods is one"?</p> <p>We see many desperate and unnecessary if not deceitful assumptions in this interpretation of Elohim.</p> <p>The Hebrew word 'echad' is also used to make an argument that God meant one with many parts in it. The questions we have are just for the word Elohim above.</p>	<p>This verse is better read exactly what it says in any language. It means there is one God only. When compared to Mark 12:29, the Greek translation, the meaning is simply one God in singular terms.</p> <p>In fact, studying these words (Elohim and echad) for yourself (using the Strong's Concordance which can be downloaded online) to check every time Elohim and echad are used, to see if it is true that the words always have plurality, you will see that they are used in many different ways. There is no reason to say God was speaking in plural terms other than by assumption.</p> <p>For example, Moses, Dagon and angels are also called Elohim. If that words implies plurality, where is the plurality of Moses, Dagon and an angel?</p>
---	---	---

Questioning the assumptions

<p>3. Matthew 28:19</p>	<p>This statement, “a unity of three co-eternal person” or this statement, “three in one God” do not appear in this verse which says “baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost”. In other words, in its plain simple reading, the verse does not say that at all.</p> <p>So how do we get this “baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost” and end up with this “a unity of three co-eternal person” or this statement, “three in one God”.</p> <p>We take it upon ourselves to make some assumptions about the word of God. We read between the lines to try to read God’s mind as to what he wanted to say, but did not say.</p> <p>The logic is, if the Son and the Spirit are present with God the Father at baptism, they must be together with him forming one God. Why make such an assumption?</p>	<p>We address these assumptions in full in two videos available on YouTube: “Thoughts on Matthew 28:19” “Matthew 28:19 and the Holy Spirit”</p> <p>The short of it, Jehovah is the Father of Christ, who gave His own name, Jehovah, to His own Son, Christ, thereby making Son, at the Father’s discretion equal to the Father. The reverence and worship given to his Son flows to Him, as the only one worthy of that worship.</p> <p>“Jehovah, the eternal, self-existent, uncreated One, Himself the Source and Sustainer of all, is alone entitled to supreme reverence and worship.” —Patriarchs and Prophets, 305. {7ABC 439.2}</p> <p>“Jehovah is the name given to Christ.” —The Signs of the Times, May 3, 1899, p. 2. {7ABC 439.3}</p> <p>Besides, the mere mention of the three involved in one act does not change who they are, as we are taught elsewhere, i.e. One is God the Father, the Almighty, the Only True God, on is the Only Begotten Son of God, and the other is God’s own Spirit. We explain this further in some points below.</p> <p>Neither does it make sense that the mere mention of the three in one sentence is the basis of figuring out who they are. There are plenty of other verses where God the Father, His Son and His Spirit are clearly identified, and it is an act of desperation to try to figure them out using a simple instruction on how to baptise.</p>
-------------------------	---	--

Questioning the assumptions

<p>4. Isaiah 48:16 Come ye near unto me, hear ye this; I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I: and now the Lord GOD, and his Spirit, hath sent me.</p>	<p>Some assumptions are made on the phrase “and now the Lord GOD, and his Spirit, hath sent me”. It is assumed that it means the one playing the role of the Father discussed with the one playing the role of the Spirit to send the third part of God who plays the role of the Son, hence the three were talking to each other, therefore are equal. That is all built on the phrase “the Lord God and His Spirit”.</p> <p>Firstly, even in that reasoning there is nothing to tell us that One God is made up of these three. Neither does it say the three are equal.</p> <p>The fact that the verse identifies one clearly as “the Lord God” and the Spirit as “His Spirit” is completely ignored. The Lord God is already there in the verse, he is not to be found by assuming that you can put three together to make one.</p>	<p>Now look at the verse for yourself. Notice that the Spirit is called His Spirit, that means belonging to God. Then it says HE HATH sent me. The words “Lord God ,..., HATH” mean ‘God has’ (singular, speaking of one who is doing this sending), which means one person, God, sent the Son and gave him His Spirit (the same as many other verses, read John 3:34,35, 20:21,22, which he did including at Christ’s baptism (John 1:32, 33)). Other translations put Isaiah 48:16 this way “...and now the Lord Jehovah hath sent me, and his Spirit” (ASV); “...and now the Lord God has sent me, and given me his spirit.” (BBE). So this verse can be clearly plainly read in harmony with all scripture that God is the one who sent both His Son and the Spirit, in His Son.</p> <p>Read the parables. Is there any parable where three person sit to send another? What we find in parables is the same as everywhere else in the Bible. In (Mark 12:1-6), the king (representing God) sent his servants, and when they were killed and persecuted, the king (representing God) sent his ONLY son (representing Christ). Very simple.</p> <p>Read Matthew 22:1-14 and you will see a king (representing God) and his ONLY son (representing Christ).</p>
---	---	---

