

*The Trinity Doctrine
Weighed in the
Balances*



(An examination of both sides of the question)

Subject: The Trinity Doctrine Weighed in the Balances

First Sabbath, 2006.

Dear Brothers and Sisters in the Lord,

The following open letter is sent out in response and obedience to the counsel of the Servant of the Lord:

“When men endanger the work and cause of God by their own wrong course of action, shall they hear no voice of reproof? If the wrongdoer only were concerned, and the work reached no farther than him, he alone should have the words of warning; but when his course of action is doing positive harm to the cause of truth, and souls are imperiled, God requires that the warning be as broad as the injury done.” {EGW, 2SM 152}

I pray that this humble response and warning will be of use to you. Please read it carefully and prayerfully. May the great God of heaven, the Father of all glory, bless you by His sweet Spirit through Jesus Christ His Son, that you may be enabled to distinguish between “human inventions” and the “divine commands.”

We are all to remember that **“The knowledge of God is not to be gained without mental effort, without prayer for wisdom.** We should search, **diligently search,** for its hidden treasures, **and seek wisdom from heaven that we may be able to distinguish between human inventions and the divine commands.”** {EGW, AU Gleaner, June 9, 1909 par. 3}

Dear Brother K.,

Grace be with you, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.

Thank you for your reply and for your sermon materials (below) that you shared with me. I will not take much of your time, I hope, so I shall get into the subject matter strait away. (Please note, your words will be shaded in gray for clarity between your comments and mine)

Before responding I would just like to share some principle statements on how we (and everyone) are to understand the Bible.

“The Bible was written for the **common people** as well as for scholars, and is within the comprehension of **all.**” {EGW, RH, January 27, 1885 par. 7}

“The language of the Bible should be explained according to its obvious meaning, unless a symbol or figure is employed. Christ has given the promise: "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." John 7:17.” {EGW, GC 599}

“Satan is engaged in leading men to pervert **the plain meaning** of God's word.” {EGW, ST, March 30, 1888 par. 6}

“The **hypnotic** influence of Satan will rest upon those who turn from the **plain** word of God to **pleasing fables.**” {EGW, 8T 294.1}

“Here is where our great danger lies,—in accepting statements from others, contrary to the **plain** word of God. The men who make such statements may profess to be messengers from heaven, but if their words

mutilate or misinterpret **the plain**, "**Thus saith the Lord**," they should have no weight with us." {EGW, YI, July 1, 1897 par. 3}

"Before accepting any doctrine or precept, we should demand a plain "Thus saith the Lord" in its support." {EGW, GC 595.1}

Based on the above it is our duty to **"demand a plain** [simple, clear, basic, obvious] **"Thus Saith the Lord"** whenever a doctrine is presented. For, if the doctrine is not **clearly** substantiated by a **plain** "Thus saith the Lord" then such doctrine is nothing but "pleasing fables" and as such is to "have no weight with us".

Before advancing any further, let me just make mention here of a clarification lest I be misunderstood. I have nothing against you personally, my dear brother, as I am sure you know especially after we had a talk in your office. I do have something to say about the message that you are sharing. God knows I hold you in all Christian love and brotherly respect, and that love compels me to speak out against error when it is presented to God's dear people. Therefore, I humbly ask that you consider my comments not to be directed at your person but at your message. If my comments seem pointed and bold at times it is because of the error that has called forth such a response. I say again, this in no wise is directed at you, but at the error. I do not have a problem with you personally, but there is a problem with what you are saying. It is this that I am commenting on. **"Faithful are the wounds of a friend; but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful."** Proverbs 27:6. I do not consider you my enemy, brother K., therefore I shall be faithful in pointing out the error of your position rather than flatter you deceitfully. It is my sincere prayer that this reply may aid you and others in seeing the light of truth regarding our great God and His dear Son.

Will you accept a reproof given in love, my brother? My Bible tells me to "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine." 2 Timothy 4:2

The Spirit of Prophecy instructs me "But how shall the reproof be given? Let the apostle answer: "With all long-suffering and doctrine." Principle should be brought to bear upon the one who needs reproof, but never should the wrongs of God's people be passed by indifferently." {EGW, 3T 358.3}

With much sadness I read your sermon, my brother. I am sad to see that the central doctrine of Popery is being advocated from our pulpits, with all its contradictions and inconsistencies and heretical nuances and overtures. Yet many of our ministering brethren are looking on, watching what is being done, but they do not seem to understand. The foundation of our faith, which was established by so much prayer, such earnest searching of the Scriptures, is being taken down, pillar by pillar.

"When errors come into our ranks, we are not to enter into controversy over them. We are faithfully to give the message of reproof, and then we are to lead the minds of the people away from fanciful, erroneous ideas, presenting the truth in contrast with error. The presentation of heavenly themes will open up to the mind principles that rest upon a foundation as enduring as eternity." {EGW, 8T 192}

I do not seek to argue or debate, but I shall, by God's grace only, seek to humbly point out the truth of the matter. I will do my best to say as little as possible, and quote the Bible and the blessed Spirit of Prophecy as much as possible. I pray the contrast between truth and error will be seen clearly.

"No matter **by whom** light is sent, we should open our hearts to receive it with the meekness of Christ. But many do not do this" {EGW, GW 301}

I humbly and prayerfully ask from you, brother K., that you will open your heart. I sincerely hope and pray that you will not be of the class that "do not do this".

The Deity

By K. A.

☞ *Comments in white by N. M.*

(Written in much charity. 1 Corinthians 13:6)

(please note, for further clarity, all my comments, however long or short, will be enclosed by

☞ at the start and end ☞) ☞

Knowing God or Just Knowing Things About God

We may know quite a few things about God on the basis of His revelation and through the information provided in the Bible. But the important question is: Do we really know Him or do we just know things *about* Him? Knowing God personally rather than just having information about Him, implies that God is a *Someone* rather than *Something*. As Christians we say that God is a **person** ☞ (I am glad you say God is a person [singular]. I hope this does not later change and become ‘God is persons’ [plural].) ☞, but when we use human words and apply them to God, we come short, and some further explanations are necessary.

☞ “**Every word** of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. **Add thou not unto his words**, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.” Proverbs 30:5, 6

“The Bible is written in **language** that **the humblest mind may comprehend**; for it is written for the people, and the Lord reveals His truth according to their necessities and their comprehension.” {EGW, BEcho, August 19, 1895 par. 5}. This gives me hope when I read it, for I am but a simple person.

If the Bible cannot **clearly** and **plainly** reveal God to the reader, then explanations from man will not lead them to understand any more clearly. ☞

Some Words

☞ (“Which things also we speak, **not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth**, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.” 1 Corinthians 2:13) ☞

The word “person” comes from a Latin word that in turn goes back to the Greek word “Hypostasis”, which more accurately can be rendered as “mode of manifestation”. This goes a little deeper and broader and further than just “person” as we use it between us as human beings.

Another word commonly used about God is the word “Trinity”. This word is not found in the Bible. The idea is found in the Bible ☞ (is there a **plain** “Thus saith the Lord” for this claim?) ☞, but not the word trinity itself. It comes from the Latin word “Trinitas”, which means a partnership of three, a trio. The idea is that the Christian God in some mysterious way is a one-ness, but at the same time a three-ness, and that the three-ness never compromises the basic one-ness of His divine being.

☞ “**Ye shall not add** unto the word which I command you, **neither shall ye diminish** ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you.” Deuteronomy 4:2 ☞

God Is Three

☞ My brother, how can you make this bold claim in opposition to the **plain** word of the Living God, “Hear, O Israel: The LORD **our God is one** LORD”, “Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, **but God is one.**” Deuteronomy 6:4, Galatians 3:20? The Bible **plainly** and **clearly** says that God is **one**. ☞

Let us first look at some Bible texts mentioning that the Godhead or the Deity consists of three. Matthew 28:19 for example:

Therefore, go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the *Father* and of the *Son* and of the *Holy Spirit*.

☞ The words “Godhead”, “Deity”, “consists of three” do not appear in this text at all. It **simply** and **plainly** states that there is a Father, a Son, and a Holy Spirit and that we are to baptize in that name, but it says nothing in regards to the relation they hold to each other. The context of this passage is not an explanation about what “the Deity consists of”, it is rather about baptism. Jesus is not here teaching them about the Godhead. To assume that “the Deity consists of three” will require a much **plainer** and **clearer** text. ☞

And 2 Corinthians 13:14:

May the grace of the Lord *Jesus Christ*, and the love of *God*, and the fellowship of the *Holy Spirit* be with you all.

☞ Once again, nothing in this text tells us about the relation between Jesus Christ, God, and the Holy Spirit. It is rather speaking of their relation to us. I am sure you noticed, though, that the word ‘God’ is used here only once. A casual look at the prior verses of that chapter will confirm that this text is not an explanation about the Godhead. It is rather a closing greeting. Just because the three are mentioned in one verse does not make it a trinity. The text has to plainly say so for me to be able to see it. Is it not rather weak to assume all that from this text? For a clear understanding of what Paul believed and taught about the Godhead please read 1 Corinthians 8:4-6 ☞

One more text: 1 Corinthians 12:4-6:

There are different kinds of gifts, but the same *Spirit*. There are different kinds of service, but the same *Lord*. There are different kinds of working, but the same *God* works all of them in all men.

☞ Same as the above. Here also the word ‘God’ is again only used once, not three times. From this I learn **plainly** that there is a Spirit, and there is a Lord and there is a God. But to cram all three into one God goes beyond the limits of this scripture. ☞

Many other texts could be quoted mentioning the three in the Godhead in the same text.

☞ (Gladly would I love to see some of those “many other texts”, my brother. To claim “three in the Godhead” will require a **very plain** and **clear** text for any candid Bible student to accept. Furthermore, the word “Godhead” simply means “divinity” or divine nature (see Strong’s Greek Lexicon). The word does not carry any numerical value whatsoever. It does not mean 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or any number at all.) ☞

And then of course, we have lots of texts mentioning each of the three separately, but referring to each of the three as fully God ☞ (if “each of the three” is “fully God”, then we have three gods! And any attempt to make these three gods into one God contradicts reason, logic and Scripture. Also there are no texts mentioned to prove “the three as fully god” to support your claim) ☞.

The creation story contains an interesting allusion to the fact that more than one “person” was involved in the origin of life on this planet and of man in particular. ☞ (My brother, an “allusion” is by no means a plain text. Would you not agree that it is rather weak to prove your claim based on an “allusion”?) ☞ Notice the plural used in Genesis 1:26:

Let us make man in *our* image, in *our* likeness.

☞ It is true the “us” means that there was more than one person in creation. Yes, there were two. But only two, not three! The plural usage (“us,” “our”) in this text is explained to us by the Messenger of the Lord:

“After the earth was created, and the beasts upon it, **the Father and Son** carried out **their** purpose, which was designed before the fall of Satan, to make man in **their own image**. **They** had wrought **together** in the creation of the earth and every living thing upon it. **And now God says to his Son, "Let us make man in our image."** {EGW, 1SP 24, 25}.

This is **plainly** saying that the plural ‘us’ applies to the Father speaking to His Son. When she also says that “they had wrought together in the creation” she is talking about the Father and the Son only. Is this not abundantly **plain**?✍

And we could read a variety of Bible verses attributing the creation of the world to the Father (Psalm 102:25), to the Son (Coll. 1:16; Hebr. 1:10), or to the Holy Spirit (Genesis 1:2; Psalm 104:30)

✍ In these last two verses the possessive is used: “The Spirit **of** God” and “**thy** spirit”, respectively. The Spirit in Genesis 1:2 is explained by Jesus in John 20:22 “And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.” Jesus breathed His own Spirit, not someone else. It is this same spirit that is mentioned in Genesis 1:2, “the Spirit **of** God”, which can also be translated “breath of God”, which breath Jesus breathed on His disciples.

Especially in Psalm 104:30 is the Psalmist talking about the LORD who is the creator, not someone called ‘the spirit’. Notice carefully how the text reads in its context:

“**O LORD** [That is: JEHOVAH], how manifold are **thy** works! in wisdom hast **thou made them all**: the earth is full of thy riches.” V. 24. The Psalmist here **plainly** says that it is the LORD who “made them **all**”. It is not consistent with the context of the Psalm to isolate verse 30 and claim that someone else did the creation.

“That **thou** givest them they gather: **thou** openest **thine hand**, they are filled with good.” V. 28

“**Thou** hidest **thy face**, they are troubled: **thou** takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust.” V. 29

“**Thou** sendest forth **thy spirit**, they are created: and **thou** renewest the face of the earth.” 30. It will be readily noticed that the possessive is used throughout these texts, “Thine hand”, “Thy face”, and “thy spirit”. The application is the same in every case. No one will claim that the “hand” and the “face” were involved in creation besides God! Would we not be inconsistent if we made that application to “thy spirit” only?

The work of creation was performed by two individual beings (not three), and here are some **plain** texts to show that fact:

“Then **I** was by **him**, as one brought up with him [*or; as a master craftsman, or a workman*] and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him” Proverbs 8:30. Please read the full context from v.22 where it is **very plain** to all that this passage is speaking about creation and it is speaking about only two beings. “When **he** prepared the heavens, **I** was there: when he set a compass upon the face of the depth” v. 27. Please notice how it **plainly** says “**I** was there” not ‘we were there’. It also says “**he** prepared the heavens”, not ‘they’. You would surely agree that “he” and “I” makes only two individuals, not three.

“Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended? who hath gathered the wind in his fists? who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established all the ends of the earth? **what is his name, and what is his son’s name, if thou canst tell?**” Proverbs 30:4. These divine creative acts are attributed to two individuals only: a Father and His Son. No mention of a third.

“In the beginning was **the Word**, and the Word was **with God**, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. **All things** were made **by him**; and without him was not any thing made that was made.” John 1:1. Here John is plainly talking about two individuals only (The Word and God), and then he talks about creation! Therefore teaching that before creation took place there were two individuals. Thus, creation is credited to only those two individuals: The Word (Christ) and God (The Father).

“Thou art worthy, **O Lord**, to receive glory and honour and power: for **thou hast created all things**, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.” Revelation 4:11. God the Father (please read in context) is the **one** who created all things.

How?

“And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in **God, who created all things by Jesus Christ**.” Ephesians 3:9. Again, Paul **plainly** says that God [the Father] created ALL things **by** His Son Jesus Christ.

“For **by him** [that is Christ] were **all things created**, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created **by him**, and for him.” Colossians 1:16

“But to us there is but one God, the Father, **of whom are all things**, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, **by whom are all things**, and we by him.” 1 Corinthians 8:6. Once again, “all things” are credited to only two beings: God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ His Son. There is no mention of anyone else who was responsible for “all things”.

Here are some **plain** statements from the pen of inspiration:

“**The Father and the Son** engaged in the mighty, wondrous work **they** had contemplated, of creating the world.” {EGW, 1SP 24}.

“The Sovereign of the universe was not alone in His work of beneficence. **He had an associate--a co-worker** who could appreciate His purposes, and could share His joy in giving happiness to created being. ... **The Father wrought by His Son** in the creation of **all** heavenly beings.” {EGW, PP 34}. Please note how it says “a co-worker” (singular) not ‘co-workers’. Therefore, “The Sovereign of the universe” + “a co-worker” makes only two. There is no mention of anyone else involved in creation.

“The **Father consulted Jesus** in regard to at once carrying out their purpose to make man to inhabit the earth.” {EGW, ST Jan. 9, 1879}.

“**Especially was his Son to work in union with himself in the anticipated creation of the earth and every living thing that should exist upon the earth.** His Son would carry out his will and his purposes, but would do nothing of himself alone. The Father's will would be fulfilled in him.” {EGW, 1SP 18}

“After the earth was created, and the beasts upon it, **the Father and Son** carried out their purpose, which was designed before the fall of Satan, to make man in their own image. **They had wrought together in the creation of the earth and every living thing upon it.**” {EGW, LHU 47}

“Man became a living soul. **Through Christ the Word, a personal God created man** and endowed him with intelligence and power.” {EGW, MH 415}

“In the beginning **the Father and the Son** had rested upon the Sabbath after Their work of **creation.**” {EGW, DA 769}. Isn't that just a wonderful statement!

I am sure that you will be in agreement with me that these are **very plain** statements. They are so **plain** they scarcely need any comment or elaboration. ☞

Some Church History

The doctrine of the Trinity did not receive its traditional shape until the fourth and fifth centuries ☞ (This fact alone should raise alarm bells in every person's mind. This means that the disciples of the *first* century did not know, believe or teach a doctrine that took its shape in the *fourth* and *fifth* century (300 years after they died)! Jesus did not then teach a doctrine that was to “receive its traditional shape” 300 years after He ascended!) ☞. **Why did it take so long? The early church** ☞ (this early church went into apostasy, brother. This was the time of the great compromise with the pagans. Please see the following quotes provided below.) ☞ **wrestled with another, related problem that needed to be settled first: Who and what was Jesus Christ? Was he human or divine? If he was both, how did the two natures relate to each other? Had Christ existed with the Father from eternity, or did he have a beginning? If he had no beginning, how could he then be called “the Son of God”? And what does it mean when the Bible says that Christ is God's “only begotten” Son?** ☞ (It means just what it says. Remember, “The language of the Bible should be explained according to its **obvious** meaning”). ☞

Gradually, the generally accepted doctrine of Christ emerged, and was finally formulated in 451 A.D.(Council of Chalcedon). It was accepted by the vast majority of Christian Churches.

☞ Please, please read carefully these words of import: “Little by little, at first in stealth and silence, and then more openly as it increased in strength and gained control of the minds of men, "the mystery of iniquity" carried forward its deceptive and blasphemous work. Almost imperceptibly the customs of heathenism found their way into the Christian church. ... But as persecution ceased, and Christianity entered the courts and palaces of kings, she laid aside the humble simplicity of Christ and His apostles for the pomp and pride of pagan priests and rulers; **and in place of the requirements of God, she substituted *human theories and traditions***. The nominal conversion of Constantine, **in the early part of the fourth century**, caused great rejoicing; **and the world, cloaked with a form of righteousness, walked into the church**. Now the work of corruption rapidly progressed. **Paganism, while appearing to be vanquished, became the conqueror**. Her spirit controlled the church. **Her doctrines**, ceremonies, and superstitions were incorporated into the faith and worship of the professed followers of Christ. **This compromise between paganism and Christianity resulted in the development of "the man of sin"** foretold in prophecy as opposing and exalting himself above God. That gigantic system of false religion is a masterpiece of Satan's power--a monument of his efforts to seat himself upon the throne to rule the earth according to his will.” {E. G. White, GC 49, 50}.

This is the exact time period that the trinity doctrine received its “traditional shape”! The prophet of God says that this was the time when “Paganism became the conqueror!” Please read that statement again and note the timing, my brother.

Sister White told us in that last statement that it was “in the early part of the **fourth** century” that the world walked into the church, and the doctrines of paganism entered the church. We all know that “the early part of the fourth century” means the early 300’s. This is the time that the trinity came in, as you admitted. Is it not clear now who is behind all this?

Here are some other quotes from our early church historians, the men who founded this movement and established its truths on the word of God, and by the living testimony of the Spirit of Prophecy. Please note the dates.

