

**THE HEAVENLY TRIO
BACKGROUND
AND
FOREGROUND:**

**The Heavenly Trio
vis-à-vis
The Trinity**

By Dexter Aldwin M. Perral

January 2020

PROLOGUE

This treatise on the “**Heavenly Trio**” vis-à-vis the **orthodox** and **tritheistic versions** of the **trinity** was written after I had read the **transcript** of the **beautiful** and **amazing Dialogue** between **Pastor Ty Gibson**, **Pastor David Asscherick**, and **Sir Brendan Paul Valiant**.

My motivation in writing this study first emanated from the questions which arose after I had read the story of “**the Fall of Lucifer**” in the Spirit of Prophecy; and the pieces of information that evoked many questions are the following, which include but are not limited to:

- a. Lucifer was, **next to Christ**, the **third highest being** in heaven **before the fall** (Ellen White; ST, July 23, 1902);
- b. **After the fall**, **Gabriel** became the **third** highest in rank, **next** to the **Son of God** (Ellen White; DA, p. 234);
- c. Only the **Father** and the **Son** are on the **heavenly throne**; the **Father** had **exalted** His **Son** to become **equal** with Him in **authority**, and so **His Son**, **Michael** (who is like the most High), was officially **recognized** in **heaven** as the **archangel** or the **commander** of the **heavenly hosts** (Ellen White; 8T 268.3);
- d. **Satan** did not wage war against the **character** of the so-called **three God-beings [Triune God]**; on the contrary, **Satan** became **Jealous** of the **Son of God’s position** in heaven—the **reason** he instituted a **rebellion** in **heaven** (Ellen White; Ms 37, 1903);

Aside from that, there is also **not a single passage** throughout the writings of Ellen White and the Scriptures that affirm our Adventist Scholars’ **theory** that **God** and His only begotten **Son** are merely **role-playing**, and also are **not Father and Son** in a **real sense** but only in a **metaphorical sense**.

According to **Pastor George Knight**, “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. More specifically, most would not be able to agree to **belief number 2**, which deals with the doctrine of **the trinity**.”

In view thereof, having also perceived the **worldwide calls** for the Church to revisit the doctrine of the trinity, I hereby join the voices of appeals to examine and **rectify** the current popular trinity view by considering the **Triotarian-Economic Trinity view** (Heavenly Trio) of Ellen White in light of divine inspiration and scripture.

SYLLABUS

- **Prologue**
- **Heavenly Trio Background**
 - Categories of Triunity
 - Triotarian-Economic Triunity
- **Heavenly Trio Foreground**
 - **Paterology: God, the Father**
 - The Heavenly Almighty Father, the God of Jesus Christ
 - **Christology: The Son of God**
 - Jesus—God in infinity but not in personality
 - John 1:1 Quantitative vs. Qualitative Divinity
 - Created vs. Begotten/Brought Forth
 - Should there be God the Mother?
 - Proverbs 30:4—God's Name and His Son's Name
 - **Pneumatology: The Spirit of God**
 - 1 Corinthians 2:11—Spirit of God vs. spirit of man
 - John 14 Proof-text—Who is the “Another Comforter”?
 - Who is the Spirit of Truth?
 - Third-Person Perspective of Jesus
 - Heteros vs. Allos
 - Jesus and the Parakletos
 - One Mediator or two mediators?
 - The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ
 - The Holy Spirit is Jesus Christ
 - Third Person OF the Godhead vs. Third Person IN the Godhead (OF vs. IN Preposition)
 - Theotes vs. Collective Term
 - God the Holy Spirit and Pantheism
 - Is God the Holy Spirit the third person of the Godhead?
 - What does "Distinct Personality" mean?
 - 2 divine beings in 3 economic personalities
 - One Holy Spirit: The Spirit of God and The Spirit of His Son
 - 3 categories of texts: oneness, twoness, threeness
 - 3 modes of divine activity
 - Father and Son's Omnipresence in One Spirit
 - Elements of Prayer: God, His Spirit, in Jesus' Name