Questioning the assumptions

<p>5. Acts 5:3-9 ...to lie to the Holy Ghost, ... thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God...</p>	<p>A case is made here that if the Spirit can be lied to, therefore it is a person, for only a person can be lied to. There is no question as to whether the Spirit is a person or not. The question is, does being lied to make the Spirit a co-equal to the God who sent the Spirit, who owns and possesses the Spirit? Does that change the abundant fact that the Spirit belongs to God and is a property/attribute of God?</p> <p>A study of the word spirit in the Bible would show that a spirit is often spoken of as if it is separate entity from the possessor of it. Not just the spirit, a property/attribute of a being, when it performs an act that the being himself does is personified. Take these examples:</p> <p>Charity does and feels a number of things (read 1 Corinthians 13:1-5) including "seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil".</p> <p>Wisdom does and feels many things (read Proverbs 9) including "she hath mingled her wine; she hath also furnished her table" (verse 2).</p> <p>The Grace of God can reign (Romans 5:21) and be frustrated (Galatians 2:21).</p> <p>For example, David's spirit is overwhelmed (Psalms 77:3), Daniel's spirit grieved (Daniel 7:15), sent from one person to another (2 Kings 2:9, double portion of Elijah's spirit came to Elisha) etc. just as much as God's spirit is also grieved (Ephesians 4:30) and sent (John 14:16), yet man's spirit remains the man himself, not another being equal and separate to him.</p> <p>Therefore, to argue that the Spirit is equal to God, or a part of God, to whom it belongs and is sent by, simply because the Spirit does and feels something is a huge assumption that ignores very simple biblical understanding of what a spirit is.</p>	<p>In simple terms, God is present to us by His Spirit, hence His Spirit can do what he does, can be lied to which means lying to God himself, can be grieved meaning God himself is grieved.</p> <p>If lying to the church or to the pastor or another person is lying to God, how much more is it when one lies to God's Spirit, sent by God Himself as His personal presence without form?</p> <p>Similarly, chiding with Moses is tempting the Lord (Exodus 17:2), because Moses is in the authority of God, to execute God's will, but is not God himself, nor a part of who God is.</p>
--	---	---

Questioning the assumptions

<p>6. Assumption on the mere mention of the Father, the Son and their Spirit in the same sentence.</p> <p>7. Matthew 28:19, 1 John 5:7, 2 Corinthians 13:14</p>	<p>The trinity doctrine considers the mere mention of the Father, His Son and His Spirit in the same sentence as evidence that there is a three in one God.</p> <p>However, a mere mention of any number of entities in one sentence doing the same act does not make their nature equal or cause them to make up one being. Neither is it a basis to assume the nature and identity of the entities.</p>	<p>Consider the case of the three men whom Abraham saw.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The men were referred to as three men/angels• They spoke with one voice• They ate food set before them by Abraham• They were on the same mission <p>All this suggests that they were three men/angels, doing the same thing together, of same identity, same authority and of an equal nature, right? Wrong, they were not the same nature, identity and authority. One of them was the creator (Jesus) and the other two were creatures (angels).</p> <p>So, there is no basis to say since the Spirit and the Son are involved in baptism as the Father, all three present, then they are equal and make up one God. God the Father can be present with His Son and with His Spirit but that does not change the most abundant fact about them, that both the Son and the Spirit belong to God and that Father and the Son share the same Spirit. There is no logic to use assumed meaning in some verses (such as Matthew 28:19; 1 John 5:17) to undo clear meaning in others (Psalms 51:1; 139:7 and many others) which present the Spirit as an attribute of God, and belonging to God. The Son of God, in many clear verses, is also presented over and over as the Son of God with God as His Father.</p>
---	---	---