“**The doctrine of the Trinity which was established in the church by the council of Nice, A. D. 325. This doctrine destroys the personality of God, and his Son Jesus Christ our Lord**. The infamous measures by which it was forced upon the church which appear upon the pages of ecclesiastical history might well cause every believer in that doctrine to blush.” {J. N. Andrews, *Review & Herald*, March 6, 1855}

“**This doctrine of the trinity was brought into the church about the same time with image worship, and keeping the day of the sun, and is but Persian doctrine remodeled**. It occupied about three hundred years from its introduction to bring the doctrine to what it is now. It was commenced about 325 A. D., and was not completed till 681. See Milman's Gibbon's Rome, vol. iv, p.422. It was adopted in Spain in 589, in England in 596, in Africa in 534. - Gib. vol. iv, pp.114,345; Milner, vol. i, p.519.” {J. N. Loughborough, *Review & Herald*, November 5, 1861}

Furthermore, I am sure you well know that the council of Chalcedon (which you mentioned) was a Catholic council. As Seventh-day Adventists, is this where we learn our doctrines? Do we go by the doctrines that are “accepted by the vast majority of Christian Churches”? No, no, brother. I protest against such conclusions and doctrines. We are *protestants*! You should protest against that too, not advocate it!

Let me quote from the pen of our historian, brother A. T. Jones concerning Chalcedon:

“As the necessity for **the Council of Chalcedon was created by the will of Leo alone; as the council when assembled was ruled from beginning to end by his legates in his name; as the documents presented in the council were addressed to "Leo, the most holy, blessed, and universal patriarch of the great city of Rome, and to the holy and Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon;" as the council distinctly acknowledged Leo as its head**, and the members of the council as members of him; as **the judgments were pronounced as his own**; as his letter was made the test, and the expression of the faith,

and with that all were required to agree; as **the decisions of the council were submitted to him for approval**, and were practically of little or no force until he had formally published his approval, and then only such portion as he did approve; as, in short, everything in connection with the council sprung from his will and returned in subjection to his will, -- **Leo, and in him the bishopric of Rome, thus became essentially the fountain of the Catholic faith.**

68. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that Leo should officially declare that the doctrinal decrees of the **Council of Chalcedon** were inspired. This is precisely what he did. In a letter to Bishop Julian of Cos (Epistle 144), he said: "The decrees of Chalcedon are inspired by the Holy Spirit, and are to be received as the definition of the faith for the welfare of the whole world." And in a letter (Epistle 145) to the emperor Leo, who succeeded Marcian in A. D. 457, he said: "The Synod of Chalcedon was held by divine inspiration." **As therefore, the doctrinal decrees of the Council of Chalcedon were the expression of the will of Leo; and as these decrees were published and held as of divine inspiration; by this turn, it was a very short cut to the infallibility of the bishop of Rome.**" {A. T. Jones, *Ecclesiastical Empire*, pp. 181, 182}

How can we, oh how can we accept a doctrine that was formulated in a council which distinctly acknowledged the "representative of Satan" as its head? {EGW, GC 50}

How can we, as Seventh-day Adventist Protestants, accept a doctrine that was approved by "the representative of Satan" on earth?

The trinity is a doctrine that Satan approves of. Not only does the devil approve of it, but it was formulated in the counsels where he, through his representative, directed the proceedings and the outcome! Does this not ring any alarm bells?

[From the Dictionary we learn the meaning of **Approve**: to endorse, support, commend, back up]

What other doctrines do we hold today that have the approval of the devil? Does he approve of the Sabbath? Does he approve of the state of the dead? Does he approve of the sanctuary? Does he approve of the three angels' messages? Does he approve of the 10 commandments? No, no, no. But, he *does* approve of the trinity!

I rest my case. I believe the point has been clearly made.

"The great error of the Romish Church is found in the fact that the Bible is interpreted in the light of the opinions of the "fathers." Their opinions are regarded as infallible, and the dignitaries of the church assume that it is their prerogative to make others believe as they do, and to use force to compel the conscience. Those who do not agree with them are pronounced heretics. **But the word of God is not thus to be interpreted.** It is to stand on its own eternal merits, to be read as the word of God, to be obeyed as the voice of God, which declares His will to the people. **The will and voice of finite man are not to be interpreted as the voice of God.**" {EGW, FE 308} ✍

Our Adventist church also had a hard time with these questions, and it took a long time to agree on these matters.

☞ Speaking of the time between 1844 -1850 Mrs. White tells us: **"The leading points of our faith** as we hold them today were **firmly** established. Point after point was **clearly defined**, and **all the brethren came into harmony**. **The whole company of believers were united in the truth.**" {E. G. White, *Manuscript Releases Volume 3*, p. 413}

"The truths given us after the passing of the time in **1844** are just as **certain** and **unchangeable** as when the Lord gave them to us in answer to our urgent prayers." {E. G. White, *Manuscript Releases Volume 1*, p. 53}

"The evidence given in our early experience has the same force that it had then. The truth is the same as it ever has been, and not a pin or a pillar can be moved from the structure of truth. That which was sought for out of the Word in 1844, 1845, and 1846 remains the truth in every particular." {E. G. White, *Manuscript Releases Volume 1*, p. 52} ✍

Most of our pioneers in the 19th century did not see the truth of the eternal divinity of Jesus, the personhood of the Holy Spirit and the Trinity.

☞ "Many of our people do not realize how **firmly** the **foundation of our faith** has been laid. My husband, Elder Joseph Bates, Father Pierce, Elder [Hiram] Edson, and others who were keen, noble, and

true, were among those who, after the passing of the time in **1844**, searched for the truth as for hidden treasure... **Thus light was given that helped us to understand the scriptures in regard to Christ**, His mission, and His priesthood. **A line of truth extending from that time to the time when we shall enter the city of God, was made plain to me**, and I gave to others the instruction that the Lord had given me.” {E. G. White, *Selected Messages Book 1*, pp. 206, 207. 1904}.

Sister White clearly says here that our pioneers of the 19th century **did** “understand the scriptures **in regard to Christ**”! She also says that God made plain to her (and them) a line of truth that extended from that time, 1844, “to the time when we shall enter the city”. That line of truth did **not** include the doctrine of the Trinity! ❌

So our church went through a similar process as the early church ❌ (but that early church went into apostasy! So where does that leave us now? If you are drawing a parallel with a church that went into apostasy to prove that we are following the same pattern, then do you not see that you are contradicting the very point you are seeking to make? What you term as “doctrinal development” would be nothing but apostasy!) ❌ – a period of doctrinal clarification and development, - but it eventually agreed that the classical statements about Christ were true, it arrived at the traditional doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and Adventists accepted the ❌ (Pope’s!) ❌ doctrine of the Trinity.

❌ It is sad to say that we as Seventh-day Adventists go by “classical statements” and “traditional doctrine[s]” to accept the “doctrine of the Trinity”. I was brought up to believe that the Bible and the Bible only is the source of doctrines for us for “all scripture...is profitable for doctrine” 2 Tim.3:16. I solemnly protest against the reception of such a doctrine that undermines our faith and destroys every pillar of Adventism! “If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?” Psalms 11:3. ❌

By the way, - it is nothing strange in a church having such a doctrinal development. The understanding of the Godhead is not the only Adventist doctrine that took years to form. We believe in progressive truth.

❌ “That which was truth in the beginning is truth **now**. Although new and important truths appropriate for succeeding generations have been opened to the understanding, **the present revealings do not contradict those of the past. Every new truth understood only makes more significant the old.**” {E. G. White, *Review & Herald*, March 2, 1886}. Progressive truth never ever contradicts previous truth. If it does contradict previous truth then it is error. We cannot claim to have a new foundational truth and call the original foundational truth error.

It is a well known fact that none (not even one!) of our pioneers was a believer in the doctrine of the trinity. I am talking about people such as: James White (Ellen White’s husband), Joseph Bates, John N. Andrews, John N. Loughborough, Uriah Smith, J. H. Waggoner (E. J. Waggoner’s father), S. N. Haskell, Roswell F. Cottrell, Joseph B. Frisbie, Merritt E. Cornell, John G. Matteson etc... and a whole lot more that could be listed as well.

Not one of these men who founded our church believed in a doctrine of a trinity! And of this fact our modern day ‘theologians’ are well aware: “Most of the founders of Seventh-day Adventism would not be able to join the church today if they had to subscribe to the denomination’s Fundamental Beliefs. Most specifically, most would not be able to agree to belief number 2, which deals with the doctrine of the Trinity.” Ministry magazine. October 1993 p.10. (Article by George Knight, professor of church history at Andrews University.)

In the 21st century, not even Ellen White would have been able to join the Seventh-day Adventist Church, an interesting proposition!

Here is just one sample quote from James White: “As **fundamental errors**, we might class with this counterfeit sabbath other errors which Protestants have brought away **from the Catholic church**, such as sprinkling for baptism, **the trinity**, the consciousness of the dead and eternal life in misery. The mass who have held these **fundamental errors**, have doubtless done it ignorantly; but can it be supposed that the church of Christ will carry along with her **these errors** till the judgment scenes burst upon the world? **We think not**” {J. S. White, *Review & Herald*, September 12, 1854}

I have never ever known that a “fundamental error” could eventually become a “fundamental truth”! “Errors may be hoary with age; but age does not make error truth, nor truth error.” {EGW, 6T 142}

At the danger of overstating the obvious, I will just mention here that this James White was married to the inspired prophet of the Lord for over 30 years! And he *never* swerved from his position on the trinity! How is it possible, in light of this, that the trinity has now become truth? And what about the prophet of God, Mrs. White, where does that leave her? How could she be a Trinitarian and not even correct her husband of over 30 years? Or is it at all possible that she and her husband actually believed the same thing?

“Where shall we find safety unless it be in the truths that the Lord has been giving for **the last fifty years?**” {E. G. White, *Review & Herald*, May 25, **1905**} ✍

Don't think that before one or many of our pioneers believed something, it must be true or closer to the unspoiled Biblical truth. At the end of the 19th century, many of our pioneers went either in the direction of a holiness / Pentecostal view ✍ (that is not correct, my brother. It is wrong to imply that **many** of our pioneers strayed. Here is what Mrs. White says about the pioneers: “**Many of the pioneers, who shared with us these trials and victories, remained true till the close of life, and have fallen asleep in Jesus.**” {E. G. White, *Review & Herald*, November 20, 1883}. You may mean some other people in the church, which is true, but certainly not the pioneers.) ✍, or in the direction of pantheism (God in all) (Especially Kellogg and Waggoner went into pantheism). They said and wrote a few things that our church today would not fully agree with.

✍ I am very surprised you mention Kellogg. Did you know, my brother, that Kellogg was teaching the very same thing that you are teaching? Do you realize that your position is the same position that Kellogg was advocating? Yes, Kellogg was teaching the trinity doctrine! The very same thing that you are advocating. Mrs. White called it pantheism. Did you realize that the trinity is nothing short of pantheism? I do not make this claim lightly. Here is the clear evidence from history:

“Ever since the council closed I have felt that I should write you confidentially regarding Dr Kellogg's plans for revising and republishing ‘The Living Temple’.... He (Kellogg) said that some days before coming to the council, he had been thinking the matter over, and began to see that he had made a slight mistake in expressing his views. He said that all the way along he had been troubled to know how to state the character of God and his relation to his creation works...

He then stated that his former views regarding the trinity had stood in his way of making a clear and absolutely correct statement; **but that within a short time he had come to believe in the trinity** and could now see pretty clearly where all the difficulty was, and believed that he could clear the matter up satisfactorily.

He told me that he now believed in God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; and his view was that it was God the Holy Ghost, and not God the Father, that filled all space, and every living thing. He said if he had believed this before writing the book, he could have expressed his views without giving the wrong impression the book now gives.

I placed before him the objections I found in the teaching, and tried to show him that the teaching was so utterly contrary to the gospel that I did not see how it could be revised by changing a few expressions.

We argued the matter at some length in a friendly way; but I felt sure that when we parted, the doctor did not understand himself, nor the character of his teaching. And I could not see how it would be possible for him to flop over, and in the course of a few days fix the books up so that it would be all right.” (Letter: A. G. Daniells to W. C. White. Oct 29. 1903 p1.2.)

This was a letter from the General Conference president of the time, Mr. A. G. Daniells, to Mrs. White's son, Willie White. This letter hardly needs any comment. Kellogg had come to a belief in the trinity. Kellogg believed in God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit! Ellen White called it Pantheism! The GC president even tried to place before Kellogg the objections in that teaching. He tried to show him how utterly contrary to the Gospel it was. Isn't that amazing! And yet people today are defending that very same trinity as truth! What a tragedy indeed.

In that very same month Ellen White wrote to the physicians and ministers at the St. Helena Sanitarium, “Your leader [that is Kellogg] has been moving the foundation timbers one by one, and his reasoning would soon leave us with no certain foundation for our faith. He has not heeded the testimonies that God through His Spirit has given. The books of the Bible containing most important instruction are disregarded because they say so much about a personal God. He has not known whither his feet were

tending. **But in his recent writings, his tendencies toward pantheism have been revealed.**" {EGW, SpTB07 39.2}

Furthermore, was Ellen White aware that Kellogg wanted to revise his book and include the trinity? Did she have any words to say about this? She most certainly did, in light of the fact that the above letter was sent to her son, she most surely had something to say about the republishing of the book to include a doctrine of a trinity (God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Spirit).

"It will be said that Living Temple has been revised. **But the Lord has shown me that the writer has not changed**, and that there can be no unity between him and the ministers of the gospel while he continues to cherish **his present sentiments**. I am bidden to lift my voice in warning to our people, saying, "**Be not deceived; God is not mocked**" (Gal. 6:7)." {EGW, 1SM 199} 1904

I find that statement so plain and so profound that I am sure a comment is not needed. I think it is very obvious to any unbiased reader what the implications are. The "present sentiments" of Dr. Kellogg was a trinity doctrine. The prophet of God plainly says this is a mockery of God. Who am I to disagree with the prophet of God!✍

The Role of Ellen G. White

Ellen White did not take a major role in the doctrinal formation of the Adventist pillar doctrines in the 1840s (just before and after the great disappointment).

✍I believe Mrs. White would disagree with that claim: "After the passing of the time in **1844** we searched for the truth as for hidden treasure. **I** met with the brethren, and we studied and prayed earnestly. Often we remained together until late at night, and sometimes through the entire night, praying for light and studying the Word. Again and again these brethren came together to study the Bible, in order that they might know its meaning, and be prepared to teach it with power. When they came to the point in their study where they said, "We can do nothing more," the Spirit of the Lord would come upon **me**. **I** would be taken off in vision, and a clear explanation of the passages we had been studying would be given **me**, with instruction as to how we were to labor and teach effectively. **Thus light was given** that helped us to understand the scriptures in regard to Christ, his mission, and his priesthood. A line of truth extending from that time to the time when we shall enter the city of God, was made plain to **me**, and **I** gave to others the instruction that the Lord had given **me**." {EGW, RH, May 25, 1905 par. 24} ✍

Towards the end of the century, however, she did help her fellow church members realize the inadequacies of their understandings on some points. On the topic of the Trinity, full equality of Christ with the Father, and the personhood of the Holy Spirit, however, she never developed major or extensive arguments ✍(we must understand that Ellen White was not a theologian. She simply wrote down what God showed her. Did God show her the correct understanding of who He was? Anyone who reads *The Story of Redemption* will know the answer. It is really simple, for her to be able to write about the Great Controversy she must have understood the two contending parties. You see, Satan was not warring against a trinity. He was actually warring to create a trinity! Just read those first few chapters of *The Story of Redemption* and it will be seen clearly)✍. She simply seems to have assumed them to be truths ✍(My brother, it sounds to me like you are assuming on behalf of Mrs. White!)✍. From the 1890 and onward she made some clear statements, though. At the end of her life, and after her death (during the first four decades of the 20th century), the Church investigated these issues further, by going to the Bible to study the topics relating to the Godhead.

✍Did not the pioneers, and Ellen White, go to that same Bible and study that same topic long before? They did, and by the guidance of God they arrived at the truth regarding the Godhead. This truth was **not** a trinity. You honestly admit that the church investigated this matter after the death of the prophet. But where does this leave the prophet? Outside the investigation? So how can she have believed a doctrine that was investigated after she died? Is it not the opposite that you have proved, brother? That

only after the prophet died could the trinity doctrine come in. The reason is clear: the prophet cannot speak out against it from her grave! But, praise God, she yet speaks through her writings.✍

Let me clarify this a little further: Unlike her husband James White, and most other early Adventist leaders Ellen G. White did not make explicit anti-Trinitarian or semi-Arian statements up till the 1890s.

✍Firstly, you do correctly admit that the pioneers of the SDA church made “explicit anti-Trinitarian” statements. It is clear to anyone who knows church history that our pioneers did not believe or advocate the trinity doctrine in any form, rather they rejected it in all its varied forms (including “three in one”, “triune god”, “three gods”, “one god-three persons”, “Tritheism”, “modalism” etc.).

Your claim about Ellen White here is absolutely unfounded. Please read carefully the following, asking yourself “would someone who believed in the trinity ever say such things?”:

“Christ the Word, the Only **Begotten** of God, was one with the eternal Father,--one in nature, in character, and in purpose,--**the only being in all the universe** that could enter into all the counsels and purposes of God.” {EGW, GC 493. 1888}

That plainly tells me that there is no other being besides Christ who enters into the counsels of God. No other being in all the universe! That makes two beings only. But we knew that for the Bible made it clear long ago:

“Even he shall build the temple of the LORD; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be **between them both.**” Zechariah 6:13

She never mentions another being besides Christ who is allowed into counsel with God. How can this be if she really was a Trinitarian, as you claim on her behalf? Where is “God the Holy Spirit”?

The only other being in the universe who wanted to enter into counsel with God and His Son was a proud angel by the name of Lucifer. It was he who wanted the heavenly counsel to include a third member! Just read the first chapter of *Patriarchs and Prophets* and see if what I am saying is true or not.

“**The only being who was one with God** lived the law in humanity, descended to the lowly life of a common laborer, and toiled at the carpenter's bench with his earthly parent.” {EGW, ST, October 14, 1897 par. 3} Here she clearly and plainly says Christ is the only being who is one with God. There is no mention of anyone else being one with God besides Christ. That is only two beings. Where is “God the Holy Spirit” if she is Trinitarian? No, she believed it is Christ who is the **ONLY** being who is one with God. I think you would agree that she is clearly not a believer in a trinity doctrine. [Note: I have selected those statements before and after the 1890’s that you mentioned to show clearly that she did *not* change in her understanding of God over that period]✍

Neither did she openly disagree with the leaders of the movement. ✍(Correct, she did not disagree with the leaders who had rejected the trinity doctrine. She agreed with them in rejecting this false teaching. She was in harmony with her husband of over 30 years. Surely, they both worshipped the same God!)✍ Her early statements were vague enough to be interpreted either way ✍(Is this not a weak way to defend a position? By making the prophet “vague”? brother, this is not correct)✍. So when she finally did change ✍(“change?” what evidence is there for this unfounded claim?)✍ or clarify her view towards the end of her life, it came as a clarification and a new emphasis, not as a reversal on her side ✍(please consider this statement again: “Christ the Word, **the Only Begotten of God**, was one with **the eternal Father**,--one in nature, in character, and in purpose,--**the only being in all the universe** that could enter into all the counsels and purposes of God.” {EGW, GC 493. 1888}. Which part of it is “vague”? What “clarification” does such a statement need? What “new emphasis” does this statement require? Is it not obvious and clear what the meaning is? This tells me simply that Christ is the only begotten of God the Father. You will of course notice that the context of that statement is in heaven, not here on earth. Therefore teaching that Christ is the only begotten of God the Father before He ever came to this earth. Why, it was even long before this earth was ever created!)✍. It was Ellen G. White who most clearly set the direction for the complete transformation in Adventist thinking on topics related to the Trinity between 1888 and 1950.