- **Tritheistic Trinity Version in the SDA Church**
 - Quasi-Catholic Trinity Admission in 1980
 - Statements from Adventist Theologians on the Trinity
 - Metaphorical Members of the Godhead
 - Interchangeable Role-playing Members of the Godhead
 - Tritheism/Tritheistic Trinity
 - God the Father
 - God the Son
 - God the Holy Spirit, the unforgiving third God-being?
 - Perichoresis Concept
 - Tritheism—Three (3) God-beings in One (1) God
 - Matthew 28:19 Threefold Name Juxtaposition Proof-text
 - The Holy Spirit is superfluous and redundant?
Reductio Ad Absurdum
 - 1 John 5:7 Interpolated Text
 - The Baptism Scene: The Father, The Son, and
The Dove-like Form
 - Metaphorical Father and Son? Role-playing Father and Son?
 - Matthew 16:15-16 (“who do you think that I am?”)
 - Lucifer's Jealousy of Michael [who is like the Most High]
 - The Antichrist
 - Destroying the Personality of God and His Son
 - The Ontological-Consubstantial Trinity Problem
 - Three (3) hypostases comprising one indivisible God-being
 - Orthodox/Tritheistic Trinity vs. Christ's Risk of Eternal Loss
 - Indivisible Tripartite Godness and Spiritualism
 - The Orthodox/Tritheistic Favorite Arguments
 - The Elohim Plurality Argument
 - The Echad Oneness Argument
 - The "Us" Pronoun in Genesis 1:26
 - The God is love = three (3) Theory
- **Epilogue**

Heavenly Trio: Its Background and Foreground

To begin with, under the realm of *Theology* Proper, there are four (4) different categories upon which the “divine triunity” is viewed:

1. *Ontological-Consubstantial Triunity* - The "trinity" is a singular [**one**] **supreme being** comprised of **three hypostases** [persons] sharing **one indivisible substance**;
2. *Modalistic-Oneness Triunity* - The "trinity" is comprised of **three modes or roles** occupied by **one individual**;
3. *Tritheistic Triunity* - The "trinity" is comprised of **three individual beings** who share the same nature, power, and purpose, etc.; **each of whom is ontologically and fully God, respectively**; and
4. *Trinitarian-Economic Triunity* - The "trinity" describes **three heavenly personalities whose economic offices of divine activity are distinct**.

A **question** now arises: “under which category does the ‘**Heavenly Trio**’ in the Spirit of Prophecy fall into?”

Today, many trinitarian brethren in the Seventh-day Adventist Church sincerely claim that the *Heavenly Trio* in the Spirit of Prophecy is exactly the same as the *Tripartite God* concept or the *Tritheistic Trinity Doctrine*, or even the *Ontological-Consubstantial Trinity* (the catholic/orthodox trinity).

At any rate, did you know that, with respect to the term “*Heavenly Trio*,” Ellen White, in her testimony against Dr. Kellogg ([Ms21-1906](#)), actually coined such term with the deliberate intention **to avoid any orthodox trinitarian expressions**, inasmuch as she and her son Willie had been informed by A.G. Daniels about Dr. J.H. Kellogg’s “The Living Temple” and the latter’s newly embraced trinitarian theology?

Take a look at A.G. Daniells letter to W.C. White:

“He [Kellogg] 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.” (A.G. Daniells letter to W.C. White, October 29, 1903 [brackets added])

Apparently, A.G. Daniells (then President of the General Conference) took the initiative to inform Mrs. White concerning Kellogg’s recently embraced belief in the trinity, which was a **departure** from the consensus view of the SDA Church’s non-orthodox trinitarian position at that time.