Questioning the assumptions

<p>8. The assumption is known and accepted by the church</p>	<p>That the idea of a three in one God is an assumption is clearly taught by the SDA church. The SDA church adopted the trinity doctrine in 1980. Shortly after that, at least two documents were produced to explain the trinity. We read Section 2 “the Trinity” of an article produced by the Advent Review Vol 158 (1981) page 4. We highlight the assumption language it uses.</p> <p>“While no single scriptural passage states formally the doctrine of the Trinity, it is assumed as a fact by Bible writers and mentioned several times. It is implied in Genesis 1, where God and the Spirit of God are portrayed acting in Creation...Matthew 28:19 commands baptism "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Here the doctrine of the Trinity seems to be set forth in such a manner as to give <u>it strong emphasis as a point of faith...</u>”</p> <p>“At Christ’s baptism the reality of the triune Godhead was evident <u>in the appearance of all three Persons at one time...</u>”</p> <p>“<u>Only by faith</u> can we accept the existence of the Trinity. Nevertheless, reason supplies evidences that support our belief in God. Through the ages theologians have developed what have become known as the traditional proofs of God.”</p>	<p>The church teaches that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no statement of the three in one God in the Bible; • It is assumed; • That a fact can be made by assuming; • That Bible writers made assumptions about it (how do we know that?); • Though assumed, and with no passage stating it, yet it is also stated several times; • It is implied; • The Bible portrays God and His Spirit acting; • A strong emphasis as a point of faith SEEMS to be set forth (if it only seems to set forth how is it a strong emphasis) • That the mere presence of the three makes them one in three God; • Only faith in reasoning supports the three in one; • It is reasoning that supplies evidence for it; and, • The reasoning is based on the tradition developed by theologians. <p>Contrary to that, we are taught to decide based on a plain “Thus saith the Lord” only, the plainest statements of the Bible, so that we DO NOT second guess God. We are never taught to decide teaching based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumption • Implication • Where there is no clear statement of the teaching • Portrayal of God and His Spirit • What seems to be set forth but not clearly stated • Faith in your reasoning/logic not on plain statements • Reasoning, not Bible text is the evidence (sophistry, theories and philosophies) • Catholic ecumenical council traditions <p>All this is plain wrong. It is not surprising that after doing all this, they end up with a doctrine which is a mystery that no one including themselves cannot understand.</p>
--	---	---