☞ To suggest that the prophet “changed” and to charge her with bringing about a “complete transformation in Adventist thinking” is a very high claim that lacks sufficient evidence. There is not a shred of a statement that supports that suggestion. The transformation that did happen in Adventist thinking after 1888 was a rejection of truth. And by the 1950’s we had the culmination in the ‘Barnhouse-Martin’ fiasco with L. E. Froom and friends. But I shall not comment on this matter at this time, although there is much available information if it is needed. ☞

If you read any E.G. White statement that you feel could be interpreted to mean that the Son of God had a beginning as God, you must see such a statement together with all the other statements by her, showing clearly the Trinitarian view she arrived at.

☞ I do not understand how the trinity is the “view she arrived at” in light of the fact that she *was* a Trinitarian before she became an Adventist! She was a Methodist (and they believe in a trinity) and when she became an Adventist she gave up the trinity doctrine. This is evidenced by the fact that she married an avowed non-trinitarian (James White). This would be against Bible counsel (2 Corinthians 6:14) if she still held to a trinity doctrine. How can she “arrive” at a doctrine that she used to believe in and then gave up as error? Will a dog return to its vomit again? Is this the case with her? “As a dog returneth to his vomit, so a fool returneth to his folly” Proverbs 26:11 ☞

While Mrs. White never used the term “Trinity” as such, she did claim that (Ev. 615):

There are three living persons in the heavenly Trio ... the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

This she wrote in 1905. In the same book, *Evangelism* (p.616), she also wrote of:

the eternal heavenly dignitaries—God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit.

☞ The two statements that you mention are just beautiful! They say some wonderful things but they in no way define the relation that these three sustain to each other. It is true there are three: a Father, a Son and a Spirit. But just because there are three does not make a trinity! This is the point that many brethren stumble over. There is one God; the Father. There is one Lord; Jesus Christ the Son. There is one Spirit; the Spirit of the Father and Son which they share. It is their life, not another individual being (see Romans 8:9). As these statements do not define the relationship between the three, but it merely lists them, we must turn to other statements which actually do define the relation between the three. This is the only way we can properly understand what she means when she lists the three. We have already seen (and will see) that the Son was begotten of the Father (the only true God, which is the Father according to John 17:3) before creation took place. He is the express image of His Father’s person. Now, notice how clearly Mrs. White explains that the Spirit is the life of Christ, not someone else:

“The impartation of the Spirit is the impartation of **the life of Christ.**” {EGW, DA 805.3}
The life of Christ is not another individual being different to Christ!

Again, she explains how she understood the spirit to be the personal presence of Christ (not someone else) in the soul:

“The work of the holy Spirit is immeasurably great. It is from this source that power and efficiency come to the worker for God; and the holy Spirit is the comforter, **as the personal presence of Christ to the soul.**” {EGW, RH, November 29, 1892 par. 3}

And again:

“Christ declared that after his ascension, he would send to his church, as his crowning gift, the Comforter, who was to take his place. **This Comforter is the Holy Spirit,—the soul of his life,** the efficacy of his church, the light and life of the world. With his Spirit Christ sends a reconciling influence and a power that takes away sin.” {EGW, RH, May 19, 1904 par. 1}

This means that the Holy Spirit is the life and glory of Christ, not another individual being:

“Jesus is seeking to impress upon them the thought that in giving **His Holy Spirit He is giving to them the glory which the Father hath given Him**, that He and His people may be one in God.” {EGW, 2MR 36, 37}

Surely, the glory of the Father given to us through Christ is NOT another different person to Christ. This was demonstrated at the baptism of Christ when the GLORY of the Father descended upon Christ, not some individual called “God the Holy Spirit” as many believe:

“Never before have the angels listened to such a prayer. They are eager to bear to their loved Commander a message of assurance and comfort. But no; **the Father Himself** will answer the petition of His Son. **Direct from the throne issue the beams of His glory**. The heavens are opened, and upon the Saviour's head descends a dovelike form of **purest light**,--fit emblem of Him, the meek and lowly One. Of the vast throng at the Jordan, few except John discerned the heavenly vision. Yet the solemnity of **the divine Presence** rested upon the assembly. The people stood silently gazing upon Christ. His form was **bathed in the light that ever surrounds the throne of God**. His upturned face was **glorified** as they had never before seen the face of man. From the open heavens a voice was heard saying, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."” {EGW, DA 112}

What a wonderful statement. It tells us about the Spirit of God very clearly. It is the glory which ever surrounds the throne of God! This is what Ellen White means when she speaks of the Spirit of God. It is the personal presence of God and Christ in an unseen form. In Spirit form. The Spirit of God and Christ is their own person, not another person. Notice “God is a person and Christ is a person.” {EGW, 1SAT 343}. Therefore, the Holy Spirit is the person of God and Christ. It is the omnipresence of them; notice “**He [Christ] would represent Himself as present in all places by His Holy Spirit, as the Omnipresent.**” {EGW, 14MR 23}

thus, “**This refers to the omnipresence of the Spirit of Christ, called the Comforter.**” {EGW, 14MR 179},

and so “**By the Spirit the Father and the Son will come and make their abode with you.**” {EGW, BEcho, January 15, 1893 par. 8}.

“Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love **me**, he will keep my words: and **my Father** will love him, and **we will come unto him**, and make our abode with him.” “Behold, **I** stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear **my** voice, and open the door, **I** will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with **me**.” John 14:23; Revelation 3:20

You see, it is through the Spirit that we have a bond with the Father and Son “The sinner then stands before God as a just person; he is taken into favor with Heaven, **and through the Spirit has fellowship with the Father and the Son.**” {EGW, 3SM 191}

“John, in the assurance of a living experience, said: "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and **truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.**" **Christ, through his Spirit, is working to draw men to himself**; and we, the human agents, are to co-operate with Christ; it is his power that gives efficiency to our labors.” {EGW, RH, January 6, 1891 par. 10}

“...and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." As you present the Word to your hearers, claim this promise of **Christ's presence**. There is no day, no hour of the day, when **He will not be near you by His Holy Spirit**. **He** is in every meeting that is held in His name. His promise is given for as long as time shall last.” {EGW, AUCR, December 30, 1907 par. 3}

“**Christ's presence** is promised to us in our labors. "Lo, I am with you always," he says, "even unto the end of the world." **In his presence** there is fulness of joy; at his right hand there are pleasures forevermore.” {EGW, RH, August 12, 1909 par. 1}

“**Receive the Holy Spirit**, and your efforts will be successful. **Christ's presence** is that which gives power.” {EGW, 1NL 12}

This is plainly and clearly demonstrated by the fact that the Holy Spirit of God (His own personal presence) can be grieved. When the Holy Spirit of God is grieved, who exactly is grieved? Is it God and Christ or is it someone else? Here is a **plain** “Thus Saith the Lord”:

“And the **LORD** said, **My spirit** shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years. And it repented **the LORD** that **he** had made man on the earth, **and it grieved him at his heart.**” Genesis 6:3, 6.

So when we read the story of Ananias and Sapphira the same fact is again demonstrated, that when we grieve the Spirit of the Lord we are really grieving the Lord himself, for the spirit is the person of the Lord Himself. Notice:

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

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

Then Peter said unto her, How is it that ye have agreed together to **tempt the Spirit of the Lord**? behold, the feet of them which have buried thy husband are at the door, and shall carry thee out.” Acts 5:3, 4, 9.

Combine this verse (using the line upon line rule, searching here a little and there a little) with this text which clearly tells us who that Spirit is:

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

Therefore, what Peter said to Ananias was really this: ‘by lying to God’s spirit you have not lied to men, but to God Himself!’ Peter was not informing Ananias that he had lied to a “God the Holy Spirit”. Rather, Ananias had lied to God (the Lord) Himself, not someone else! Please see Ephesians 4:30 in this light and it will make much more sense.

Here is another very clear statement to confirm the above. Much point is made over the expression “heavenly trio” thinking this refers to a trinity. Notice how Mrs. White *defines* the “heavenly trio” in this sentence (and by the way, Ellen White wrote “trio” with a small ‘t’ not a capital ‘T’ as was misquoted above from *Evangelism*):

“Let them be thankful to God for His manifold mercies and be kind to one another. They have **one God and one Saviour**; and **one Spirit--the Spirit of Christ--**is to bring unity into their ranks.” {EGW, 9T 189}

Wonderful indeed! Praise God for the Spirit of Prophecy. It is in perfect harmony with the word of the Living God. Notice how in that statement she actually defines clearly the “eternal heavenly dignitaries”. She says there is one God only, it is the Father. Only one Saviour, which is Christ. And only one Spirit. Then she says that spirit is the spirit of Christ! Amen and Amen.

Does this mean that Ellen White believed the Spirit to be Christ *Himself*, in invisible form?

“Cumbered with humanity, Christ could not be in every place personally; therefore it was altogether for their advantage that He should leave them, go to His father, and send the Holy Spirit to be His successor on earth. **The Holy Spirit is Himself divested** of the personality of humanity and independent thereof. **He would represent Himself as present in all places by His Holy Spirit, as the Omnipresent.**” {EGW, 14MR 23} How clear and beautiful is that statement! Christ is omnipresent by His Spirit. That Spirit is Himself in an invisible form! He is unseen by the world (see next EGW quote). It is the life and presence of Christ. This is good news indeed.

Our beloved Master said “I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you. Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also. Judas saith unto him, not Iscariot, Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?” John 14:18, 19, 22

Commenting on these lovely verses the servant of the Lord writes “That Christ should manifest **Himself** to them, **and yet be invisible to the world, was a mystery to the disciples**. They could not understand the words of Christ in their spiritual sense. They were thinking of the outward, visible manifestation. **They could not take in the fact that they could have the presence of Christ with them, and yet He be unseen by the world. They did not understand the meaning of a spiritual manifestation.**” {EGW, SW, September 13, 1898 par. 2} How so very wonderful indeed!

Does that mean that when God gives us His Spirit He actually gives us *Himself*, not a third member of a trinity?

“In giving us **His Spirit**, God gives us **Himself**, making **Himself** a fountain of divine influences, to give health and life to the world.” {EGW, 7T 273}

“Christ tells us that **the Holy Spirit is the Comforter, and the Comforter is the Holy Ghost**, “the Spirit of truth, which the Father shall send in My name.” ... **This refers to the omnipresence of the Spirit of Christ, called the Comforter.**” {EGW, 14MR 179}

See how it gets clearer and plainer as we allow the prophet to explain what she means? This saves us from falling into the error of misunderstanding her utterances.

The last quote raises a very very important question. Who *is* our Comforter? Is the Comforter Jesus Christ Himself or is it someone else?

“**The Saviour is our Comforter**. This I have proved Him to be.” {EGW, 8MR 49}

“As by faith we look to Jesus, our faith pierces the shadow, and we adore God for His wondrous love in giving **Jesus the Comforter**.” {EGW, 19MR 297, 298}

“Let them study the seventeenth of John, and learn how to pray and how to live the prayer of **Christ. He is the Comforter**.” {EGW, RH, January 27, 1903}

Here we have a glimpse of the deception that Satan has perpetrated in the remnant church. He has convinced almost everyone that the Comforter is *not* Jesus, but someone else. What a tragedy this is! This is why our churches are weak and sickly and ready to die. It is because we have a different Comforter to Christ. Notice:

“The reason why the churches are weak and sickly and ready to die, is that the enemy has brought influences of a discouraging nature to bear upon trembling souls. **He has sought to shut Jesus from their view as the Comforter**, as one who **reproves**, who warns, who admonishes them, saying, “This is the way, walk ye in it”” {EGW, RH, August 26, 1890 par. 10} (compare with John 16:8)

Be it clear to all that the prophet is here talking about SDA churches. My brother, have you ever been in a weak and sickly church? A church that was ready to die? Did you ever wonder why such a condition exists in most (if not all) of our churches? Well, the reason is stated right there for all of us to know why. It is because we have adopted a doctrine that denies Jesus as our Comforter. I hope now it is clear just what the trinity doctrine really does. It is killing all our churches because it shuts Jesus from our view as the Comforter, replacing Him with a different Comforter. This is according to the prophet of God, not me.

Are not those statements plain and abundantly clear? But, who hath believed our report!

It is Jesus who is our Comforter, not anyone else. Jesus is our Comforter, He is not physically here with us, but He does this in “another” form. He does it in Spirit form! That is what Jesus meant when he said “And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you **another Comforter**, that he may abide with you for ever” John 14:16. Jesus explains what He meant just 2 verses later. He says plainly “**I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you.**” John 14:18. This “other Comforter” is none other than Christ Himself in Spirit form. He is not seen (physically) as He was when He was here on earth. This is exactly what He said, Notice: “Yet a little while, and **the world seeth me no more; but ye see me**: because I live, ye shall live also.” V.19. He is removed from the eye of sense, but He is still with us in Spirit. Notice:

“While Jesus ministers in the sanctuary above, **He is still by His Spirit the minister of the church on earth. He is withdrawn from the eye of sense, but His parting promise is fulfilled, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."** Matt. 28:20.” {EGW, DA 166}

Jesus is the one who is with us always. Jesus did not lie to us and send us someone else. He said “I am with you”. I believe the word of my Lord.

He is now only seen by the eye of faith, as He told His disciples “but ye see me”. Notice:

“**By looking constantly to Jesus with the eye of faith**, we shall be strengthened. God will make the most precious revelations to His hungering, thirsting people. They will find that Christ is a personal Saviour. As they feed upon His word, they find that **it is spirit and life**. The word destroys the natural, earthly nature, and imparts **a new life in Christ Jesus. The Holy Spirit comes to the soul as a Comforter**. By the transforming **agency of His grace**, the image of God is reproduced in the disciple; he becomes a new creature. Love takes the place of hatred, and the heart receives the divine similitude. This is what it means to live "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." **This is eating the Bread that comes down from heaven.**” {EGW, DA 391.1}

How wonderful is that statement! It plainly tells us that the Spirit is contained in the word of Christ. This is the life, the new life in Christ. *This* is the Holy Spirit! Notice how plainly Mrs. White spoke of the Spirit being in the word, “**God's holy, educating Spirit is in His word.**” {EGW, COL 132} This spirit is the life of God! It is God’s life that is in the word, not someone else! When we receive the Spirit we are actually receiving life. The very personal (not impersonal) and holy life of God. *That* is the Holy Spirit. Notice how this is explained again by Mrs. White “The word of God is the seed. Every seed has in itself a germinating principle. In it the life of the plant is enfolded. **So there is life in God's word. Christ says, "The words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are life."** John 6:63. "He that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life." John 5:24. **In every command and in every promise of the word of God is the power, the very life of God, by which the command may be fulfilled and the promise realized.** He who by faith receives the word **is receiving the very life and character of God.**” {EGW, COL 38}

How so very simple and abundantly plain. How beautiful are those statements! The Holy Spirit is “the very life and character of God”. God’s word contains His own life, His own person!

This understanding clearly explains Genesis 1:2 which is one of the most misunderstood verses in all of scripture! The Spirit of God was hovering over the waters because that Spirit is in the word of God, and God used His word to create! “For He **spake** and it was done” Psalm 33:9. In essence, when God spoke that first creative word “let there be light” He was saying “let there be **LIFE**”. That life is His Spirit. All of creation is derived and dependant on the life of God. (Please see John 1:4 for the connection between light and life). Oh, there is so much more that can be said on this point alone, but we shall leave that to another time.✍

Repeatedly she refers (Ev. 617; DA 691) to the Holy Spirit as the

Third person of the Godhead.

✎ The “third person of the Godhead” does not mean a third person **in** the Godhead. The “third person of the Godhead” was understood by Ellen White to be none other than the glorified life of Christ (His very own life), not another individual being different to Christ and the Father. Only this life of Christ can give us victory over sin (no one else in the universe can do it). This she calls the “third person of the Godhead”. Let us allow the prophet (rather than anyone else) to explain to us what *she* meant by that expression. This is the safest thing to do if we truly desire to know the truth.

Who is the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead?

“Christ tells us that the Holy Spirit is the Comforter, and the Comforter is the Holy Ghost, “the Spirit of truth, which the Father shall send in My name.” ... **This refers to the omnipresence of the Spirit of Christ, called the Comforter.**” {E. G. White, *Manuscript Releases Vol.14*, p. 179}

Now let us read a similar statement with more context around it:

“The Spirit was given **as a regenerating agency**, and without this the sacrifice of Christ would have been of no avail. The power of evil had been strengthening for centuries, and the submission of man to this satanic captivity was amazing. *Sin could be resisted and overcome only through the mighty agency of the third person of the Godhead, who would come with no modified energy, but in the fulness of divine power.* It is the Spirit that makes effectual what has been wrought out by the world's Redeemer. It is by the Spirit that the heart is made pure. Through the Spirit the believer becomes a partaker of the divine nature. **Christ has given his Spirit as a divine power** to overcome all hereditary and cultivated tendencies to evil, and to impress **his own character** upon the church.” {E. G. White, *Review and Herald*, May 19, 1904 par. 3}

Christ's spirit is a divine power. It is “His own character” (His own life) not a *different* person to Him. What is the **only** power that can break the hold of evil from our hearts?

“Our condition through sin has become preternatural, and the power that restores us must be supernatural, else it has no value. There is but one power that can **break the hold of evil** from the hearts of men, **and that is the power of God in Jesus Christ.**” {E. G. White, *Testimonies Volume 8*, p. 291}

“**The divine Spirit** that the world's Redeemer promised to send **is the presence and power of God.**” {E. G. White, *Signs of the Times*, November 23, 1891}

Therefore, the power of God, which is in Christ, is present *in the third person*. It is Christ and His power in the third person of the Godhead. It is not another person in the Godhead, no, it is *the third person of* (not **in**) the Godhead.

“There must be a power working from within, a new life from above, before men can be changed from sin to holiness. **That power is Christ.** His grace **alone** can quicken the lifeless faculties of the soul, and attract it to God, to holiness.” {E. G. White, *Steps to Christ*, p. 18}

“Christ declared that after his ascension, he would send to his church, as his crowning gift, the Comforter, who was to take his place. This Comforter is the Holy Spirit,--*the soul of his life*, the efficacy of his church, **the light and life of the world. With his Spirit Christ sends a reconciling influence and a power that takes away sin.**” {E. G. White, *Review and Herald*, May 19, 1904 par. 1}

Notice now how clearly she says that the life of Christ is what helps us resist temptation. The life of Christ is His spirit (not someone else!). This is the Comforter, this is the Holy Spirit, and this is what is called the “third person of the Godhead.”

‘Third person’ is *also* a grammatical term. Jesus often spoke of Himself *in the third person*:

“For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of **the Son of man** be....And then shall appear the sign of **the Son of man** in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see **the Son of man** coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.” Matthew 24:27, 30.

In this passage (and many others) Jesus was talking about Himself, not someone else. It is Jesus who is the Son of man who will come again. But He was speaking about Himself *in the third person*, not in the first person. This was not an uncommon way for our Lord to speak.