Let us also take a look at Willie White’s response to A. G. Daniells:

*“Mother and I have just read your letter of October 29 in which you speak of the various plans that have been proposed for the revising and reproduction of ‘The Living Temple’. . . I think she will write to you soon expressing her views regarding this . . . “I believe it will be necessary to issue a special Testimony soon, and this must contain a very full and clear statement on the positive side of this question, as well as articles pointing out the **errors** in the teaching of those who have departed from the truth through fascinating and deceptive theories.”* (W.C. White’s letter to A.G. Daniells, November 4, 1903).

It was then, whereafter she had been informed, that Ellen White wrote letters to Dr. Kellogg wherewith she rebuked the latter.

Meanwhile, the textual background of Mrs. White’s **“Heavenly Trio”** is further illuminated insofar as Mrs. White actually borrowed a popular trinitarian’s words against illustrations that describe **God** as **three-in-one**.

In conjunction therewith, the allusive statements evident in Mrs. White’s line of reasoning were derived from a man named *W. E. Boardman*, who was a *trinitarian*. Boardman had written a very popular book called **'The Higher Christian Life'** in 1858. In his book, he gave illustrations that trinitarians would use to support their **God** as **three-in-one** belief.

In her testimony against Dr. Kellogg, Ellen White actually borrowed what Boardman wrote almost word-for-word, but when she came to where Boardman had described the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit as **“tri-personality of the one God”** inasmuch as they are regarded as **“the living personalities of the living God”** or **“living persons of the living God,”** Mrs. White, on the contrary, said instead that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, were the **“living persons of the heavenly trio.”**

Did you notice the difference? Boardman's expressions were [orthodox] trinitarian, in which, three "persons" or "personalities" comprise the one God. On the contrary, **Ellen White never made any statement that God is composed of three beings** in respect of the Heavenly Trio, much less anywhere in all of her writings. Ellen White neither used the trinitarian expression "*Triune God*" nor the term *Trinity* in regard to the Godhead. Meanwhile, Ellen White nevertheless did not make any categorical statement in favor of nor against the term "trinity."

Now, before we proceed to the comparison between the **Heavenly Trio** and the current **popular concept of Trinity** in the SDA Church, let us first see how Ellen White carefully avoided the trinitarian expressions of W.E. Boardman.

Noteworthy is Boardman's usage of "**IS**" in describing each of the three divine persons' attributes, to wit:

*"the Father **IS** all the fulness of the godhead invisible."*

*"the Son **IS** all the fulness of the godhead manifested."*

*"the Spirit **IS** all the fulness of the godhead making manifest."*

(W. E. Boardman, Higher Christian Life, p. 106)

On the other end, Mrs. White's deviant expressions are so conspicuous, as she states thus:

*"The Father **IS** all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and is invisible to mortal sight."*

*"The Son **IS** all the fulness of the Godhead manifested. The Word of God declares Him to be "the express image of His person." "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." **Here is shown the personality of the Father.**"*

*"The Comforter that Christ promised to send after He ascended to heaven, is the Spirit **IN** all the fulness of the Godhead, making manifest the power of divine grace to all who receive and believe in Christ as a personal Saviour."*

Did you notice the **difference**? Did you see Ellen White's **modifications**?

First:

For Boardman: "the Father **is** all the fulness of the Godhead *invisible*."

For Mrs. White: "the Father **is** all the fulness of the *Godhead bodily*, and is *invisible to mortal sight*."

Second:

For Boardman: "*the Son is all the fulness of the Godhead manifested*."

For Mrs. White: "*The Son is all the fulness of the Godhead manifested. The Word of God declares Him to be 'the express image of His person.' 'God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' Here is shown the personality of the Father."*

Third:

For Boardman: "*the Spirit IS all the fulness of the Godhead making manifest*."

For Mrs. White: "*The Comforter that Christ promised to send after He ascended to heaven, is the Spirit IN all the fulness of the Godhead, making manifest the power of divine grace to all who receive and believe in Christ as a personal Saviour*."