Questioning the assumptions

<p>9. Turning the Bible upside down - clear verses are hiding meaning and unclear verses are revealing meaning.</p>	<p>Verses which do not say anything about three persons making one God are considered to be saying so, while verses which clearly say the Son and the Spirit belong to the Father are considered to be not saying so. It is assumed that the Bible is hiding the meaning that the Father, the Son and the Spirit are just actors in roles, they chose to perform.</p> <p>The whole idea is built on assuming that there is some hidden meaning which we need to decipher by reading between the lines, as if God did not mean what the Bible writers actually said, yet somehow modern biblical scholars have figured out the actual meanings, despite the meaning not being clearly stated in the Bible.</p>	<p>The biblical way of understanding the Bible is explained this way by EGW. "Everything simple he shrouded in mystery, and by artful perversion cast doubt upon the plainest statements of God. And his high position gave greater force to his representations." {EP 14.1}</p> <p>"History is repeating. With the open Bible in front of them, many religious leaders of our time are destroying faith in it as the Word of God. They dissect the Word and set their own opinions above its plainest statements. This is why unbelief is growing rapidly and iniquity is everywhere." {HH 113.2}</p> <p>"...The Pharisees scoffed at Christ; they criticized the simplicity of his language, which was so plain that the child, the aged, the common people heard him gladly, and were charmed by his words. The Sadducees also derided him because his discourses were so unlike anything delivered by their rulers and scribes. Those Jewish teachers spoke in monotonous tones, and the plainest and most precious scriptures were made uninteresting and unintelligible, buried under such a mass of tradition and learned lore that after the Rabbis had spoken, the people knew less of the meaning of the Scriptures than before they listened..." {CE 142.2}</p> <p>In other words, take the simplest obvious meaning, which Jesus himself used. He did not use "learned lore". Of course, God wants us to understand, not to fail to understand him. The Bible is to be decided on the plainest simplest meaning. If you take that into account, you will see that more than 50 times in the Bible, the Spirit is clearly stated as belonging to God (Spirit OF God, His Spirit, My Spirit, etc). Even many more times, Christ is clearly presented as God own Son. Why should we use a few verses with assumed meaning to overturn these abundantly clearly stated plainest truths that God has a real Son, and a real Spirit, both of which belong to Him?</p> <p>When God said the Spirit is "OF" Him, he simply meant "OF" not "in the role of". When he said "Son" he meant "SON", not "in the role of a son".</p>
---	---	---

Questioning the assumptions

<p>10. Dependence on the lexicon and single texts</p>	<p>The trinity doctrine is so heavily dependent on Hebrew and Greek words. For this reason, many laypeople are put off. In other words, they find it hard to investigate the true meaning of such words from languages they have no idea about.</p> <p>For this reason, laypeople surrender themselves to the purported Hebrew and Greek knowledge of scholars, taking them as truth. There is a strong tendency in trinitarian interpretation to try to find meaning by digging into a single verse, breaking it into parts as if communication is such a technical process.</p>	<p>Heavy dependence on Hebrew and Greek words removes the Bible from the average person who has no knowledge of or access to Hebrew and Greek lexicon. The Bible is literally re-chained to the monastery. No wonder many people do not read their Bibles anymore. They feel inadequate to do so, because they know no Hebrew and Greek.</p> <p>God is a loving Father, trying to make our communication with Him as simple as possible not as hard as possible, in any language.</p> <p>Bible writers communicated to a specific audience of their time, using the nuances of the language at that time, but not crafting sentences for those to come in a thousand years' time, who will read the Bible in a different language. While the lexicon and dissecting single texts can have its role in interpretation, it makes sense where abundant evidence is not available in simple terms (i.e. without the lexicon) and where two texts seem to contradict, or where a single text seem to contradict the abundance of evidence. However, to make the lexicon and single texts the bedrock of interpretation is to assume that Bible writers had such a technical and mechanical approach to sentence construction as in worldly literature writings.</p>
<p>11. Arbitrary choice of meaning of Hebrew words.</p>	<p>Scholars argue at length about the meaning of words such as Elohim, echad, mono genes, etc. However, in most cases none of them can clearly prove the other to be wrong.</p> <p>That means, in the end, one chooses a meaning of a word that already suits the interpretation they want to give, while they cannot prove that other meanings do not apply.</p> <p>For example, some scholars argue that mono genes (Greek word translated into 'only begotten' in KJV John 3:16) means special and that "only begotten son" means "special kind of person". Yet they can never prove that monogenes does not actually mean simply an "only begotten son", i.e. the only Son of the Father. They never prove that other meanings are impossible, but all they need to make a doctrine is that the meaning they want is possible.</p>	<p>Heavy dependence on the Hebrew and Greek lexicon brings several problems. Firstly, it brings confusion in endless subjective arguments which can never be settled. For example, one says monogenes means that only to suit his ideas. The other says something else to suit his idea also. The choice of meaning of Hebrew and Greek words is often arbitrary, from among the many meanings available.</p> <p>Secondly, it allows theologians to fit virtually any doctrine into the Bible. It is much better to not base our understanding on the lexicon, but on abundance of simple contextual biblical evidence. For example, the Bible states more than 50 times and in varying ways that the Spirit belongs to God and is sent by God. Similarly, the Bible says over and over that God has a Son like Him. Even apocryphal books such as the Book of Enoch are centered on that Son of God. Even Nebuchadnezzar knew that God has a Son. And the Bible states over and over that there is one single individual God, God the Father. The point is, if different biblical writers used the same words and described the same understanding over the 1500 years during the Bible was written, we can be sure that is what God exactly wanted to communicate to us.</p>