Jesus would at times speak of Himself as if He were speaking of someone else. He would seem to be talking about someone else, yet it would be Himself. Notice (On the walk to Emmaus):

“Thus Christ discoursed to His disciples, opening their minds that they might understand the Scriptures. The disciples were weary, but the conversation did not flag. Words of life and assurance fell from the Saviour's lips. But still their eyes were holden. As He told them of the overthrow of Jerusalem, they looked upon the doomed city with weeping. But little did they yet suspect who their traveling companion was. They did not think that the subject of their conversation was walking by their side; **for Christ referred to Himself as though He were another person.**” {EGW, DA 800.1}

“**After that he appeared in another form** unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country.’ Mark 16:12

When Jesus appeared in “another form” it was still Him. When Jesus talks about “another Comforter” is it possible that it also could be Him?

“And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you **another Comforter**, that he may abide with you for ever” John 14:16

Who is this “another Comforter”? Who is this “Comforter” that will abide with us for ever?

Jesus **plainly** answers these questions for us:

“**I** will not leave you comfortless: **I** will come to you.” “And, lo, **I** am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.” John 14:18; Matthew 28:20

Praise the Lord! It is so clear and simple. Jesus is withdrawn from the eye of sense but His personal presence is with us still.

You see, Jesus was referring to Himself as though He were *another person*. The reason is that when He comes as a Comforter He will be in “another form”, that is, in Spirit (Galatians 4:6).

Just like Jesus appeared to the two disciples in “another form” which they did not recognize, so He also comes to us today in “another form”, He is in Spirit form as “another Comforter.”

Even though He comes to us by His Holy Spirit as “another Comforter”, yet we should still be able to recognize Him.

Notice: “**He is coming to us by His Holy Spirit today. Let us recognize Him now; then we shall recognize Him when He comes in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory.**” {EGW, RH, April 30, 1901 par. 8} There is grave danger if we do not recognize Christ now. Like the two disciples of Emmaus, there are many today whose eyes are holden. But little do they suspect who their Comforter really is. It is Christ *in the third person*.

Notice how Jesus said “**he**...shall be **in you**” (John14:17) speaking *in the third person*, and then a few breaths later Jesus says “**I in you**” (v.20) speaking in the first person. Is that not plain enough for anyone?

So it is not strange that the prophet refers to the spirit of God also *in the third person*. It is called the third person of the Godhead. This expression does not mean a trinity when it is harmonized with the Bible and other Spirit of Prophecy quotes.✍

In regard to Jesus Christ, Ellen G. White went beyond the so called semi-Arian view of pioneers like Uriah Smith, E.T. Waggoner on most other early Adventists, when she described Jesus. In Evangelism p. 615 she states that Jesus was

Equal with God, infinite and omnipotent ... He is the eternal, self-existent Son.

On the same page she says that

Christ is the pre-existent, self-existent Son of God ... there never was a time when he was not in close fellowship with the eternal God.

☞ These wonderful statements are so beautiful, for they carry a clear meaning. They are so simple and abundantly plain. They actually prove what I am trying to say! That Jesus *is* the pre-existent Son of God. He was the Son of God *before* Bethlehem. This was the belief of everyone in our church. This statement is a plain one that is frequently used to show people that Mrs. White did not believe in a trinity.

Reading on, we can use some common sense and see what the statement is saying, and what it is **not** saying. When it says “there never was a time when he was not in close fellowship with the eternal God” it is just like saying ‘there never was a time when Gabriel was not in close fellowship with the Son of God.’ We do not understand that to mean that Gabriel never had a beginning. The statement reads the same way regarding Christ. So also, ever since He was begotten, there never was a time when Christ was not in close fellowship with the eternal God (notice here that the Father is called the eternal God). Ever since Christ was begotten of the Father He has been in close fellowship with Him. There never was a time since that event when He was not in that close fellowship. This is what that statement means. It is also just like saying ‘there never was a time when Eve was not in close fellowship with Adam’. Do we understand that statement to mean that Eve and Adam are the same age, or that Eve never had a beginning? Certainly not! The same is also applicable to Christ in that statement. Notice also that the subject of the statement is Christ and not the Father. She just said that Christ is the pre-existent **Son** of God, meaning that He was a Son in His pre-existence. We know that this Son-ship is a real and literal one based on birth (brought forth). It is after clarifying this fact, that Christ *is* the Son of God *in His pre-existence*, she *then* says there never was a time when He was not in fellowship with the eternal God. The meaning should be clear to all. Ever since Christ was begotten of the Father He has ever been in close fellowship with Him. This is what the statement says. Now let us look at what that statement **does not** say. That statement does **not** say Christ was never begotten. It does **not** say Christ has no beginning.

Here is how Ellen White explains how long Christ was in close fellowship with the Father: “**He who had been in the presence of the Father from the beginning**, He who was the express image of the invisible God, was alone able to reveal the character of the Deity to mankind.” {EGW, MH 422}

She says here that it was from the beginning! The beginning of what? That beginning must refer to something. It is the beginning spoken of in John 1:1 “In **the beginning** was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” This beginning is the birth of Christ in heaven before all things; Notice “**The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old.**” Proverbs 8:22. Ever since that event Christ has always been in close fellowship with the Father! How so very plain and simple.

Notice how this is again expressed:

“**Christ was the Son of God**; He had been one with Him **before the angels were called into existence. He had ever stood at the right hand of the Father**; His supremacy, so full of blessing to all who came under its benignant control, had not heretofore been questioned. The harmony of heaven had never been interrupted; wherefore should there now be discord?” {EGW, PP 38, 39}

Yes, wherefore should there now be discord *still*?

That Christ was begotten in heaven before all things cannot be doubted by anyone who reads the Spirit of Prophecy:

“A complete offering has been made; for “God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son,”-- **not a son by creation**, as were the angels, **nor a son by adoption**, as is the forgiven sinner, **but a Son begotten** in the express image of the Father's person, **and in all the brightness of his majesty and glory**, one equal with God in authority, dignity, and divine perfection. In him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.” {EGW, ST, May 30, 1895 par. 3}

The birth spoken of in this statement was in heaven where Christ shared the full visible glory of the Father. This was not the case in Bethlehem. Notice:

“Had He appeared with **the glory that was His with the Father** before the world was, we could not have endured the light of His presence. That we might behold it and not be destroyed, **the manifestation of His glory was shrouded**. His divinity was veiled with humanity,--the invisible glory in the visible human form.” {EGW, DA 23.1}

This makes Christ the Firstborn of heaven. Notice:

“The dedication of the first-born had its origin in the earliest times. **God had promised to give the First-born of heaven to save the sinner.**” {EGW, DA 51}

Therefore, we rightly conclude that Christ *is* the Firstborn of heaven. He was born first in heaven, and then later He came to earth to be “**born again**”! When He was born on earth He became the Son of God in a **new sense**. Notice:

“In His humanity He was a partaker of the divine nature. **In His incarnation He gained in a new sense the title of the Son of God**. Said the angel to Mary, “The power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (Luke 1:35). While the Son of a human being, **He became the Son of God in a new sense**. Thus He stood in our world--**the Son of God, yet allied by birth to the human race.**” {EGW, 1SM 226, 227}

“While upon this earth, **the Son of God was the Son of man**; yet there were times when His divinity flashed forth.” {EGW, 8T 202} ✍

(Ev. 615, cf. DA 469, 470) Perhaps the most controversial and surprising statements for most Adventists in the 1890s, was a sentence in Mrs. White’s book on the life of Christ (Desire of Ages, p. 530), in which she noted that

in Christ is life, original, unborrowed, underived.

When Ellen White wrote these words, she caught many Adventists off guard. One of them was the young preacher M.L. Andreassen, later becoming a well known SDA writer. He later wrote that they were so astonished when the Desire of Ages was first published and they read statements like the one just quoted, presenting the doctrine of the Trinity which was at that time not generally accepted by the Adventists. The quoted statement he could not believe EGW had written until he saw it in her own handwriting just as it had been published. (MLA: MS, Nov. 30, 1948).

Traditional beliefs die hard in Adventist theology. In fact, Anti-trinitarian views are still not dead. A revival of anti-trinitarian ideas is taking place today. They often build on the un-Adventist assumption that the earliest traditions of the church are always the best ✍ (“**That which was truth then, is truth today.**” {EGW, 2SM 104} “**That which was truth in the beginning is truth now.** Although new and important truths appropriate for succeeding generations have been opened to the understanding, **the present revealings do not contradict those of the past. Every new truth understood only makes more significant the old.**” {EGW, RH, March 2, 1886 par. 6}) ✍. **Don’t forget we belong to a church which believes in progressive truth!**

✍ We just read two plain statements that “progressive truth” cannot contradict the old truth. Thus, Ellen White falls by her own counsel if she really became Trinitarian. Furthermore, brother K., you base your argument here on what one man has concluded. You would agree with me that it is not safe to trust to what man concludes. Let us allow the prophet to explain herself, rather than Andreassen. Here is the full context, it is so simple and clear:

“In Him [Christ] was life, original, unborrowed, underived. This life is not inherent in man. He can **possess** it only through Christ. He cannot earn it; **it is given** him as a free gift if he will believe in Christ as His personal Saviour. “This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent” (John 17:3). This is the open fountain of life for the world.” {EGW, 1SM 296, 297}

According to this statement, original, unborrowed, underived life can be **given**. It will be given as a free gift to those who believe. This is in harmony with the words of Christ when He said that God the Father gave Him that life (original, unborrowed, underived life):

“For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he **given** to the Son to have life in himself” John 5:26

This is the Son’s life by right of inheritance. He inherited that life of God the Father by birth (for He is the only-begotten Son). Therefore, Christ is the only one who has this life as the Father. It is His Father’s life, and Christ inherited it by virtue of being brought forth from Him.

Christ received ALL things from the Father. Does that include life as well? Is it true that it is *the Father’s life* which flows through His only begotten Son? Notice:

“**All things Christ received from God**, but He took to give. So in the heavenly courts, in His ministry for all created beings: through the beloved Son, **the Father’s life** flows out to all; through the Son it returns, in praise and joyous service, a tide of love, to **the great Source of all.**” {DA 21}

The Messenger of God says plainly: The Father is “the great Source of all”. He is the source of life. He is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is His life that we can receive through Christ. Christ has this very same life by right of inheritance. This life was GIVEN to Him by His Father!

“I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life,” Christ declares; “no one cometh unto the Father, but by me.” **Christ is invested with power to give life to all creatures.**” {EGW, RH, April 5, 1906 par. 12}

“As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.” John 17:2

Remember how we found earlier that the Lord’s Messenger plainly said that God’s word contained His Spirit: “**God’s holy, educating Spirit is in His word.**” {EGW, COL 132}. We are also told “The word of God is the seed. Every seed has in itself a germinating principle. In it the life of the plant is enfolded. **So there is life in God’s word.**” {EGW, COL 38}. Thus it is plain that the Spirit is the life of God and that it is contained in His Word. The spirit is the life of God! It is God’s life that is in the Word. It is the Father’s life that is in His Son, for Christ is the Word of God! Is this not plain and simple?

“When truth becomes an abiding principle in the life, the soul is “born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.” This new birth is the result of receiving Christ as the Word of God.” {EGW, AA 520}

But Christ chose to share this life with us, for Ellen White said that this life is given to us as a free gift through Christ. In other words, we receive His own life (spirit)! Notice:

“**Christ gives them the life of his life.** The Holy Spirit puts forth its highest energies to work in mind and heart. Through the grace given us, we may achieve victories which, because of our defects of character and the smallness of our faith, may have seemed to us impossible.” {EGW, RH, January 5, 1911 par. 6}

Please notice, the Holy Spirit is the “life of his life”! Here is another:

“**Christ gives them the breath of His own spirit, the life of His own life.** The Holy Spirit puts forth its highest energies to work in heart and mind.” {EGW, DA 827}

This life that we receive in Christ is His own original, unborrowed underived life. We have that life which is His. Notice:

“He suffered the death which was ours, **that we might receive the life which was His.** “With His stripes we are healed.” Isaiah 53:5.” {EGW, 8T 208} How wonderful! That is why we will live forever!

If Ellen White really changed the direction of the church through the book *Desire of Ages* then why is it that her sons continued to believe in the truth? Her sons did not become Trinitarian. Why is that? Did she not teach them the ‘new light’?

Here is some proof:

“Christ is the only being **begotten of the Father.**” {James Edson White, *Past, Present and Future*, p. 52. 1909}

“The statements and the arguments of some of our ministers, in their effort to prove **that the Holy Spirit is an individual as are God the Father and Christ**, the eternal Son, have **perplexed me**, and sometimes they have **made me sad.**” {Letter, Willie C. White to H. W. Carr, April 30, 1935}

Could it be possible that *many*, like Andreassen, have misunderstood the prophet? Yes, they have. ☞

“The Son of God”

What about all the statements from Ellen G. White, and also from the Bible (e.g. Prov. 30:4), that refers to Jesus as the “Son of God” even before he was begotten as a human being on this earth? Don’t these statements and texts show that Jesus was begotten also as God, meaning that one point of time, he came into being, coming out from God the Father? ☞ (Did we not just read earlier that this is the very thing that Mrs. White said: Christ was the only begotten of God the Father?) ☞ If this is what these texts say, the Bible would be in contradiction to itself.

☞ No brother, the Bible would then be in contradiction with *you*, not with itself. We all know it does not contradict itself. If it says Jesus is begotten of God (like in John 1:14 for example), then that is just what it means. Our failure to understand it is not evidence of its inconsistency. It is rather evidence of ours. It is evidence that we have not rightly divided the word of truth. Furthermore, exactly which part of the Bible is contradicted by the fact that Jesus *is* the only begotten Son of God the Father? Is there any passage that says the opposite? Is there a passage that says Jesus is NOT the only begotten Son? Yea, there is none, I know not any. ☞

It is not uncommon, in the Bible, and also in our everyday speaking, to call or refer to someone using a description or name that refers to the future. Thus you find that God is referred to as our Judge and Jesus as our Savior ☞ (but God is not our Judge, it is Jesus according to John 5:22) ☞, ages before they actually play these roles ☞ (Jesus being a judge is not a role-play. It is more real than we can imagine!) ☞. One of my daughters got married this summer. She referred to the parents of her fiancée as her father and mother in law before they actually was married. She spoke of what was to be as if it already was. If I heard you were going to start studying at the University from next month, I may happen to say to you when I meet you today: “Oh, there is my friend, the student”. Or if you hear of one who is about to emigrate to Canada in a few months time, you may say to him when you meet him now: “Hi, how is my Canadian friend doing?” If a married couple are expecting a baby, it would be quite normal if they sometimes pretend to speak to their unborn, referring to themselves as mother or father, right? So also in the Bible: Even in the Old Testament, the second person in the Godhead is referred to as God the Son ☞ (But the Old Testament is entirely silent regarding a “second person in the Godhead” and “God the Son”. Which part of the Old Testament are you referring to? These terms are as foreign to the Bible as are the “Eucharist” and the “mass”!) ☞, with reference to his incarnation, even before he was actually incarnated.

☞ Congratulations on the marriage of your daughter, but that does not help your argument. Your whole argument here is based on human reasoning. I fail to see any Bible passage that supports your idea. I would much rather see an argument that compares “spiritual things with spiritual”. If we read carefully the Bible, remembering what the Prophet has said “**The language of the Bible should be explained according to its obvious meaning, unless a symbol or figure is employed.**” {EGW, GC 599} when we read a text and find there no symbolism or figures, then we can take the text according to its obvious meaning.

The only text you do mention is Proverbs 30:4 “Who **hath** ascended up into heaven, or descended? who **hath** gathered the wind in his fists? who **hath** bound the waters in a garment? who **hath** established all the ends of the earth? **what is his name, and what is his son’s name, if thou canst tell?**”

Now, my brother, this fantastic verse is not a prophecy! There are no symbols of figures used in that text. The text is actually speaking of PAST events not future. The word “hath” is past tense. It is speaking

about creative acts which we all know occurred in the past. It attributes those creative acts to only two beings, and one of them is the Son of the other! That makes a Father and a Son. I fail to see any prophetic reference in this text. All attempts to turn it into a symbolism or a prophecy will require some proof that is not available. Therefore, your argument does not apply.✍

Whenever the word "Son" is used about the second person in the Godhead ✎(again, this is not a Biblical term)✍, it is with reference – sometimes future reference – to his incarnation (being born as a man).

✎I must say, brother, that this is not true. There is no scripture to substantiate the claim that you are making. The wonderful text that you mention is not a prophecy. This should be clear to anyone who actually reads the text. Mrs. White clearly tells us that when Christ was begotten in Bethlehem He became the Son of God in a NEW sense:

“In His **incarnation** He gained in a new sense the title of the Son of God. ... While the Son of a human being, **He became the Son of God in a new sense**. Thus He stood in our world--the Son of God, yet allied by birth to the human race.” {EGW, 1SM 226, 227}

This means that He was already the Son of God before the incarnation. You see, He was the Son of God by birth, and He became the Son of man also by birth. That is why in His incarnation He gained the title of the Son of God in a new sense. He must have had it in an original or ‘old’ sense. What would that refer to? The only answer is His birth before all creation. (Please see again Proverbs 8:22-30 which, by the way, is not a prophecy.)✍

It is used with reference to his humanity, never with reference to his divinity. As God, Jesus is not Son ✎(Not so, read Hebrews 1:8 Where Jesus is called Son as God. This is a clear reference to His divinity not Humanity. In His divinity He is called Son, thus teaching that Jesus *is* the Son of God)✍, he is as much God, as much eternal, as much self-existing as the first person of the Godhead, the Father.

✎This term, “first person of the Godhead”, is not a Biblical term. It is a coined phrase, and I have entertained the idea that doctrines which require words coined in the human mind to express them, are coined doctrines. The reason I am commenting about such things is simple. I am not trying to be clever. These non-biblical terms represent and reflect non-biblical ideas. These ideas get implanted in people’s minds and, over time, they prove to be very hard to shake off. The constant and regular use of them adequately demonstrates the point I am making. Some people actually get upset when these things are pointed out to them. Therefore, I try to remain within the confines of scripture and use the terms it gives me, rather than the terms that man may conjure up in his fallen mind. “Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.” 1 Corinthians 2:13✍

So let it be clear that the name "Son" refers to the incarnation (God being born in human flesh, with Mary as the Mother, God as the Father, and thus the human Jesus being the Son. Jesus was not son as God, but as man.

✎My brother, you are limiting the word “Son” to the incarnation only. You say it is “never with reference to his divinity”, and “Jesus was not son as God”. But why does Mrs. White say differently?

“**Christ was the Son of God**; He had been one with Him **before the angels were called into existence.**” {EGW, PP 38}

“The Scriptures **clearly** indicate the relation between God and Christ, and they bring to view as clearly the personality and individuality of each. [Hebrews 1:1-5 quoted] **God is the Father of Christ; Christ is the Son of God. To Christ has been given an exalted position. He has been made equal with the Father. All the counsels of God are opened to His Son.**” {EGW, 8T 268.3}

Here we see that the prophet clearly uses the term “Son” and she applies it to Christ in heaven (and just before anyone says “this is a prophecy” I ask that the statement be read again to make sure it is NOT

a prophecy!). This is not the incarnation, for Christ shared the counsels of God in heaven long before the incarnation.