Notice the differences, Mrs. White instead says, as compared to Boardman's statements, that:

1. The Father **IS** *the fulness of the Godhead bodily* (**yet is invisible to mortal sight**);
2. The Son **IS** *the fulness of the Godhead manifested* (**for which the personality of the Father is shown, from Whom the only begotten Son was brought forth from eternity**); and
3. The Comforter is the Spirit **IN (not IS)** all the fulness of the Godhead, making manifest the power of divine grace.

Hereinabove, Ellen White emphatically foregrounds, among other significant modifications, that the Son **IS** all the fulness of the Godhead inasmuch as the Father **IS** all the fulness of the Godhead; and when it comes, however, to the **Holy Spirit**, she changes her wording.

Did you notice that?

Here, instead of saying, “the Spirit **IS** all the fullness of the Godhead,” she says “the Spirit **IN** all the fulness of the Godhead.”

Now, what does that mean?

Logically, if Mrs. White had been putting across the idea that the Holy Spirit was an **individual being** such as the Father and the Son, she would have unambiguously and unequivocally stated that “*the Spirit IS all the fullness of the Godhead*” in that regard, as she did in regard to the Father and the Son. But in truth, she did not, did she?

Hence, for Ellen White, the Holy Spirit is **IN** the fulness of the Godhead. Yet what does that mean? That means—**the Spirit of God is not someone apart from God but is a part of God—which is IN Him (within Him).**

In view thereof, before going further, let us note that it is established by clear and convincing evidence that an **intertextuality** exists between Ellen White’s “Ms 21” (1906) and W.E. Boardman’s “The Higher Christian Life” (1858). Stated otherwise, affirmatively, Ellen White formulated her thoughts and premises upon examining Boardman's popular publication.

Conclusively, in light of Boardman's book which was full of orthodox trinitarian expressions, like “**tri-personality of the one God**” and “**the Triune God,**” as well as “**three living persons of the living God**”—not to mention “**Trinity,**” Ellen White, however, did not concur with any of these expressions. Thus, she deliberately shunned any of these orthodox trinitarian expressions and coined the Brand-New Term “**Heavenly Trio.**”

Wherefore, in the era of Mrs. White and the Pioneers, there already was a **peculiar view** held in respect of **the divine triunity**, but it was neither the orthodox trinity (catholic version), nor the tritheistic trinity (the popular quasi-catholic version among Adventists), not to mention the modalistic trinity (the Sabellianism oneness trinity version, popular among Pentecostals). So, what was it? It was the **Heavenly Trio**—the **Triotarian-Economic Triunity**. This **Triotarian view** (to be expounded hereinafter) holds the view that there is a **triunity** of divine **economic offices or personalities** who are working for the **redemption** of humanity: (1) the **Father** [our personal God], (2) the **Son of God** [Jesus our Prince and Savior], and (3) the **Holy Spirit** [not a **third being IN the Godhead** but the **third person OF the Godhead**, which also personifies Jesus Christ as a distinct personality or **agency**].

The Heavenly Trio vis-à-vis The Trinity

Having examined the background of the term “Heavenly Trio,” let us now proceed to the comparative study between the **Heavenly Trio** under the Spirit of Prophecy and the **popular version of the Trinity** in our Church, which is otherwise identified as the “**Tritheistic Trinitarianism.**” (compare tritheistic trinity from other aforementioned views on the divine triunity hereinbefore)

First, let us see if whether the **Heavenly Trio**, as many trinitarians claim, is the same as the **Tritheistic Trinity**. Let us put pressure on the probable cause in respect of why Ellen White created the term “**Heavenly Trio**” instead of unequivocally and unambiguously adopting the term “**Triune God Trinity.**”

The Heavenly Trio Foreground

The **three (3) heavenly personalities** of the **Heavenly Trio** who are working together for the redemption of man, according to the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy, are:

1. **First. God, the Father. He is the Almighty Father**—the Almighty God, YHWH the sovereign and Supreme, the Alethenos Theos, the only True GOD; He is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel; He is the Head, the Father, and the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the God who gave His only begotten Son—