Questioning the assumptions

<p>12. The audacity to explain the nature and identity of God by implication.</p>	<p>Trinitarians seek to explain the nature of God by using words, which in their minds, though they do not say three in one God, they imply that. This means the nature of God and His identity are determined by implication and assumption. Can a man define God by implication and assumption? Do we have authority to do this on the God of Heaven, the Almighty?</p>	<p>We find it totally unbelievable that the nature and identity of God can be realised by assumption. An assumption is likely to be an error. Does anyone want to try the error of defining God in terms that are probably wrong? If no man or woman wants to be mistaken his identity, or name, or nature, would God be happy with those who deliberately, even after receiving warning, continue to make God's nature and identity a matter of assumption. This is God almighty we are talking about.</p>
---	---	---

Questioning the assumptions

<p>13. The duck test logic (also called the red fire truck logic) (all the verses that have to do with what the Spirit does, feels, thinks, etc. Matthew 28:19; Acts 5:4; 2 Corinthians 13:14; 1 John 5:7, and more.)</p>	<p>While the Father is expressly stated in the Bible as God, and the Son is stated likewise, albeit with important nuances, the Spirit is never called God directly. The claim that the Spirit is called God as an entity on its own, separate from and equal to the Father and the Son is premised on the duck test. The duck test is a way of reasoning which says if it quacks like a duck, swims like a duck and walks like a duck, then it probably is a duck.</p> <p>In a similar way, trinitarians argue that if the Spirit can be lied to like God (Acts 5:4), be grieved like God (Ephesians 4:30), give gifts like God (1 Corinthians 12:8), make decisions like God, be in the baptism ordinance like God (Matthew 28:19), blasphemed like God (Mark 3:29) then it is another God-being or God-person separate from and equal to God the Father and His Son.</p> <p>The red fire truck logic is similar. The reasoning is that, the fire truck is red, my car is red, therefore my car is a fire truck. So, they say God is grieved, the Spirit is grieved, God gives gifts, the Spirit gives gifts, etc. therefore the Spirit is God.</p> <p>Neither the duck test nor the red fire truck logic can be used to establish truth. They are probable assumptions, not facts, not truth. In short, there is no logical reason to use the capabilities of the Spirit to make it another separate God-being to God the Father. We already know that the Spirit belongs to Him, as His attribute, just as man has a spirit in him (1 Corinthians 2:11).</p>	<p>If the trinitarian mind could consider these simple points. First, the duck test is built on the fact that the duck already exists and is there. So, who the duck truly is without assumption is already know before the duck test is performed. So, it is with red fire truck test. The red fire truck is already there.</p> <p>So, if one is asked, which one is the duck, or the red fire truck, a normally reasoning person will point to the actual duck or fire truck, not the assumed one. Similarly, the Spirit's actions and feelings are compared to God, to determine if the Spirit is God. Yet the simple fact that God already is there and has to be there before the Spirit can be compared to him is lost in the reasoning. If a duck did not already exist, the duck test would not be possible. If God did not already exist before the logic is applied, the logic would not be possible.</p> <p>Secondly, it is an established fact that one who is sent has the same capabilities, on the matter that he has been given authority, as the one who sent him. For example, Joseph, due to the sweeping authority given to him by Pharaoh, was like unto Pharaoh himself. Everything that Pharaoh could do, Joseph could do. So much so that even his brothers acknowledged that Joseph was like Pharaoh himself. But that did not make Joseph another Pharaoh, physically, so that we could say the one Pharaoh is two or three persons united in one. Pharaoh remained Pharaoh with the ultimate authority, and Joseph remained Joseph, one on whom authority was bestowed.</p> <p>This is true for both the Son and the Spirit. They are both sent in the Father's name and can do no less than what the Father Himself can do.</p> <p>Although the spirit of man is often referred to as feeling and doing that which the man himself is feeling and doing, which is also said pertaining to the Spirit of God, the spirit of man is never another being separate and equal to him. For example, David's spirit is overwhelmed (Psalms 77:3), Daniel's spirit grieved (Daniel 7:15), sent from one person to another (2 Kings 2:9, double portion of Elijah's spirit came to Elisha) etc. just as much as God's spirit is also grieved (Ephesians 4:30) and sent (John 14:16), yet man's spirit remains the man himself, not another being equal and separate to him.</p> <p>Similarly, a heart has thoughts (Genesis 6:5; Job 17:11; Daniel 2:30), wisdom can build a house, kill a beast, furnish a table and cry (Proverbs 9:1-3), and charity can suffer long, thinks no evil. So, can we say since a heart, wisdom, and charity are able to do these things which men do, then they are other men separate each on its own? Obviously not. Simply, an attribute of a person can be said to do that</p>
---	--	--