I know that someone may still try to argue that this may be in Bethlehem at the incarnation. But this is in heaven, before all things. Here is another one to clarify this fact:

“He who was made equal with God bore the sin of the transgressor, and thereby made a channel whereby the love of God could be communicated to a fallen world, and his grace and power imparted to those who came to Christ in penitence for their sin.” {EGW, ST, February 5, 1894 par. 10}

Any Bible student knows that when Christ was born in Bethlehem He was made “a little lower than the angels” (Hebrews 2:9). The prophet’s use of the term “made equal with God” signifies that she is talking about an event different to the incarnation. Namely the birth of Christ *before* all things were created (as to *how* He was begotten we are not told). There is no other way around it, unless someone will resort to some serious twisting of an obviously clear statement.✂

When Jesus was born as a man, God became one of us. Jesus was our human brother. God was the Father of Jesus, our brother. That makes God our Father also. We are his adopted sons and daughter (Eph. 1:5, Gal. 4:5). We are heirs. Let us read Romans 8:16-17:

The Spirit himself testifies with our spirit that we are god’s children. Now if we are children, then we are heirs—heirs of God and co-heirs with Christ.

This is what the plan of redemption or salvation is all about. This is what the Bible is all about. Even in the Old Testament, the plan of salvation is the core. Not strange that even before the actual time of the incarnation, we find the names “God the Father” and “God the Son” used ✂(you say that we find those names used. But where are they used? Where is the term “God the Son” used in the Bible? It is not even there! Where is it in the Spirit of Prophecy? It is not there either! The term “God the Father” is never used in the OT. I am sorry, but your claim that these names were used before the incarnation is just not true)✂. The Old Testament is prophetic. All points to when Jesus came, lived and died, to serve and save.

There are a few Bible texts that may seem problematic at first glance. However, seeing them together with other Bible texts, and looking at the original language, it is not a problem like it may appear to be. Let me take an example with Micah 5:2:

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

What does it mean that Jesus’ “origins are from old, from ancient times”? The word translated “origins” is the Hebrew word “mosa’oth”, literally meaning “goings forth or out”. The text presents Jesus as the King (ruler over Israel). A king is “going forth” in his kingly function. The going forth may also ✂(or may not)✂ refer to all the OT appearances of Jesus. The incarnation was not the first time the second person in the Godhead ✂(Where is “the second person in the Godhead” to be found in the Bible? It is just not there)✂ was “going forth” to humanity. There are a series of instances in the OT where God the Son ✂(“God the Son” is not a scriptural term. Where does it come from, brother?)✂ appeared (or went forth): e.g. to Abraham (Gen 18) or to Jacob (Gen. 32:24-32). So Micah is simply saying that the second person in the Godhead ✂(Micah did not say “second person in the Godhead”. That is what you said, not Micah!)✂ had been going forth from ancient times or from eternity. Thus Micah clearly sets forth the pre-existence of the One who was to be born in Bethlehem. The goings forth of Christ reaches back to eternity ✂(but to whom did He appear in eternity? Was Abraham in eternity? Was Jacob? There were only about 1250 years between Micah and Abraham. Does that place Abraham in eternity?)✂. They are in plural, because it has been many of them.

✂Your whole reasoning to explain away this lovely text is not correct. If you consult the Lexicon you will find the following for the term “goings forth”:

04163. hauwm *mo-tsaw-aw'*; **a family descent**; also a sewer [marg.; compare 06675]:—draught house; going forth. (Strong's Hebrew Lexicon)

It is clear from the lexicon that the *primary* meaning of the word is “family decent”! This makes the text read in perfect harmony with the other Bible passages. When we insert that meaning in the text it will read like this: “whose origin [family descent] is from of old, from ancient days” (RSV)

Therefore, the text is speaking of his eternal sonship, as is very commonly interpreted; being the only begotten of the Father, of the same nature with him, and a distinct person from him; the eternal Word that went forth from him, and was with him from the days of eternity, and is truly God by nature.

So as the former part of the text sets forth his human birth, the latter sets forth His divine birth; which, due to the excellency and ineffableness of it, is expressed in the plural number, “goings forth”. This text actually proves the pre-existence of Christ before the world was, whose “goings forth [were] from ancient days”, when as yet the world was not created.

Now notice how Mrs. White uses that same text, and applies correctly the meaning of the phrase “goings forth”.

“His "goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." Micah 5:2. And the Son of God declares concerning Himself: "The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting. . . . When He appointed the foundations of the earth: then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him: and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him." Proverbs 8:22-30.” {EGW, PP 34}

Isn't that just lovely! It clearly says there that Christ's “goings forth” were “**before** His works of old”, meaning *before* creation. That means that the application of “goings forth” to the appearances of Christ *after* creation is not correct. She uses it in the meaning of “family decent”, for she is talking about Christ as the Son of God! His “family decent” is God the Father! This is in harmony with the Bible and her other statements. The word simply means “family decent”, and she uses that text in the context of heaven, and then she quotes Proverbs 8:22-30! Need I say anything more? It is so plain and clear. Micah 5:2 is talking about the origin of Christ. It is talking about His birth when He was “brought forth” from the days of eternity, before the works of old.

Just what does Proverbs 8:22-30 really mean? Let us quote it and see:

“The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old.

I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.

When there were no depths, I was brought forth;

when there were no fountains abounding with water.

Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth:

While as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world.

When he prepared the heavens, I was there: when he set a compass upon the face of the depth:

When he established the clouds above: when he strengthened the fountains of the deep:

When he gave to the sea his decree, that the waters should not pass his commandment:

when he appointed the foundations of the earth:

Then I was by him, as one brought up with him:

and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him”

Jesus Christ says He was “brought forth” before the creation of all things. Jesus also says that after He was “brought forth” He was a worker with His Father in the creation of all things. Please consult anyone with an Arabic Bible regarding this passage where the term “brought forth” is actually translated “begun” or “started”. In other words, Jesus is saying “When there were no depths, I was begun... before the hills was I begun”! If Jesus Himself (this Jesus who is a faithful and true witness who does not lie) says that He was “brought forth” or “begun” then why should I not believe my Lord and Saviour? Why should I refuse to accept the utterances of Him who is the chiefest among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely?

(Note: That this passage is speaking of Christ will not be argued by any honest Bible student. Please see 1Corinthians 1:24, 30 as to who is the wisdom of God. Also compare Luke 11:49 with Matthew 23:34 to see that Christ is the Wisdom of God.

Furthermore, from the inspired pen of the Spirit of Prophecy we read:

“**And the Son of God declares concerning Himself:** "The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting. . . . When He appointed the foundations of the earth: then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him: and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him." **Proverbs 8:22-30.**” {EGW, PP 34}

Here is another,

“"The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old," **Christ says.** "When He gave to the sea His decree, that the waters should not pass His commandment; when He appointed the foundations of the earth; then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him; and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him."” {EGW, ST, February 22, 1899 par. 5}

And again,

“**The Lord Jesus Christ,** the divine Son of God, existed from eternity, a distinct person, yet one with the Father. **He** was the surpassing glory of heaven. **He** was the commander of the heavenly intelligences, and the adoring homage of the angels was received by **him as his right.** This was no robbery of God. "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way," **he declares,** "before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth; while as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When he prepared the heavens, I was there: when he set a compass upon the face of the depth."” {EGW, RH, April 5, 1906 par. 7}

And yet another,

“**Through Solomon Christ declared:** "The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth; when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth. . . . When He gave to the sea His decree, that the waters should not pass His commandment; when He appointed the foundations of the earth; then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him; and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him."” {EGW, ST, August 29, 1900 par. 14}

Furthermore, let it not be imagined for one instant that by this I mean that Christ is a created being. The Son of God is **not** a created being, He is **begotten**. Notice how inspiration clearly contrasts those two words (created and begotten):

“"God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son,"-- **not a son by creation,** as were the angels, nor a son by adoption, as is the forgiven sinner, **but a Son begotten** in the express image of the Father's person, and in all the brightness of his majesty and glory, one equal with God in authority, dignity, and divine perfection. In him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.” {EGW, ST, May 30, 1895 par. 3}

Ellen White says that Christ is NOT a Son by creation, but a Son Begotten. Let us believe all that God has revealed to us and not add unto His word.✍

Parallels to Pagan Religions

Some will argue that the doctrine of the Trinity has a pagan background, as the Babylonian religion, the old Egyptian religion, the Hindu religion etc. has a trinity view of their gods. If there were no Biblical ground for the doctrine, we would need to search elsewhere for the origin and it should concern us that other heathen religions had these ideas before the Christians took after it. But as there is strong Biblical evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity ✍(but there is no “strong Biblical evidence for the doctrine of the trinity”. There is not a single plain text that can be used to support it.)✍, **and it is supported by the Spirit of prophecy** ✍(but we saw that the Spirit of Prophecy did not support any such thing)✍, **we must conclude that it is not that the Christian trinitarian**

understanding of the Godhead derived from heathen religions, but rather that heathen religions copied the idea of a triune Deity from the religion of the Bible.

☞ This is a very interesting proposition. So the Egyptians and the Babylonians got their trinity from the Bible. This may sound plausible at first, but upon some thought and reflection the careful thinker will discover that there was no Bible in existence at that time! Every Bible student knows that the Bible was first written by Moses *after* he left Egypt. So, how could they get it from the Bible if there was no Bible to get it from?

I know it will be argued that they got it from the patriarchs or from Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. Again, this sounds like a plausible idea only until the same careful thinker will remember that the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob was not a trinity! This is confirmed by Peter who said: "The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, **hath glorified his Son Jesus**; whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go." Acts 3:13. Here we see that the God of the fathers is God the Father, not a trinity. Peter clearly says that this God of the fathers has glorified His Son Jesus. Therefore teaching that the Father of Jesus is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. There is no mention of any trinity, or "triune Deity", there. This is further proved when one searches the book of Genesis for a "triune Deity". It is simply not there! So, the question now remains, how *did* those heathen religions get it from the Bible as you claim, seeing it is not in the Bible? ☞

Another example of this is that some of the other non-Biblical religions have copied the idea of a creation. The Bible did not get it from them, they got it from the Bible. So let us not turn this around.

☞ In speaking about this very point regarding the trinity this is what J. N. Loughborough, our first church historian, had to say:

"Its origin is pagan and fabulous. Instead of pointing us to scripture for proof of the trinity, we are pointed to the trident of the Persians, with the assertion that "by this they designed to teach the idea of a trinity, **and if they had the doctrine of the trinity, they must have received it by tradition from the people of God. But this is all assumed, for it is certain that the Jewish church held to no such doctrine.** Says Mr. Summerbell, "A friend of mine who was present in a New York synagogue, asked the Rabbi for an explanation of the word `elohim'. A Trinitarian clergyman who stood by, replied, `Why, that has reference to the three persons in the Trinity,' when a Jew stepped forward and said he must not mention that word again, or they would have to compel him to leave the house; for it was not permitted to mention the name of any strange god in the synagogue." (Discussion between Summerbell and Flood on Trinity, p. 38) Milman says the idea of the Trident is fabulous. (Hist. Christianity, p.34)" {J. N. Loughborough, *Review & Herald*, November 5, 1861} ☞

Is Trinitarianism Catholic?

Some also argue that because the Catholic Church holds a Trinitarian view, we as Adventists should go against it. They say that since the church councils of the ancient Catholic church settled on a Trinitarian view, like they settled on various false teachings around the same time (Sunday, baptism by immersion, etc.), that is a proof we should stick to an opposite view or understanding of God. That is just like saying that because Catholics pray we should not pray ☞ (but the Catholics pray to dead saints. We should not pray to dead saints) ☞, because Catholics believe one should go to church, we shouldn't ☞ (but the Catholic churches are shrines of Satan, represented by the Sun-god. A casual walk into any cathedral will reveal this fact. The answer is no, we should not go to that kind of 'church') ☞, because Catholics are conservative, we shouldn't be ☞ (but a conservative Catholic means a strict pagan. I say this in full knowledge that these poor Catholics are not possibly aware of this fact. But you and I both know it) ☞, etc. This way of arguing does not make sense ☞ (I agree. This argument is only half an argument, which does not make much sense. It is not examining their doctrines and comparing them. It is only examining the Biblical terms that they have ascribed to their pagan practices.) ☞. Even in the Catholic faith there is some truth ☞ ("To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is **no light in them.**" Isaiah 8:20) ☞. The Catholic Church certainly has some views and practices relating to the three persons of the Godhead that we with the Bible in our hands are not prepared to defend (e.g. the

role of Mary, called the mother of God), but the understanding of God being three persons ☞(but you stated in the beginning of your sermon “that God is **a person**” (p.4). Now you contradict yourself and say God is “three persons”. This is not consistent)☞, all from eternity, all self-existent, all with no beginning, we see as Biblical. The big and important question for us should be: What is Biblical? What does the Bible teaches us?

☞ You make an appeal to the word of God. I agree with you there. Here is what happens when we **do** hold to the word of God: “The church that holds to the word of God is **irreconcilably separated from Rome**.” {EGW, ST, February 19, 1894 par. 4} The prophet says “irreconcilably”, that means there can be no doctrinal conciliation. Who am I to argue with what the Spirit says through the prophet? It seems to me that you are trying to prove the exact opposite. That we are **not** “irreconcilably separated from Rome”. The Prophet says there **is** irreconcilable separation; you say there is **no** separation on this doctrine. I go with the prophet.☞

That Jews believe in the Sabbath does not make the Sabbath Jewish ☞(Correct, because the Sabbath was *before* the Jews, they did not invent it)☞. That Baptists believe in baptism by immersion does not make Baptism Baptist ☞(Correct, because Baptism was *before* the Baptists came along, and they did in no wise invent it)☞. That Catholics believe in the Trinity does not make the belief in the Trinity Catholic ☞(Not correct, because the trinity *originated* with the Catholics! They invented it and to this they freely admit. They clearly state that they did not get it from the Bible. The very fact that it took 300-400 years to come up with that doctrine (as you admitted) is proof enough that it does not come from God’s word. This is further evidenced by the fact that it came up in the Catholic councils. Observe:

A Catholic Challenge

“Protestants not Guided by Scripture. [“Doctrinal Catechism”- pp. 101,174,351-355.]

“Q. Have you any other proofs that they [Protestants] are not guided by the Scriptures? A. Yes; so many, that we cannot admit more than a mere specimen into this small work. They reject much that is clearly contained in Scripture, and profess more that is nowhere discoverable in that Divine Book.

Q. Give some examples of both? A. They should, if the Scripture were their only rule, wash the feet of one another, according to the command of Christ, in the 13th chap. of St. John; - they should keep, not the Sunday, but the Saturday, according to the commandment, ‘Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath-day;’ for this commandment has not, in Scripture, been changed or abrogated.”

“Q. Have you any other way of proving that the Church has power to institute festivals of precept? A. Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her; - she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday the seventh day, a change for which there is no Scriptural authority.”

“Q. Do you observe other necessary truths as taught by the Church, not clearly laid down in Scripture? A. The doctrine of the Trinity, a doctrine the knowledge of which is certainly necessary to salvation, is not explicitly and evidently laid down in Scripture, in the Protestant sense of private interpretation.” {*Review & Herald*, August 22, 1854}.

Please note that this is a quote from the Roman Catholic Doctrinal Catechism which was quoted in our *Review and Herald*. We used this statement alongside the Sabbath questions to show people that Rome originated them both. We still use the Sabbath quotes today, but why are we not consistent with the other claim that they make about the trinity?

And if we have accepted the Catholic trinity, then how long will it be before we accept the Catholic Sun-day? Or is this possibility too far fetched? Listen to this fearful prophecy: “The Lord has a controversy **with his professed people in these last days**. In this controversy **men in responsible positions** will take a course directly opposite to that pursued by Nehemiah. They will not only ignore and despise the Sabbath themselves, but they will try to keep it from others by burying it beneath the rubbish of custom and tradition. **In churches and in large gatherings in the open air, ministers will urge upon the people the necessity of keeping the first day of the week.**” {EGW, RH, March 18, 1884 par. 8}☞

All these points of faith goes back to the Bible, and represented the truth before there were any Denominations.

☞ So, you conclude that the Catholic “understanding of God being three persons, all from eternity, all self-existent, all with no beginning, we see as Biblical.” (p.29) This, in other words, means that we hold to the same trinity as the Catholics! But how can this be?

Is this not the most Satanic deception of them all? How is it that we hold to the same god as “the representative of Satan”? How is it that we and the antichrist worship the same god? How can we claim to be different when we have the same Babylonian god of the pope? How can we give the three angel’s message when we are worshipping the same god as the beast? How, how, how?

This does not make any sense. I can just see Satan having a very good laugh at such a position of similarity with the mother of harlots. Has it come to this? Do we worship the same god as does the harlot?

Here, I know, someone will claim that *we* have it right and that Rome just happens to have this truth too. But this is not what the Bible says. My Bible clearly and plainly tells me that Rome worships the dragon, not the true God (Rev.13:4). Satan would not have the “right arm” of his strength worshipping the true God. This is just absurd. It even insults the intelligence of Satan! Surely, this is apparent to any clear thinking individual!

How can the Papacy, the direct agent of Satan in this world, be a worshipper of the true God? If the trinity is indeed truth, then how is it possible that Rome boasts all her other errors are based on the trinity?

Listen to what the representative of Satan says:

“The mystery of the Trinity is the central doctrine of the Catholic Faith. Upon it are based all the other teachings of the Church.” (*Handbook For Today’s Catholic*, p. 11)

Am I to understand that the representative of Satan is promoting the true God? Are all the other heresies and pagan rituals of Catholicism based on the trinity (the true God)?

You see, either we are worshipping the god of the Catholics, or they are worshipping our God. But, Satan is too clever to allow his brain child to be worshipping the true God. Satan receives worship through the papacy (Revelation 13:4). If Satan is being worshipped through the papacy, then what does that say about us if we worship the same god?

If Satan is worshipped through the papacy, then how is it possible that they still worship the true God (the trinity)?

If the trinity is really the true God then how is it that Satan is the one who is worshipped through the papacy, for they believe in the trinity?

My dear brother, can you not see what your conclusion has done? You have mingled the holy with the profane. The common with the sacred! I am sure you realize the sure danger of this mixture, “There is always danger, when the common is mingled with the sacred, that the common will be allowed to take the place of the sacred.” {EGW, 8T 88}

How is it that the woman of Revelation 12 and the woman of Revelation 17 both have the same god? This is virtually impossible! God will not allow it, and Satan will not allow it. God will not have His people worshipping the same god as the harlot. Satan will not have his people worshipping the same God as the faithful. This is what the whole great controversy is all about: ***Who Do You Worship!*** My brother, your theology has brought about a situation where there is no need for a controversy. Is not this the spirit of compromise?

Why do we need to go and convert the Catholics? They are worshipping the ‘true God’ in trinity anyway, according to your conclusion? So, when I tell a Catholic brother “Fear God and worship Him” he will reply, “But I already do”? How can I explain to him that his trinity leads to Satan worship but our trinity leads to true worship when both trinities are the same? How am I supposed to give that Catholic the third angel’s message if he already worships the true God? What does it mean to worship the beast and his image if all of Christianity believes in the trinity (which is the true God according to you)? Can you not see how the three angel’s messages are rendered useless with the suggestion you have made? Can you not see how the trinity is the binding doctrine uniting all ‘Christians’ into one big Ecumenical family? Am I supposed to believe that the Ecumenical movement is worshipping the true God? Does the Bible tell us that all the world will unite together and worship the true God? Certainly not! *They will worship Satan.* But, all those ‘Christians’ who are uniting together are worshipping the same god: it is the trinity? I hope

it is becoming clear what the implications of all this really mean! Surely, we say aright, that the trinity doctrine is nothing short of Satanism! I say this knowing full well that I shall meet this record again in the Judgment.