“**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.**” (E. G. White, Testimonies Volume 8, p. 268);

“[L]et parents and children both remember that **God is the Father and the Owner of us all.**” (E.G. White; Ms 75, 1895)

“Yet to us, there is but **ONE GOD, the Father...**” (1 Cor. 8:6);

“Have we not all **ONE Father**? Has not **ONE God** created us?” (Mal. 2:10);

“**God** (the Father) gave us **His only begotten Son**” (John 3:16);

“...**One God and Father of all...**” (Eph. 4:6);

“Blessed be **the God and Father** of our Lord Jesus Christ ...” (1 Peter 1:3)

“For *there is* **ONE God**, and **one Mediator between God and men...**” (1 Tim. 2:5)

“...the **head of Christ is God.**” (1 Cor. 11:3)

2. **Second. Jesus, the Only Begotten Son of God**—the Prince and Savior, Jesus Christ [Michael], who inherited the nature and essence of His Father, who is God in infinity, but not in personality—

“The Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of the Father, is **truly God in infinity, but not in personality.**” (E.G. White; UL 367.4);

“The Man Christ **Jesus was not the Lord God Almighty...**” (E.G. White, Ms140, Sept 27, 1903);

“**He [Christ] was not the Father but in Him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily...**” (E.G. White, Lt8a, July 7, 1890);

“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.”** (Ellen Gould White; Selected Messages Book 1, p. 247.4);

“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 beings. ‘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.’ [John 1:1, 2.] **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.** ‘His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the **mighty God**, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace.’ [Isaiah 9:6.] **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 the works of old. **I was set up from everlasting.** ... When He appointed the foundations of the earth, **then was I with Him, as one brought up with Him;** and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him’ (Ellen White; Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 34.1);

(Note: Is there any **other being**, let alone a **third co-equal being**, that could enter into all the counsels and purposes of God, **other than the dearly beloved begotten Son of God?** Is there?)

At any rate, before we proceed with the next quotation and give our summative commentary for this number, let us first underscore **Ellen White’s emphasis on John 1:1** wherein she highlighted the relationship between **God and His Son.**

John 1:1 says:

“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with [**the**] **God**, and the word was **God**.”

Now, let us see the original Greek text:

“Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος.”

As you can see in John 1:1, the word **God** is mentioned **twice**, but in the original Greek text, two different terms were used by John to leave a distinction (**semantics**).

To clearly see and notice the distinction made by John, let us transliterate, and apply **lexico-semantic analysis** to, the text in John 1:1:

En archē ēn ho Logos, kai ho Logos ēn pròs tòn Theón, kai theòs ēn ho Logos.

Now, you can see that John used **two terms** to speak of **two (2) divine beings**: the first is the Almighty God (tòn Theón) and the second is the Logos (theòs). **Grammatically**, the first one is a **noun** (τὸν Θεόν) referring to the **Father**, and the other is an **adjective** (Θεός) describing **Jesus**.

Thus, to simplify, we can construe the text to mean that: **The Word was then with the Divine Being from eternity, and what the Divine Being was, also was the Word**—forasmuch as **the Word** was likewise **divine**.

Now, who are these two Divine Beings? **God and the Son of God** are the two divine beings, are they not? But, does that already mean that we have a **biune God**, or that we worship **two Gods**?

No, **we only have one God, the Father**, and we have **one Lord, Jesus Christ**. (1 Cor. 8:6; John 17:3; 1 John 5:20)

In English language, **quantitatively**, there is only **one God (the Father)**; yet, **qualitatively**, there are **two divine beings (Father and Son) identified as God**, respectively. (This principle will be expounded further)

Nevertheless, **we honor God and we honor also His beloved Son**, do we not? We exalt two divine beings, **the Father and the Son**, because **our fellowship** is with **the two divine beings**. (See John 5:23; 1 John 1:3)

In light of the statements quoted from the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy, it is revealed to us that **the Father and the Son have one substance and one spirit**, inasmuch as **the Son inherited the nature and essence of His Father**, as the Father is the source of His Son's life. However, many trinitarian brethren claim that Christ was given life only in His incarnation, in light of John 5:26. Is that true and tenable?