Questioning the assumptions

		<p>which the person can do. The capabilities of that attribute never can make the attribute, such as a love, another person equal to the possessor of the love. That is called personification, or speaking in the THIRD PERSON. We cover this in a YouTube video titled “Discrepancies concerning the Spirit”.</p> <p>Therefore, it is a huge assumption to try to determine the nature of the Son and of the Spirit by what they do. For as long as they are both sent by the Father and given authority to execute the Father’s will, their deeds, feelings and thoughts are exactly as the Father who sent them, yet the Father remains the only true God (John 17:3), the source of both the Son and the Spirit.</p>
--	--	---

Questioning the assumptions

<p>14. Applying human conditions to scripture</p>	<p>Trinitarian understanding on how Jesus is God is based on a condition that trinitarians themselves design and apply to the Bible. They argue that for Christ to be fully God, he cannot be begotten because if he is begotten, he has a beginning point. But the way they want it is that God must not be eternal and they want eternal to be many days/years going back in time.</p> <p>Firstly, there is no condition in the Bible that says to be begotten removes divinity from Christ. Secondly, there is no definition of eternity which says it must be many days/years backwards in time. Third, the condition that God's nature is known by having existed many days/years backwards in time, is fundamentally flawed because God is outside time, not subject to it. To make God subject to time is to demean his omnipotence.</p> <p>Fourth, they say God cannot beget without a wife. But who said God needs a wife to beget? Where was Eve's mother?</p>	<p>If the trinitarian mind could consider some very simple facts, they would not need to impose conditions on the divinity of Christ.</p> <p>Firstly, time began and is going to end. Secondly, eternity cannot be reckoned in days/years going backwards or forwards. For example, if we start from year 2020 going backwards, when does eternity start? Is it yesterday, last month, last year, may be ten years ago, or is it at creation, when? Third, God does not reside in time since He created it and is going to end it.</p> <p>With that, that Christ was begotten is not a matter of a beginning in time, but of events in the realm of eternity which is beyond human understanding. Hence Christ can be begotten, but without a beginning in time as we know it.</p> <p>Fourth, even if God begets in time as we know it, God omnipotent can beget one exactly like Him, fully divine and having all the divine attributes like Him. Nothing stops that from happening and it does not diminish the divinity of the one begotten. Just as man can beget a son who is completely human, not an inch less human than his father. The Bible says Christ is an exact copy, or express image of the Father's person. That's what a Son is supposed to be, right.</p> <p>Fifth, to say God cannot beget without a wife is to encroach on the holy. The capabilities of God are beyond us to determine what He can or cannot do in having a Son who is an express image of himself. In any case, Adam was God's son but he had no mother. Angels are God's sons and we have not heard of their mother's either. Eve had no mother either.</p> <p>Is it not a mockery to God to have human minds design restrictions for Him? One wonders who wants to mock God!!</p> <p>Sixth, the Bible says believers have eternal life. So, does it mean we existed from endless years going backwards?</p> <p>A simple understanding of eternity, which does not step beyond the bounds of what was revealed to us, is that it is a different realm of existence where no time is reckoned the way we do on earth. We stop there and no further. God inhabits eternity (Isaiah 57:13). Therefore, the trinitarian condition that if Christ was born, then he had beginning in time is an unnecessary impediment to simple understanding of the Bible within the limits of human mental capacities.</p>
---	--	---