Listen to the words of Brother J. S. Washburn, a good friend of Ellen White, regarding this very point: "Satan has taken some heathen conception of a three-headed monstrosity, and with deliberate intention to cast contempt upon divinity, has woven it into Romanism as our glorious God, an impossible, absurd invention. **This monstrous doctrine transplanted from heathenism into the Roman Papal Church is seeking to intrude its evil presence into the teachings of the Third Angel's Message. ...**

And the fact that Christ is not the mediator in the Roman Church demonstrates that the Trinity destroys the truth that Christ is the one, the only mediator. The so-called Christian Church, the Papacy, that originated the doctrine of the Trinity, does not recognize him as the only mediator but substitutes a multitude of ghosts of dead men and women as mediators. If you hold the Trinity doctrine, in reality, Christ is no longer your mediator. ...

The whole Trinity doctrine is utterly foreign to all the Bible and the teachings of the Spirit of Prophecy. Revelation gives not the slightest hint of it. **This monstrous heathen conception finds no place in all the free universe of our Blessed heavenly Father and His Son, our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ...**The Catholic heathen doctrine of the Sunday Sabbath is just as sacred as the Catholic pagan doctrine of the Trinity and no more so...

Seventh-day Adventists claim to take the word of God as supreme authority and to have "come out of Babylon", to have renounced forever the vain traditions of Rome. **If we should go back to the immortality of the soul, purgatory, eternal torment and the Sunday Sabbath, would that be anything less than apostasy? If, however, we leap over all these minor, secondary doctrines and accept and teach the very central root doctrine of Romanism, the Trinity ... even though our words seem to be spiritual, is this anything else or anything less than apostasy, and the very Omega of apostasy?...**

However kindly or beautiful or apparently profound his sermons or articles may be, **when a man has arrived at the place where he teaches the heathen Catholic doctrine of the Trinity ... is he a true Seventh-day Adventist? Is he even a true preacher of the Gospel?** And when many regard him as a great teacher and accept his unscriptural theories, absolutely contrary to the Spirit of Prophecy, **it is time that the watchmen should sound a note of warning.**" {Portions of a letter written by J. S. Washburn in 1939.} (This letter was liked by a conference president so much that he distributed it to 32 of his ministers.)

How is it possible that the SDA church, which was raised by God Himself, was in error for over 80 years on the true understanding of God (while a living prophet was among them, mind you), yet Rome (Babylon), the antichrist power and Satan's vehicle, was correct?! And we had to go to *them* (after the prophet died, mind you) to get our so called correct (current) understanding, namely the trinity? This does not make sense to me. So while the remnant church of God was in error over the doctrine of God, the antichrist was in truth? And I am expected to believe this 'truth'? God forbid! Let Rome and her gods alone, brethren, just let them *alone*! I much rather prefer the faith which was delivered unto the saints!

The words of inspiration clearly declare that "It is a backsliding church that lessens the distance between itself and the Papacy." {EGW, ST, February 19, 1894 par. 4} ☞

Only One God ☞(My brother, do you not here contradict yourself? You previously said that "God is three" (p.4) now you say "only one God". Which one is it? God commands us saying: "Come now, and let us **reason** together..." Isaiah 1:18. It is not very consistent with reason to state that God is both "three" and "one". This flies in the face of all the reason that God has been pleased to grant unto us. Surely, if God asks us to reason with Him then His truth must be reasonable, not **unreasonable**.)☞

Let us now turn to the Bible and study the three persons in the Godhead ☞(again, the use of unbiblical terms over and over does not make them Biblical. "three persons in the Godhead" remains outside the revealed will and counsel of God.)☞, **with special emphasis on God the Son and God the Holy Spirit, as they are the most difficult to understand.**

☞The difficulty arises from the fact that "God the Son" and "God the Holy Spirit" are not mentioned in the Holy Bible. It is indeed "most difficult to understand" something when there is nothing said about it

in the Bible. Furthermore, such an explanation will be sought for in vain from the Bible. It is like trying to see what the Bible says about something that it does not mention! ✍

First: Let it be clear that it is only ONE God ✍ (with this I agree. This one God is revealed and clearly identified in the Bible. It is God the Father according to Ephesians 4:6 “one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in you all”) ✍. **Sometimes 1 John 5:7 is used to show that God is three but one.** It is not a good text to use, as it is not in the oldest Greek manuscripts. Actually, these words are not found in any Greek manuscripts before the 16th century. But there are other texts clearly stating that God is one, but that the one God is three persons. ✍ (This contradicts your earlier admission “that God is a person” (p.4). This is really confusing. How can God be “a person” and “three persons” both at the same time? This destroys the personality of God!)

To say that “the one God is three persons” means that God the Father is three persons! For, according to the Bible, it clearly tells us that the One God is God the Father. I do not know how it is possible for God the Father to be three persons. I would only ask for a plain “Thus Saith the Lord” before I can accept such a strange proposition; which strangeness will cease as soon as I see the plain passage. ✍

One OT text is Deuteronomy 6:4:

Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is *one*.

And then one NT text; 1 Cor. 8:4:

... there is no God but *one*.

The Hebrew word used for “one” in the Old testament is the word “echad”, and that is the same word used in Genesis 2:24 about husband and wife. Husband and wife are one, but still two persons ✍ (it is true, they are two persons. But the text you quote never said that they would be one person. The word one does not apply to their person. It applies just as the text says “one flesh”) ✍. **God is one, but the Godhead is comprised of God the father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit.**

✍ Is there a plain “Thus saith the Lord” for this conclusion? You are drawing your conclusion from the marriage relation rather than from a plain text. But, you are not consistent, for if the Godhead is just like the husband and wife, as you claim, then why do you conclude that there are three in the Godhead when there are but two in the marriage?).

Jesus Christ explained to us the text in Deuteronomy 6:4 that you quoted earlier. He quotes it in Mark 12:29 and the word used for “one” there is the Greek word (*εἰς ἓν*) which means a numeral one.

Much point is made over the word “Echad” (one) used of Adam and Eve. But do all these people who make that point know that this is not the case when it comes to the NT? When those passages (Deut.6:4 and Gen.2:24) are quoted in the NT the word used for “one” is actually different! This means that the writers of the NT were well aware that “Echad” for God did not mean a plurality of persons. This is clear for when they wrote about the man and woman being “one” they employed a different Greek word than (*εἰς ἓν*). Due to space, I will just give the references and leave it with you for further study. (Matthew 19:5, 6; Mark 10:8; Ephesians 5:31 compared with Mark 12:29; 1 Cor.8:4-6)

I notice you did not comment on the Greek word for “one” that Paul used in that text 1 Corinthians 8:4. According to the Lexicon it simply means ‘one’, a numeral one. It does not mean a unit, or a compound or any such thing. It means a single solitary ONE. If we were to ask Paul to clarify to us what he understood regarding the one God we would get a clear and plain answer:

“But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.” 1 Corinthians 8:6

Says the great apostle, “There is none other God but one,” and “there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things.” He tells us who this one God is. It is not the Holy Ghost; it is not Jesus Christ, but it is the Father. How the doctrine of the Trinity, of one God being three, can be reconciled with these positive statements I do not know. ✍

In Matthew 28:18-19 we are told to preach and baptize

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

☞ This passage was dealt with earlier. Once again we note it says nothing of “God the Father”, “God the Son”, or “God the Holy Spirit”. The mention of Father, Son and Holy Spirit does not make a three in one God. We are baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. By this we express our belief in the existence of the one true God, the mediation of his Son, and the influence of the Holy Spirit. ☞

In many verses, the unity of the Godhead is underlined. Listen for example to these texts in the Gospel of John:

8:19: Jesus replied. If you knew me, you would know my Father also.

10:30: I and the Father are one.

14:9.1'0: Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father ... Don't you believe that I am in the Father, and that the Father is in me?

17:22: (Jesus prays to the Father:) . . . that they may be one as we are one.

☞ You are trying to prove that the Godhead is three, yet all the texts here mentioned only prove two rather than three! There are not three mentioned in any of the above texts. It is only two: the Father and the Son. If these are the examples of the “many verses” which prove a trinity, then I need not make any more comments. ☞

Trinity or tri-unity refers to the fact that God is one, but that this God consist of God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit ☞ (yet none of the texts you quoted say anything about that. The texts you quote do not even mention the Holy Spirit! I do not see the words “trinity” or “tri-unity” at all there. Furthermore, there is no text in the Bible that says “God consists of...” The Bible simply says God is one God, and that one God is the Father) ☞. Together they are a perfect unity. It is important to understand that the difference between the three persons of the Godhead is a difference in role or function ☞ (does this mean that they are only playing roles? Is the Father-Son relationship only a role-play?) ☞, and NOT a difference in rank. None of the three is lesser God than the others. All three are God with life original, unborrowed, underived ☞ (any clear thinking person will have to admit that if “all three are God” then you have three gods! There is no way around this plain fact. And all attempts to try to prove that these three gods make up only one god is an apparent contradiction of itself, reason, logic, and the Bible) ☞.

The word *Deity* appears in the Bible (e.g. Coll. 2:9). To understand the nature of the deity fully takes more than our mental capacity (Job: “Can you fathom the mysteries of God? Job 11:7.) But then again, there are so many things even on the human level that we do not understand, but still willingly accepts that we should be prepared to accept also what the Bible tells us about the Deity, even though we find it hard to grasp its mysteries. Can you understand that the universe never ends? Can you understand electricity? Can you understand the conception, growth and birth of a baby? These are mysteries, wonders, that go beyond our mental capacity. We accept it as real and true, but we can't explain how it can be.

☞ “For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are **clearly seen, being understood** by the things that are made, even his eternal power and **Godhead**; so that they are without excuse:” Romans 1:20. ☞

God the Father ☞ (Here you make mention of what is popularly termed “the first person in the Godhead” This translates to “**God #1**”) ☞

Let us look a little closer at the Deity or Godhead. First God the Father:

Throughout the Bible, God is called “Father”. Even in the Old Testament times God was referred to as “Father” (Deut. 32:6, Isa. 63:16). In the New Testament, God is constantly referred to as “Father”. Just in the gospels, Jesus refers to God as “Father” 170 times (E.g. Matt. 6:9). This is all with reference to God as Father of the Incarnated God Jesus.

☞ Not so. It is not only with reference to the incarnation. Please see John 8:42 and what Ellen White says about it in the *Desire of Ages*. Actually, let me quote it here.

“In mockery they answered, “We be not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God.” These words, **in allusion to the circumstances of His birth**, were intended as a thrust against Christ in the

presence of those who were beginning to believe on Him. Jesus gave no heed to the base insinuation, but said, "If God were your Father, ye would love Me: for I proceeded forth and came from God." {EGW, DA 467} [Please link the "proceeded forth" mentioned here with "whose goings forth" in Micah 5:2 and you will see a wonderful picture develop. Jesus was actually telling the Pharisees that He is the one referred to in Micah 5:2. He says "I **proceeded forth** and came from God" meaning 'I am the one whose "**goings forth**" have been from of old, from the days of eternity'. I am the one who was born (proceeded forth) from God in the days of eternity!]

"The Pharisees, partly comprehending his meaning, said, "We be not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God." But Jesus answered them: "If God were your Father, ye would love me; for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me." **The Pharisees had turned from God, and refused to recognize his Son.**" {EGW, ST, October 23, 1879 par. 17}

"Jesus said, 'If God were your father, you would love me, **for God is the source of my being**, and from him I come.'" John 8:42 (The New English Bible)

A few verses later Jesus confirms this fact (that He is the Son of God) again in most plain language: "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am." John 8:58

Let us allow the prophet to comment on this much misunderstood verse:

"With solemn dignity Jesus answered, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I AM." Silence fell upon the vast assembly. **The name of God**, given to Moses to express the idea of the eternal presence, **had been claimed as His own by this Galilean Rabbi**. He had announced Himself to be the self-existent One, **He who had been promised to Israel, "whose goings forth have been from of old, from the days of eternity."** Micah 5:2, margin. Again the priests and rabbis cried out against Jesus as a blasphemer. **His claim to be one with God** had before stirred them to take His life, and a few months later they plainly declared, "For a good work we stone Thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that Thou, being a man, makest Thyself God." John 10:33. **Because He was, and avowed Himself to be, the Son of God, they were bent on destroying Him.**" {EGW, DA 469, 470}

The fact that Jesus claimed "the name of God" (I AM) is evidence that He is the Son of the Great I AM, God the Father. He has the name of His Father by inheritance (Hebrews 1:4). Therefore, in claiming to be I AM Christ is actually affirming His divine Sonship, for it is a divine title. He is saying that He is the self-existent one who was promised to Israel. Micah 5:2 is a prophecy about the Son of God, the King of Israel whose goings forth (origin) is from the days of eternity (everlasting).

Please see the meaning of the word *everlasting*:

05769. מלֹוֹע *o-lawm*' concealed, i.e. the vanishing point; generally, time out of mind (past or future), i.e. practically eternity. (Strong's Hebrew Lexicon)

He claimed to be one with God because He was brought forth from God. You see, when Jesus said "before Abraham was, I AM" He was claiming to be the Messiah, the King of Israel, the One who had been promised to Israel. The One whose origin (birth) was from the days of eternity as the prophet states. It was the Son of God who had been promised to Israel. When Christ claimed the name of God he was claiming to be one with God. The priests and rabbis understood this for they were once again bent on destroying him because "He was and avowed Himself to be the Son of God."

Furthermore, according to your theology, God the Father is not the one who fathered Jesus in the incarnation, it was rather "God the Holy Spirit" (Luke 1:35) which you believe to be God number 3, not God number 1, the Father. Do you not see how you are contradicting yourself in this point? ☹

Jesus is our human brother. That makes God our Father too. We are God's children.

God the FATHER is from eternity (Gen. 21:33; Psalm 90:2), he **created** (Psalm 102:25, Eph. 3:9). He is **almighty** (Matt. 28:18 ☹ This text is not speaking about the Father, it is Jesus. ☹), he is **all-wise** (Job 28:20,23, Prov. 2:6), he is **omniscient** (knows everything) (Job 37:16; Psalm 139:2-4); he is **omnipotent** (all-powerful, able to do whatever he wills) (Matt. 19:26), **omnipresent** (is present everywhere) (Psalm 139:7-12 ☹ I will just note here that you use this

passage to refer to the Father, which is correct), he is **immutable** (unchangeable, perfect)(James 1:17). Furthermore, God is **holy** (Psalm 99:9), **righteous** (Ezra 9:15), **just** (Rev. 22:12), **merciful** (Is. 55:7), **gracious** (Titus 2:11), **truthful** (1 John. 5:20), **pure** (Hab. 1:13), and **loving** (1 John 4:8; Jer. 31:3). All these characteristics are also true of the second and third persons of the Godhead, by the way, because there is no lesser or greater degree of being God. The mentioned characteristics are what being God is all about, and it is true of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit.

None of the texts that you quote make any mention of the following:

That God the Father is a part of three.

That God the Father is the “first person of the Godhead”.

That God the Father does not have a Son.

That God the Father is playing a role as ‘Father’.

That God the Father is only the Father as a result of the incarnation.

That God the Father has two other “gods” with Him.

That God the Father shares His counsels with another two.

That God the Father is not the One God of the Bible.

That God the Father is not ‘the only true God’ John 17:3

On the other hand, there is clear and plain scripture testimony that the Father *is* the only true God.

The distinction between Christ and the true God is most clearly shown by the Saviour’s own words:

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

Jesus plainly says His Father is the only true God. But Trinitarians contradict this by saying that the Son and Holy Ghost are just as much the true God as the Father is. Yet, there is not a single passage in scripture that supports this claim. Jesus even declares that the knowledge of this truth is necessary to eternal life, “and this is life eternal”. We must know the Father as the only true God. Then there is no true God besides the Father. But we must also know His Son Jesus Christ, whom He has sent. How simple and plain is this doctrine, and how abundantly sustained by the Holy Bible.

But remember, lest I be thought to degrade Christ as is so commonly misunderstood. As the Son of the self-existent God, He has by nature all the attributes of Deity. He is equal to the Father, and is worthy of worship and praise as is the Father (John 5:23).

“It is true that there are many sons of God, but Christ is the “only begotten Son of God,” and therefore the Son of God in a sense in which no other being ever was or ever can be. The angels are sons of God, as was Adam (Job 38:7; Luke 3:38), by creation; Christians are the sons of God by adoption (Rom. 8:14, 15), **but Christ is the Son of God by birth.**” {E. J. Waggoner, *Christ and His Righteousness*, p.12. 1890}

To which Mrs. White heartily agreed: ““God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son,”-- not a son by creation, as were the angels, nor a son by adoption, as is the forgiven sinner, **but a Son begotten** in the express image of the Father's person...” {EGW, ST, May 30, 1895}

The writer to the Hebrews further shows that the position of the Son of God is not one to which Christ has been elevated, but that it is one which He has by right. That right is the right of inheritance, which came about by birth. Since it is a divine inheritance therefore it must be a divine birth. And since that inheritance belonged to Christ before He came to earth, therefore we are correct in concluding that the birth of Christ must have also been before He came to earth.

The Scriptures declare that Christ is “the only begotten Son of God.” He is begotten, not created. As to when or how He was begotten, it is not for us to inquire, nor could our minds grasp it if we were told. The prophet Micah tells us all that we can know about it in these words, “But thou, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto Me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from the days of eternity.” Micah 5:2, margin. There was a time when Christ proceeded forth and came from God, from the bosom of the Father (John 8:42; 1:18), but that time was so far back in the days of eternity that to finite

comprehension it is practically without beginning. But the point is that Christ is a begotten Son and not a created subject. ❧

God the Son ❧ (this popular human term is not a popular Biblical term. Therefore, “the second person in the Godhead” would also be known as “**God #2**”) ❧

Let us then look specifically at God the Son: It is mentioned specifically about Christ that he **created** (Coll. 1:16; John 1:3,10; Hebr. 1:2,10), he is **almighty** (Matt. 28:18), from **eternity** (Isa. 9:6, John: 1:1-2; Coll. 1:17; Hebr. 1:12) ❧ but none of the texts you quote here say “from eternity”? Isaiah 9:6 is a future prophecy: “His name **shall be**” ❧). He is **fully God** (Isa. 9:6, John 1:1; 20:28; Hebr. 1:8) ❧ yes, He is fully God because it pleased the Father “For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell” Colossians 1:19 ❧), and at the same time **fully man** (Matt. 16:13; Luke 19:10). He **atoned** for our sins, in order to be able to offer us eternal life (1 John 4:9,10). He is our only **Savior** (Acts 4:12), he is our **mediator or spokesman** (Hebr. 4:14-15; 1 John 2:1), and he is our **example** that we should follow (1 Pet. 2:21).

❧ None of the texts you quoted mention any of the following:

That Christ is not the begotten Son of God.

That Christ is called “God the Son”

That “God the Son” is part of a trinity.

That Christ is playing the role of a Son.

That Christ is a member in a “three-one Godhead”

That Christ was not born in heaven before all things.

That “God the Son” is a co-eternal being.

That Christ had no beginning.

That Christ is the only true God alongside the Father.

That Christ is the One God the Father.