Questioning the assumptions

<p>15. The trinity is a mystery and holy ground</p>	<p>Trinitarians argue that the trinity, i.e. one God in three persons is a mystery that cannot be understood. It sounds as if even those who crafted the doctrine have no idea what they ended up with. In fact, the thinking is that the fact that no one can understand the trinity is the evidence that it is the true God because God cannot be understood. So quite often, to prove to a trinitarian that the trinity does not make sense causes them to hold on to it even more because they want it not to make sense. The lack of sense is taken as the evidence of truthfulness.</p> <p>The challenge is that, they say at the same time that it is not clearly stated in the Bible. That means the trinity has to be created by human minds first, before it becomes a mystery to them.</p>	<p>The true mystery is that something so lacking in common sense as 1 person plus 1 person plus 1 person equals 1 person equals/being can be so gripping and be held on to so tenaciously by so many. Even those who created this one in three idea of God cannot find its sense. Usually, something lacking sense and logic is discarded. [Just to clarify that 1 person plus 1 person equals one FLESH (flesh is one nature not one person) is different from 1person + 1person + 1person = 1 person/being. The first tells us that Adam and Eve are one nature, the second says three persons make up another person/being.]</p> <p>To put in other words, it is like this. Let us say you have some fresh tasty ingredients to make food with. Yet after following a certain recipe, you end up with food so horrible you cannot eat it. The problem is how you cooked the food. The very bad taste of the food is evidence that you did something wrong. Similarly, the purpose of doctrine is to teach, not to fail to teach. The very confusing mysterious nature of the idea of a three in one God is the very evidence that the logic/reasoning behind it is wrong. Those who stand up to teach it admit that they cannot understand it. One wonders why then the doctrine was crafted if it fails to do that which a doctrine must do, i.e. make things clear.</p> <p>A verse in the Bible can be a mystery, or it can state a mystery. But when several verses are taken from the Bible, removed from their plain meaning by adding assumptions to them, and a mysterious doctrine no one can explain is made out of them, then that mystery is a human creation. It is the greatest evidence against itself, that something is wrong in the method used to 'cook' it.</p> <p>The Bible speaks of the mystery of God as being the incarnation (1 Timothy 3:16) not the trinity.</p> <p>For this reason, i.e. the lack of common sense, we join John the Revelator marvelling at the beast when he saw what the beast could do to deceive many, yet disgusted and sorrowful because of the impact it has on people's minds.</p>
---	---	---