Finally, your conclusion that Jesus is not the literal begotten Son of God the Father is not based on a single passage of scripture, while there is testimony in abundance to the contrary. Your conclusion that Jesus must be a part of a trinity is not based on any plain passage. Your conclusion that Jesus is “God the Son” is an unbiblical conclusion. ❧

Let us just read a couple of texts as examples: First Coll. 1:16-17:

For by him all things were created, things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or powers or rulers or authorities; all things were created by him and for him. (v.17) He is before all things, and in him all things hold together.

❧ Let us read the passage from verse 15. The apostle Paul says, speaking of Christ, “Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature.” Notice, first: This cannot refer to his birth of the Virgin Mary, in Bethlehem of Judea, because millions of creatures, in connection with this world, had been born previous to that time. Cain and Abel had been born more than four thousand years previously. Second: The following verse makes his birth antecedent to the creation of all things in heaven and on earth, including all worlds, all ranks and orders of intelligences, visible and invisible. “For by *him*.” By whom? By the *first born of every creature*. The pronoun *him* refers to this being for its antecedent. “For **by** him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created **by** him, and for him.” Verse 16. All things in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible, thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers, evidently include all the orders of created intelligences. Now, he must have been born, i.e., had a real intelligent existence, before he could exercise creative power. But all the works of creation are ascribed to him as the “*first born of every creature*,” hence the birth here spoken of, must have been previous to the existence of the first creature in heaven or in earth. To be such, it must refer to his Divine nature, unless he had two distinctive natures before his incarnation; which thing no one believes. But the 17th verse fixes the priority of the birth here spoken of. “And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.” Here the pronoun *he* refers to the same person for its antecedent, that the pronoun *him* does; and both refer to “the first born of every creature.” And the “all things, he is” before, in this verse, are evidently the “all things” named in the previous verse. Hence the point is fully established, that it is the Divine nature of our blessed Redeemer which is here spoken of; and that this nature *was born*: and in reference to his order, he was “*the first born*.” ❧

Isaiah 9:6:

For to us a child is born, to us a son is given, and the government will be on his shoulders. And he will be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.

☞ Much stress is laid on Isaiah 9:6, as proving a trinity because Christ is called the everlasting Father. But it can have no reference to a trinity. Is Christ the Father in the trinity? If so, how is he the Son? Or if he is both Father and Son, how can there be a trinity? For a trinity is three persons. To recognize a trinity, the distinction between the Father and Son must be preserved. Christ is called “the second person in the trinity” but if this text proves a trinity, or refers to it at all, it proves that he is not the second, but the first. And if he is the first, who is the second? It is very plain that this text has no reference to such a doctrine.

The Son is the everlasting Father, not of himself, nor of his Father, but of his children. His language is “I and the children which God hath given me.” Hebrews 2:13.

“However much a shepherd may love his sheep, he loves his sons and daughters more. **Jesus is not only our shepherd; He is our "everlasting Father."** And He says, "I know Mine own, and Mine own know Me, even as the Father knoweth Me, and I know the Father." John 10:14, 15, R. V. What a statement is this!--the only-begotten Son, He who is in the bosom of the Father, He whom God has declared to be "the Man that is My fellow" (Zech. 13:7),--**the communion between Him and the eternal God is taken to represent the communion between Christ and His children on the earth!**" {EGW, DA 483} ☞

John 1:

(v.1) In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. (v.2) He was with God in the beginning. Through him all things were made, without him nothing was made that has been made. (v.4) In him was life ... (v.14) The Word became flesh and made dwellings among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the One and Only, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth, (v.18) No one has ever seen God, but God the One and Only, who is at the Father's side, has made him known.

☞ The Word was “in the beginning.” The mind of man cannot grasp the ages that are spanned in this phrase. It is not given to men to know when or how the Son was begotten; but we know that he was the Divine Word, not simply before He came to this earth to die, but even before the world was created. In verse 14, this Word, who was “in the beginning” “with God,” who “was God,” and by whom “all things were made, that were made,” is declared to be the “only begotten of the Father,” thereby teaching that in his highest nature he was begotten; and consequently as such, he must have had a beginning. This beginning goes beyond our grasp, and we cannot fathom how long Christ has had existence. Does Sister White confirm this fact? Does she say anything about how long Christ has had existence?

“Angels of God looked with amazement upon **Christ**, who took upon Himself the form of man and humbly united His divinity with humanity in order that He might minister to fallen man. It is a marvel among the heavenly angels. God has told us that He did do it, and we are to accept the Word of God just as it reads. **And although we may try to reason in regard to our Creator, how long He has had existence**, where evil first entered into our world, and all these things, we may reason about them until we fall down faint and exhausted with the research when there is yet an infinity beyond.” {EGW, 7BC 919}

This statement comes as a shocking surprise to all those who think that Ellen White was a Trinitarian. Here she clearly says that the existence of Christ is longer than we can comprehend. She would not be able to say that about Him if He never had a beginning. This phrase would not make any sense if it referred to a being that has always existed. God the Father, on the other hand, always has been. But in speaking of Christ, the prophet of God tells us that the length of His existence is beyond our comprehension. This is a golden opportunity for her to simply tell us that He had no beginning, but rather than doing that she emphatically tells us the opposite; that the length of His existence cannot be measured by any human computation of figures.

“Christ shows them that, although they might reckon His life to be less than fifty years, yet **His divine life could not be reckoned by human computation. The existence of Christ before His incarnation is not measured by figures.**” {EGW, Signs of the Times, May 3, 1899.}

This is not the language one would use to speak of someone who has no beginning. Again, rather than telling us that Christ has no beginning, she tells us that His pre-incarnate life (His divine life) is not measured in figures. I leave it with you to honestly and prayerfully ponder the import of those precious words. This testimony is so plain and clear that no amount of twisting or wrangling will dissolve its obvious meaning.

It is this beginning that John 1:1 speaks about when it is compared with Proverbs 8:22. To say otherwise would be insult and derision to our blessed Lord, the only-begotten of God. Let all men be warned of attempting to deny the Holy one of the Lord. What man is there that would dare deny the divine heritage and birthright of the only begotten Son of God? ❧

God the Holy Spirit ❧(this God mentioned here is not in the Bible. This is “**God #3**”. My brother, you have again succeeded in admitting that there are three gods! You may deny this claim, but your honesty shines through. Anyone who can count knows that God + God + God = 3 Gods. I just ask you to consider the first commandment in light of this belief. And every argument to prove three persons (gods!) is one God, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, all of them of one substance, and every way equal to each other, and all three forming but one, contradicts itself, contradicts reason, and contradicts the Bible) ❧

Then we come to God the Holy Spirit: The expression Spirit or Ghost is confusing, because it leads the thoughts to something abstract and diffuse. But “Spirit” refers to the function, not to the nature or the third person of the Godhead.

❧I have never heard that before. I am not sure how you will prove this bold claim with no Bible to support it. You are saying that the spirit is not a “spirit” in nature! What is it then? And if the spirit is not a spirit does that mean the Father is not a Father? Is the Son not a Son either? And how can you say it is not a spirit without a single Bible text? I simply cannot accept this claim. I will do as the prophet said, I will demand a “plain Thus saith the Lord”. ❧

He is also called the **Counselor** (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:7), which by the way is exactly the same word we find used about Jesus (in 1 John 2:1).

❧Which just proves what the Bible is trying to say. That the “Comforter” is none other than the “Advocate” KJV. We do not have two Advocates but only one. It is Jesus Christ (1 Tim. 2:5) ❧

Also the Holy Spirit was part of the **creating** team (Gen. 1:1-2). ❧Creating team? I do not see this terminology in my Bible. I would object to the use of this language. I was not made by a “creating team”. I was created by a personal loving Father through His beloved Son. This is what my Bible tells me. It does not tell me about any teams doing any creating! Furthermore, we dealt with this claim before, but a few more words may be in place. This text is misunderstood by nearly every Trinitarian. I do not claim that I know better, but let us just allow the Bible to explain itself. The word spirit is the Hebrew xwr *ruwach* which means breath or wind. Now let us read Psalm 33:6 and see how God created everything: “By the word of the LORD were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the **breath** of his mouth.” The Lexicon tells us that the word “breath” in this verse is that same Hebrew word used in Genesis 1:2 for ‘spirit’. This makes the passages read in perfect harmony. The spirit of the Lord is the breath of His mouth. This is what the Bible clearly teaches. It never says that the breath of his mouth is another individual being. Notice how clearly this is demonstrated in John 20:22 “And when he had said this, he **breathed** on them, and saith unto them, **Receive ye the Holy Ghost**” How beautiful! Jesus was not breathing another person called “God the Holy Spirit”. This would make absolutely no sense. The breath of Jesus is His Holy Spirit. This is how creation took place. ❧

He is called both the Spirit of God (Gen. 1:2) and the Spirit of Christ (1 Pet. 1:11).

❧Here you frankly admit what I am saying all along. This is because the Holy Spirit is the shared breath and life of God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ. The Father and the Son both have the same Holy Spirit, because they are both holy, and they are both spirit (John 4:23, 24; 1 Corinthians 15:45). Therefore the Holy Spirit is called both the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ (Romans 8:9). This does not say that the Spirit is another different person. ❧

There are many texts showing that the Holy Spirit has divine characteristics: He is **lifegiver** (Rom. 8:11), he is **omnipresent** (Psalm 139:7-8) you have already used this text before and applied it to the Father (p.35). Now you are using this passage again but apply it to the Spirit. Which one is it, the Father or the Spirit? It cannot be both for the passage speaks only of one being (note the pronouns) (☞), **omniscient** (all-knowing) (1 Cor.2:10-11) and he can **reveal the future** (Luke 2:26).

The Holy Spirit is not just the power of God. He is clearly mentioned separate from or in addition to God's power, and should therefore not be confused with God's power (Acts 10:38). The Holy Spirit *has* power, but that is different from *being* a power (Rom. 15:13; 1 Cor. 2:4).

☞ “**The divine Spirit** that the world's Redeemer promised to send, **is the presence and power of God.**” {EGW, ST, November 23, 1891 par. 1} ☞

There are many texts showing clearly that the Holy Spirit is a person. We have already noticed that he is called the “**Comforter**”. He is always referred to as “**him**” rather than “**it**” (John 16:13; Eph. 1:13-14).

☞ But the Bible does speak of the Spirit as “it”, notice: “The Spirit **itself** beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God”, “Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit **itself** maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.”, “Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when **it** testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.”, Romans 8:16, 26; 1 Peter 1:11.

This is the same also for the modern day prophet where she refers to the Spirit as “it” countless times. This would not be fitting if the Spirit is a third different person to the Father and the Son. It would be an insult to call “God the Holy Spirit” an ‘it’.

“When the Spirit of God takes possession of the heart, **it** transforms the life.” {EGW, DA 173.1}

“The Holy Spirit seeks to abide in each soul. If **it** is welcomed as an honored guest, those who receive **it** will be made complete in Christ; the good work begun will be finished; and holy thoughts, heavenly affections, and Christlike actions will take the place of impure thoughts perverse sentiments, and rebellious acts.” {EGW, 18MR 47.3}

“Instead of being repressed and driven back, the Holy Spirit should be welcomed, and **its** presence encouraged.” {EGW, NPU Gleaner, May 26, 1909 par. 4}

There are literally hundreds of such statements. These are just a mere sample. It was not strange for Mrs. White to say ‘it’ about the Spirit. But one does not find any reference where the Father or the Son are called ‘it’. Why would this be the case if she really was a Trinitarian as many people claim? How can a Trinitarian call “God the Holy Spirit” an ‘it’?

And of this fact the brethren at the White Estate are well aware. I will just quote a case in point (the devotional book *Ye Shall Receive Power* 1995) to demonstrate that there are people who realize it is improper to call the Spirit “it” if it is a “God the Holy Spirit”. These people (I do not know who they are) actually dared to tamper with the words of the Prophet of God! I know this is a very bold claim to make, but here is the proof (anyone can check it on the EGW CD) and it has also been admitted:

In the book *Ye Shall Receive Power*:

“When the Spirit of God takes possession of the heart, **He** transforms the life.” {YRP 15.2}

But the original statement reads as follows in *The Desire of Ages*:

“When the Spirit of God takes possession of the heart, **it** transforms the life.” {EGW, DA 173.1}

Here is another:

“The change of heart represented by the new birth can be brought about only by the effectual working of the Holy Spirit. **He** alone can cleanse us from all impurity. If **He** is allowed to mold and fashion our hearts, we shall be able to discern the character of the kingdom of God, and realize the necessity of the change which must be made before we can obtain entrance to this kingdom. {YRP 24.2}

But the original quote reads:

“The change of heart represented by the new birth can be brought about only by the effectual working of the Holy Spirit. **It** alone can cleanse us from all impurity. If **it** is allowed to mold and fashion our hearts,

we shall be able to discern the character of the kingdom of God, and realize the necessity of the change which must be made before we can obtain entrance to this kingdom.” {EGW, YI, September 9, 1897 par. 3}

Yet another:

YRP says

“We need to open our hearts to the influence of the Spirit, and to experience **His** transforming power.” {YRP 56.4}

But the original says

“We need to open our hearts to the influence of the Spirit, and to experience **its** transforming power.” {EGW, RH, June 24, 1884 par. 4}

And more:

YRP says

“Their minds were illuminated by the Holy Spirit, their hearts felt **His** softening, subduing influence.” {YRP 89.3}

Original says:

“Their minds were illuminated by the Holy Spirit, their hearts felt **its** softening, subduing influence.” {EGW, RH, May 23, 1893 par. 12}

I will stop here. There are much more examples that can be cited, but I will keep it brief. These are enough to demonstrate the point adequately and clearly.

Is this how the doctrine of a trinity is defended? By altering the words of the prophet!? Who dares to meddle with what the Prophet wrote? *“Every fool will be meddling.” Proverbs 20:3.* If the Prophet wrote “it” then what mortal fool is it that dares to change it to “he” or “his”? This is criminal! I must speak out plainly on this matter, for there are many of God’s dear people who are deceived on these things because they do not study for themselves. I would not dare to make such a claim had there not been glaring proof in front of my eyes. God will hold these people responsible for the deceptions that they are perpetrating upon God’s dear people. God said:

“What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: **thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.**” **Deuteronomy 12:32**

“**Add thou not unto his words,** lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.” **Proverbs 30:6**

“For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, **If any man shall add unto these things,** God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: **And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy,** God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.” **Revelation 22:18, 19**

It is such a class that the Bible calls “deceiving, and being deceived.”

As for you, my dear brother, I hope you will see the futility of using the argument that the Spirit is not called “it” in light of the foregoing. It would be a poor argument indeed if it is supported by statements that have been altered and edited! After all, anyone can do that.

You see, the Prophet had no problem calling the Spirit “it”. But today, there are many people who have a problem calling the Spirit “it”. Is it not safe to follow the Prophet anymore? ☹

The Holy Spirit refers to itself ☹(even *you* call the spirit ‘it’!)☹ as “**me**” (Acts 13:2). As a person, the Holy Spirit has **feelings** and can be hurt or offended (Isa. 63:10; Eph.4:30: “Do not grieve the Holy Spirit”). You can not grieve a power or an influence, Only a person can be grieved. As a person, the Holy Spirit has an intellect (1 Cor. 2:11), he has a will (Rom. 8:27; 1 Cor. 12:11), he makes decisions (Acts 15:28). A power cannot make a decision, only a person

can!. He speaks (John 16:13; Acts 8:29; 13:2), he shows love (Rom. 15:13), he is judging (Gen. 6:3), convincing (John 16:8).

☞ All the texts that you mention apply to the spirit as the person and presence of God, not another individual. Every one of these texts speaking of the Spirit doing something, it means that God is doing something, not someone else. God does these things **BY** His spirit, which is **Himself**, not someone else. This is true because God the Father is a spirit, He is a holy spirit (John 4:23, 24). Notice how clearly it is stated that when God gives us His spirit He is not giving us someone else, but it is **Himself**: “In giving us **His Spirit**, God gives us **Himself**, making **Himself** a fountain of divine influences, to give health and life to the world.” {EGW, 7T 273.1}

To conclude this section, none of the texts you quoted mention any of the following:

That there is a “God the Holy Spirit”.

That the Spirit is a part of a trinity.

That the Spirit is a co-equal being to God.

That the Spirit is a co-eternal being with God.

That the Spirit is present in the councils of heaven (Zec.6:12, 13).

That the Spirit will be seen in heaven by the redeemed (Rev.21:22, 23; 22:1, 3).

That the Spirit is to be worshipped.

That the Spirit is to be praised.

That the Spirit is to be prayed to.

Finally, there is no plain text that tells me your conclusion of a trinity is correct. Your conclusion that the Spirit must be a third individual person in a Godhead of three is not mentioned in a single text that you quote (it is not in any text in the whole Bible altogether). If what you say is really true, then why is there no **plain** “Thus Saith the Lord” in its support? ☞

Romans 8:26-27 is an interesting text:

We do not know what we ought to pray for, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with groans that words cannot express. And he who searches our hearts knows the mind of the Spirit, because the Spirit intercedes for the saints in accordance with God’s will.

The text tells us how the Holy Spirit is interceding for us before God ☞ (it does not say “before God”, this phrase is added by you) ☞. If—as some say—the Holy Spirit is just a part of God the Father, namely his power, the text does not make sense. because then the text says that God the Father intercedes before himself. What the verses say is that the person God the Holy Spirit intercedes for the saints before the person God the Father. God the Father does not pray to himself!

☞ Here, my brother, you have built your whole argument on the phrase that was added by *you*! If we just take the Bible as it reads without adding anything the meaning is abundantly clear.

“We have **only one channel** of approach to God. Our prayers can come to him through **one name only**,--that of the Lord Jesus our advocate. **His Spirit** must **inspire** our petitions. No strange fire was to be used in the censers that were waved before God in the sanctuary. **So the Lord himself** must kindle **in our hearts** the burning desire, if our prayers are acceptable to him. **The Holy Spirit within** must make intercessions for us, with groanings that cannot be uttered.” {EGW, RH, February 9, 1897 par. 10}.

Wonderful statement! The Holy Spirit is not “interceding for us before God” as you have suggested. No, the prophet plainly says that the Holy Spirit is “within” making intercessions for us. Our prayers come through only **ONE** channel, not two! That one channel is our Lord Jesus. The spirit **of** Jesus, “His Spirit”, inspires us as we pray. It is “the Lord himself” who kindles our hearts! Who is this “Lord”? why, it is Jesus, not anyone else! Please read that quote again carefully, my brother. It is clear that only Christ is the one who inspires our petitions. He draws them out and He presents them before His Father in heaven.

“While **Jesus ministers in the sanctuary above**, **He** is still **by His Spirit** the minister of the church on earth.” {EGW, DA 166}.

How many ministers are mentioned here? Is it not only the one minister, the Lord Jesus? Yes, “For there is one God, and **one mediator** between God and men, the man Christ Jesus” 1 Timothy 2:5. This

one mediator works on two levels. He is in heaven **in the flesh** interceding before the Father, and He (the same one: Jesus) is in our hearts **in the Spirit**. But it is the one and the same Jesus in both cases who is in heaven and who is also in our hearts. (Please see Colossians 1:27; 3:11, Galatians 1:16, John 6:56, John 14:17, **18**, 20, 23, John 15:4, John 17:23, Romans 8:10 etc.) In every one of those texts it plainly says that Christ is in us, **not** someone else. Yet Christ is not in us in His physical flesh form, but He is in us in Spirit form for He is both flesh (John 1:14) and he is also Spirit (1Cor. 15:45). We do not have two intercessors; it is blasphemous to even intimate such notions!✍

Also notice John 14:16-17. Jesus says:

I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Counselor to be with you forever—the Spirit of truth.

✍ We dealt with this before, but a few more words will not go amiss. Notice it is called the Spirit of truth. Who is this Spirit of truth? Is Jesus talking about another individual being that He will send? Who is this Spirit? **“Now the Lord is that Spirit:** and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.” 2 Corinthians 3:17. Please read that text in its context to make sure that it does mean what it actually says.✍

You see the dynamics here: God the Son ✍ (The text does not say “God the Son” it says “I”, that is, Jesus the Son of God.)✍ says he will ask God the Father to send us God the Holy Spirit ✍ (once again, “God the Holy Spirit” is added by you. The text says plainly “Comforter” KJV. We should always endeavor to take the Bible as it reads without adding “words which man’s wisdom teacheth” but only those “which the Holy Ghost teacheth”. **“Add thou not unto his words,** lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.” Proverbs 30:6.)✍. **If God is only one person, a text like this does not really make much sense, does it?** ✍ (The conclusion you draw is again based on the words that were added by *you*. I agree with you that this does not make much sense. It is the words that you are adding that do not make much sense, brother. The Bible is abundantly clear and simple. Furthermore, God the Father *is* only one person, and His Son is another person. “God is a person and Christ is a person.” {EGW, 1SAT 343.3} Furthermore, you here contradict yourself again, for you said earlier that “God is a person” (p.4)!✍

I said earlier that the differences between the three persons of the Godhead were not a difference of rank, but a difference of role or function ✍ (There is no scripture to support this claim. I am sure you would quote it, if there was such a text)✍. So what is the role, function, task or work of the Holy Spirit?

We just read a text saying that the Spirit was to be with us or in us. Later in the same chapter (John 14:26) we read that the Spirit is to **teach us and remind us** about things. In chapter 16, verse 8 in John we are told that the Holy Spirit is to **convict of sin**, righteousness and judgment. Verse 13 in same chapter talks about the Spirit **guiding us into all the truth**. And John 3:5 talks about the Holy Spirit **leading people to conversion and salvation**.

Ellen White was very clear on the personhood of the Holy Spirit being a

“divine person”, “as much a person as God is a person”

✍ The Holy Spirit is a person because God is a person. The Holy Spirit is the person of God. Therefore it is as much a person as God is a person, but not another different person. The Holy Spirit is God *in the third person*. This is known as the third person of the Godhead. This in no wise means a different individual to God. If you read that statement in its context, rather than out of it, you will clearly see that she is talking about the Lord God. It is the Lord God who is our keeper and helper. It is the Lord who hears every word uttered. Here it is in its full context:

“**The Lord** says this because **He** knows it is for our good. **He** would build a wall around us, to keep us from transgression, so that His blessing and love may be bestowed on us in rich measure. This is the reason we have established a school here. The Lord instructed us that this was the place in which we should locate, and we have had every reason to think that we are in the right place. We have been brought together as a school, and we need to realize that the Holy Spirit, who is as much a person as God is a person, is walking through these grounds, **unseen by human eyes; that the Lord God is our Keeper and Helper. He hears every word we utter** and knows every thought of the mind.” {EGW, 2SAT 136, 137, Ms 66, 1899}.

The meaning becomes clear when we quote the whole statement, rather than just half statements, which are likely to be misunderstood. Mrs. White is not here talking of more than one individual, for she is using the singular pronoun “he” all through. If she were talking of more than one she would have used “they” rather than “he”. Therefore, she is talking only of one person “The Lord”. It is “The Lord” who is our keeper, not someone else. The Lord is the one who hears every word. It is the Lord who is “unseen by human eyes,” for He is in Spirit form! And even though He is in spirit form yet He is as much a real person as if He were here physically! This is the meaning of that statement. His personal presence is His person, which is as much a person as He is a person!

Now let us compare the SOP here a little and there a little:

“**Christ walks unseen through our streets.** With messages of mercy **He** comes to our homes. With all who are seeking to minister in His name, **He** waits to co-operate. **He is in the midst of us**, to heal and to bless, if we will receive **Him.**” {EGW, MH 107}

“**Remember that Jesus is beside you wherever you go**, noting your actions **and listening to your words.** Would you be ashamed to hear his voice speaking to you, and to know that **he hears your conversation?**” {EGW, YI, February 4, 1897 par. 3}

Who walks unseen in our streets? Who is it that listens to our words and hears our conversation? Why, it is Jesus who is beside us. But, how is He beside us? In what form?

“What saith our Saviour? “**I** will not leave you comfortless: **I** will come to you.” “He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father; and **I** will love him, and will manifest **myself** to him.” When trials overshadow the soul, remember the words of Christ, **remember that He is an unseen presence in the person of the Holy Spirit**, and **He will be the peace and comfort given you**, manifesting to you that **He** is with you, the Sun of Righteousness, chasing away your darkness. “If a man love me,” Christ said, “he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and **we** will come unto him, and make our abode with him.” Be of good cheer; **light will come**, and your soul will rejoice greatly in the Lord.” {EGW, DG 185.2}

Therefore, we rightly conclude that the Holy Spirit is the unseen personal presence of the Father and the Son. The Holy Spirit is the unseen person of Christ. How so very beautiful indeed! It is Jesus, as an unseen personal presence, who is always with me. *That* is the Holy Spirit! How comforting is that thought and abundantly sweet. Jesus can comfort me for He was tempted in all points like me. He can Succor me. But how much comfort will be afforded me from someone who never took humanity, someone who was never tempted, someone who was never tried, someone who does not understand what it is like to be tempted? Yea, verily, none whatsoever! ❌

(Ev. 617,616). She also said in Desire of Ages that the Holy Spirit was the

“Third person of the Godhead”

❌ We saw earlier that speaking in the third person was not uncommon for Jesus nor for Ellen White. The third person does not lend credence to the conclusions drawn by the trinity doctrine of three co-equal, co-eternal beings. We must remember that the ‘third person’ is plainly defined by the prophet herself, and it is also a grammatical term not only numerical. ❌

Closing Words

(DA 671). With her statements on the Trinity ❌ (But Mrs. White does **not** have **one** statement about the Trinity. She **never** even uses that word at **all** in **all** her writings, which fact you have admitted) ❌, the full divinity of Christ, and the personhood of the Holy Spirit, Mrs. White pointed Adventism in a new direction ❌ (“a new direction”? Does that mean that Adventism was going in the wrong ‘old’ direction for over 80 years? And furthermore, that Christ was going to come while we were going in that ‘old’ direction? What does that tell us about the “new direction” that we are now in? Is this why we are still waiting for the ‘soon’ coming of Christ for over 160 years? This “**new** direction” is contrary to the word of God for “**Thus saith the LORD**, Stand ye in the ways, and see, **and ask for the old paths**, where is the good way, **and walk therein**, and ye shall find rest for your souls. **But they said, We will not walk therein.**” Jeremiah 6:16. Will you walk therein, my brother? Or will you “not walk therein”? I appeal to you in the name of Jesus to follow the plain “Thus saith the Lord”). ❌. These topics were studied in depth in the Bible, and the Church concluded on its present view, in line with Ellen Whites statements. Now as we have started the 21st Century, we are facing a revival of

anti-Trinitarian ideas in some circles. We even hear anti-Trinitarians maintain that their view is glorifying Christ. To teach that God the Son was begotten as God, and has not existed in all eternity, is belittling and dishonoring God.

☞ My brother, the Bible clearly and plainly teaches the Jesus *is* the only begotten Son of God. I yield to the higher authority of the word of the Living God. It is not belittling and dishonoring to God to believe His word! Shall I believe man when God Himself has spoken? “God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar” Romans 3:4

Jesus Christ existed from the days of eternity, when He was brought forth. This is why Jesus is called the eternal Son of God, for He was begotten in eternity.

“**From the days of eternity** the Lord Jesus Christ was one with the Father; He was "the image of God," the image of His greatness and majesty, "the outshining of His glory.” {EGW, DA 19}

“But while God's Word speaks of the humanity of Christ when upon this earth, it also speaks decidedly regarding his **pre-existence**. The Word existed as a divine being, **even as the eternal Son of God**, in union and oneness with his Father.” {EGW, RH, April 5, 1906 par. 5}

Jesus is called the “eternal Son of God” because His Father (God) is the eternal God. Therefore, since Christ is the Son of the eternal God then He is rightfully called “the eternal Son”.

“**He was the Son of the eternal God**, but as man's surety, he must meet and resist every temptation with which man is assailed.” {EGW, ST, May 27, 1897 par. 5}

As to His being the Son of God, it is by birth. He was the only begotten of God, the eternal Father.

“Christ, the Word, **the only begotten of God**, was one with **the eternal Father**--one in nature, in character, in purpose--the only being that could enter into all the counsels and purposes of God.” {EGW, PP 35}

“**The Eternal Father, the unchangeable one, gave his only begotten Son**, tore from his bosom Him who was made in the express image of his person, and sent him down to earth to reveal how greatly he loved mankind.” {EGW, RH, July 9, 1895 par. 13}

Please notice how the “present view” is actually out of line with Ellen White statements. Notice how Ellen White clearly and plainly explains the correct understanding and conclusion of all this matter.

“The Father and the Son **alone** are to be exalted.” {EGW, YI, July 7, 1898 par. 2}

The above statement alone should be sufficient to abolish the theory of a trinity. Honestly, how could Ellen White (if she was really a Trinitarian) make a statement like that? I recommend that you read that statement in its full context to ascertain its truthfulness and clarity. I will ask again the oft repeated question: where is ‘God the Holy Spirit’? If the Father and the Son *alone* are to be exalted, then what am I to do with ‘God the Holy Spirit’? Surely we say aright, the servant of the Lord was *not* a believer in that doctrine which is espoused by the mother of all harlots, neither in any of its varied and multitudinous forms.

Furthermore, where in the Bible does our Lord Jesus ever teach that God is a trinity? Did He not rather clearly and plainly teach that the Father is the *only* true God? (John 17:3). Did He not also teach that He Himself is the Son of that true God? (John 10:36). I believe every word that Jesus said.

Notice also the danger that results from such strange doctrines and notions. Please read this warning carefully, for it is very serious:

“The faithful Peter speaks of the **dangers** to which the Christian church would be exposed **in the last days**, and more fully describes **the heresies** which would arise and the blaspheming seducers who would

seek to draw away souls after them. "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, **even denying the Lord** that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of." Here God has worked out for us the proof of the class mentioned. **They have refused to acknowledge Christ as the Son of God, and they have no more reverence for the eternal Father than for his Son, Jesus Christ. They have neither the Son nor the Father.** And like their great leader, the rebel chief, they are **in rebellion against the law of God**, and they despise the blood of Christ." {EGW, RH, April 15, 1875 par. 11, 12}

After all, we all know that the great Law of God prohibits the worship of any trinity. It would be sad indeed to rebel against the law of God and break its first precept so blatantly. The Bible says clearly "no other gods before **me**" not 'before **us**'. Is it not clear how the trinity doctrine cannot be harmonized with the law of God, but is rather a rebellion against it? This rebellion was begun by a proud angel in heaven who wanted to be worshipped alongside God. I am so thankful that God has not left us in the dark regarding this wonderful truth.

"Let them be thankful to God for His manifold mercies and be kind to one another. They have **one God and one Saviour**; and **one Spirit--the Spirit of Christ**--is to bring unity into their ranks." {EGW, 9T 189}

"There is a **personal God, the Father**; there is a **personal Christ, the Son**." {EGW, 6BC 1068.3}

"In the Bible every duty is made plain. Every lesson given is comprehensible. **Every lesson reveals to us the Father and the Son.** The word is able to make all wise unto salvation." {EGW, 8T 157.2}

The lessons of the Bible reveal to us the Father and the Son, not a trinity! This is the revelation that is to make all men wise unto salvation. Our salvation and eternal life depends on a knowledge of the Father and the Son, not a trinity (see John 17:3).

But, alas, who hath believed our report?

While we are ignorant of this matter God does not hold us responsible, but now that the light is shining clearly on this matter, we can no longer plead ignorance. God requires repentance.

"And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent" Acts 17:30

☞ Lastly, my dear brethren, hold not your peace if you know God's truth. Please be warned that this is no time for cowards and shirkers. In a time of religious crisis it is treason to hide your colors. This warning I share with all, as my duty before God: **"If God abhors one sin above another, of which His people are guilty, it is doing nothing in case of an emergency. Indifference and neutrality in a religious crisis is regarded of God as a grievous crime and equal to the very worst type of hostility against God."** {EGW, 3T 280}. All heaven knows that we are living in the midst of a monumental religious crisis of unparalleled proportions. Please do not just do *nothing*. It is at times such as this that you need to come to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty. Remember Meroz (see Judges 5:23).

Please do not hold your peace "For if thou altogether holdest thy peace at this time, then shall there enlargement and deliverance arise to the Jews from another place; but thou and thy father's house shall be destroyed: and who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?" Esther 4:14.

My dear brothers and sisters, if you know there is error being preached and propagated and you continue to hold your peace, then know for certain that God will hold you responsible for that silence, and you will be guilty alike and will just as surely receive the displeasure of God. This is a very serious matter. **"If wrongs are apparent among His people, and if the servants of God pass on indifferent to them, they virtually sustain and justify the sinner, and are alike guilty and will just as surely receive the displeasure of God; for they will be made responsible for the sins of the guilty.** In vision I

have been pointed to many instances where the displeasure of God has been incurred by a neglect on the part of His servants to deal with the wrongs and sins existing among them. **Those who have excused these wrongs have been thought by the people to be very amiable and lovely in disposition, simply because they shunned to discharge a plain Scriptural duty. The task was not agreeable to their feelings; therefore they avoided it.**” {EGW, 3T 265, 266}

I pray you will all make the right decision, and be bold enough to stand for that decision that you make. After all, it is not the cowards who achieve glorious victories on the battlefield, but it is those who are “valiant for the truth.”

In closing, I earnestly appeal to you, my dear brother K., and to every reader of this: please be very careful what position you take. The Lord will hold you responsible if you persist in your stand after He has revealed His truth to you. **“We must receive every ray of light, and walk in it, that it may not be our condemnation in the judgment.”** {EGW, RH, September 3, 1889 par. 19}. My brother, God will hold you accountable for the souls that you mislead, and there will be an account that you will not be pleased to meet in the judgment. I know these are serious words to say, but it is a serious matter to mislead souls, for God will require their blood at your hand. I know that you are well aware of this fact. I warn you in all brotherly love and concern. Please, for your own soul’s sake, do not continue to teach and preach the trinity doctrine.

“I have been shown that many who profess to have a knowledge of present truth, know not what they believe. They do not understand the evidences of their faith. They have no just appreciation of the work for the present time. When the time of trial shall come, there are men now preaching to others, who will find, upon examining the positions they hold, **that there are many things for which they can give no satisfactory reason.** Until thus tested, they knew not their great ignorance. And there are **many in the church** who take it for granted that they understand what they believe, **but, until controversy arises, they do not know their own weakness.**” {EGW, GW 298}

I believe a basic sign of a true Christian is honesty and integrity. Everyone can make an honest mistake, but if he is made aware of it, a true Christian will be prompt to correct it. I trust that you will write around or contact all the people to whom you preached the sermon above, and make them aware of the fact that it is not a Biblically sustained theory. I hope you realize this duty that is now upon your shoulders. I have done my part in declaring to you the truth of God. It now rests with you to take action to truly “undo the damage” that has been done to God’s dear people.

The warning comes to all of us: “If, because your own minds are not clear and elevated, you give the wrong bias to other minds, God will call you to account. He will ask: “Why did you do the devil’s work when you were supposed to be doing a good work for the Master?” In the great day of final accounts the unfaithful servant will meet the result of his unfaithfulness.” {EGW, 8T 95}

My brother, I know you hold an important position of trust and responsibility, “When there are among God’s people those who have departed from the path of humble obedience...**shall we keep silence for fear of hurting their feelings?** ... And when men standing in the position of **leaders and teachers** work under the power of spiritualistic ideas and sophistries, **shall we keep silent, for fear of injuring their influence, while souls are being beguiled?** Satan will use every advantage that he can obtain to cause souls to become beclouded and perplexed in regard to the work of the church, **in regard to the word of God, and in regard to the words of warning which He has given through the testimonies of His Spirit, to guard His little flock from the subtleties of the enemy. When men stand out in defiance against the counsel of God, they are warring against God.** Is it right for those connected with such ones to treat them as if they were in perfect harmony with them, making no difference between him that serveth God and him that serveth him not? **Though they be ministers or medical missionaries, they have dishonored Christ before the forces of the loyal and the disloyal. Open rebuke is necessary, to prevent others from being ensnared.**” {EGW, SpTB02 9, 10} I have endeavored, by God’s grace, to follow and keep that testimony, for my Bible tells me “Blessed are they that keep his testimonies, and that seek him with the whole heart.” Psalms 119:2

My Bible commands me to love you, not hate you. It also tells me *how* I am to show that love: “Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart: **thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him**” for “**reproofs of instruction are the way of life.**” Leviticus 19:17; Proverbs 6:23.

I am further instructed by the Spirit of Prophecy to “**Deal faithfully with wrongdoing. Warn every soul that is in danger. Leave none to deceive themselves. Call sin by its right name.**” {EGW, DA 805, 806} My brother K., I warn you that your soul will be in grave danger if you continue to hold to this teaching after light has been shown to you. Please, do not deceive yourself and others with you. It is a sin to break God’s law, and teach others to do so (Matthew 5:19). The trinity doctrine breaks God’s law by shattering the first commandment. Therefore, the trinity doctrine (in all its forms) is sin.

I am certain, brother K., you will **not** give in to the enemy’s temptations and become offended by what I have written. I believe you love the law of God and wish to keep it with your whole heart, and the Bible says “Great peace have they which love thy law: **and nothing shall offend them.**” Psalms 119:165

If my words have wounded and bruised your soul, I am sorry; I am wounded and bruised also. In the intensity of my desire that you should make straight paths for your feet, I have written earnest words to you, but never, never, to denounce or condemn you. Oh, that God would make you understand that my deep interest in you has not changed in the least. I have a most earnest desire that you shall stand fast in God, firm, tried, and true. I know that the Lord wants you to have the crown of victory. It is for this reason that I send you this, because I am afraid for you. If I were not concerned about you I would not have taken the time and effort to write so much. But, my brother, I believe you are sincere and honest in your desire for truth. I pray that enough evidence has been provided here to clarify the truth of the matter. In the name of the Lord Jesus, the Son of the Living God, I pray that you will not harden your heart against the Holy Spirit of God.

“The secret of the LORD is with them that fear him; and he will shew them his covenant.”
Psalms 25:14

But as for me, this secret is not revealed to me for any wisdom that I have more than any living, But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty, and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen. That no flesh should glory in his presence, that, according as it is written, he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. For the Lord giveth wisdom: out of His mouth cometh knowledge and understanding. He revealeth the deep and secret things: He knoweth what is in the darkness, and the light dwelleth with Him. I thank thee, and praise thee, O thou God of my fathers for thou givest wisdom unto the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding. Nevertheless, The Lord knoweth them that are His. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.

“Finally, brethren, farewell. Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you.” 2 Corinthians 13:11

Written in much love and concern, and I pray that this will be the same spirit in which it will be received.

Blessed Sabbath to all.

Maranatha,

*For more information visit
www.acts321.org*