Questioning the assumptions

<p>16. John 14:16-18</p>	<p>This verse is used to prove that the Spirit is another person other than the Father and the Son. As usual in the trinity doctrine, it all comes down to Greek words, and grammar. In this case it is said that Christ referred to the Comforter as “HE” a personal second pronoun. It means another person, equal to, separate from Christ himself. Also, since Christ sends the Comforter after returning to heaven then, that’s another person who was in heaven when Christ was here on earth.</p> <p>There are four problems with this reasoning.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A personal pronoun does not automatically mean that a person is taking of another person. Wisdom (Proverbs 9) and charity (1 Corinthians 13:5) are both called “she”. If a personal pronoun automatically meant another person, then wisdom and charity would be other people too, women. So is the fig tree (Matthew 24:32) also referred to as he. The pronoun is not an automatic sign of the nature of the entity referred to.2. Jesus himself referred to himself in the same way (as he, his, him) many times. When he spoke of himself as the Good Shepherd, as the Son of Man, he said “he”, “his” and “him” to refer to himself.3. John himself referred to himself as another person more than once. It was his style of writing (John 18:15; John 13:23; John 19:26; John 20:2; John 21:7; John 21:20).4. The spirit of a being is the same person as himself, not another person separate from him. It is his person or personality. For details check the YouTube videos “Discrepancies concerning the Spirit”, “Matthew 28:19 and the Spirit” and “Thoughts on Matthew 28:19”.	<p>A simple understanding which is abundantly demonstrated in the Bible is that the Spirit is the Spirit of God, His own presence. After the glorification of Jesus (John 7:39), the Spirit of God took a specific function (person/personality/officework) never before existing, i.e. the Spirit of the one who is both fully God and fully Man (which never existed before) hence making it possible for us to partake of divine nature and be reconciled to God by the union of the divine and the human. This is the third person/personality of divinity. That’s why always, EGW writes of the third person in conjunction with baptism and the life of the Christian thereafter, to overcome carnal nature by the power (or Spirit) of the one who overcame carnal nature in the flesh (righteousness by faith).</p> <p>The Spirit of God in this sense is Christ himself, present in us by His Spirit, not another person separate and equal to him (John 14:17, 20, 21, 23; Galatians 4:6, 2 Corinthians 3:17).</p>
--------------------------	---	--

Questioning the assumptions

<p>17. The source of the assumption, the pagan theory.</p>	<p>It is often said that the idea of a three in one God is pagan. Trinitarians argue that it is not pagan, but that the Devil copied the three in one nature of the God of the Bible into paganism.</p> <p>This could make sense only if the Bible clearly stated that the God of the Bible is three in one. But since the idea of a three in one God is assumed into the Bible text, this argument, that the Devil copied the three in one nature of God, does not make sense.</p>	<p>One cannot assume what one does not know already. The white liquid cup example illustrates that very clearly. Consider this. Suppose you see a white liquid in a cup, and you ask yourself what you it is? If you have seen or heard of a white liquid called milk, you could say this white liquid in a cup is probably milk. However, if you have never seen milk or heard of it, you could never figure out that the white liquid is milk, because you do not know that milk exists. Similarly, when you see the words Father, His Son and His Spirit, the only thing you can figure out is that there is a father, who has a son and a spirit. You would never assume that they are one in three, unless you have the idea from elsewhere before.</p> <p>Therefore, since the idea of three in one God is not stated in the Bible, and is assumed by Bible readers, they must have gotten it from somewhere for them to be able to assume it. The only source of that idea is pagan mythology. Consider that the idea of a three in one God came into Christianity at a time known for the paganization of Christianity, i.e. mixing Bible and pagan ideas, and after it, the dark ages were ushered in.</p>
--	---	---

Conclusion

That God is One, is clearly stated, i.e. the God the Father. That God is three in that One is NOT anywhere stated as everyone knows. Therefore, there is not a single verse that trinitarians use to prove the threeness of God without placing huge unnecessary assumptions on it. No reader, who comes to the Bible without the need to find evidence for the trinity would find a three in one God in the Bible.

If there is anywhere where you think this presentation is missing the point, or if you can respond to the concerns raised about the reasoning behind the one in three God, please write to us using the email below.

May the Only True God, and the Only Begotten Son of God, and the Spirit of God richly bless us all as we study, to make simple that which has been confused by human tradition. Let the light of God shine into the world.

Amen.