Was Christ not given life in Himself even before His incarnation? Has He not had life in Himself **before, during and since the incarnation?**

Would it make sense if He was given life only in the incarnation if He already had it? If that life was only incarnational, then how would **John 5:26** be reconciled with **Proverbs 8:22-31** wherein **Christ declared Himself that He was brought forth** before all creation began? **Would Proverbs 8:22-31 be also interpreted as incarnational? Could it be?**

Let us once again see **Ellen White's statement** as she quotes **Proverbs 8:22-31:**

“And the Son of God declares concerning Himself: ‘The Lord possessed Me in the beginning of His way, before the works of old. **I was set up from everlasting. ... When He appointed the foundations of the earth, then was I with Him, as one brought up with Him;** and I was daily His delight, **rejoicing always before Him”** (Ellen G. White; Patriarchs and Prophets, p. 34.1)

So clear, we only have **One YHWH—He is the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, from Whom and from Whose Own Bosom Jesus His Son was brought forth;** so, for that reason, **Jesus is also divine as much as His Father is divine,** because **the Son of God inherited the essence of God** (Prov. 8:22-31; 30:4; 1 Cor. 1:24, John 1:18; 5:26; Col. 1:15-17).

Yet, a question arises: **“If we accept that Jesus is really the begotten Son of God, does that make us concede that Jesus is only created by God, the Father”?**

No, the Spirit of Prophecy clearly makes a distinction between ‘created’ and ‘begotten’:

“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.”** (E.G. White; ST, 1895)

That is why Ellen White acknowledges this **quantitative** and **qualitative divinity** principle, as she states:

“God's love for the world was not manifest because **He sent His Son**, but because **He** loved the world, **He sent His Son into the world** that divinity clothed with humanity might touch humanity, while divinity lay hold of infinity. Though sin had produced a gulf between man and his God, divine benevolence provided a plan to bridge that gulf. **And what material did He use? A part of Himself**. The **brightness of the Father's glory** came to a world all seared and marred with the curse, and **in His own divine character, in His own divine body**, bridged the gulf and opened **a channel of communication between God and man**.” (E.G. White, Lt36a, Sept 18, 1890)

“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.” (Ellen White; RH, July 9, 1895, para. 13)

A subsequent **question** might then arise: **“if Jesus was a real begotten Son of God the Father, would there not be a need for a mother together with the Father in heaven from whom Christ was brought forth?”**

Well, when **Eve** was **taken from** the substance of Adam, **was there any need for a mother** by whom **Eve** would be **brought forth? Was there?** The answer to that is, of course, **needless to say**.

Let us again take a look at these statements:

“The man **Christ Jesus was not the Lord God Almighty...**” (Ellen White; Lift Him Up, 235.3)

“The Lord **Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of the Father, is truly God in infinity, but not in personality**.” (E.G. White; UL 367.4)

In view thereof, **quantitatively**, there is **one God** (the Father); and **qualitatively**, there are **two divine [God] beings** (God and the Son of God).

To expound, let us apply the principle in John 1:1 to Adam and Eve:

“In the beginning was **Eve**, and **Eve was with Adam**, and **Eve was Adam**.”

“In the beginning was **Eve**, and **Eve was with [the] human**, and **Eve was human**.”

(Note: in **Genesis 5:2**, **Adam** and **Eve** were called **ADAM**)

“Adam had enjoyed the companionship of God and of holy angels. ... Love, gratitude, loyalty to the Creator—all were overborne by love to Eve. **She was a part of himself** ...” (E.G. White, PP, 56.2)

(Note: **Christ** was a **part of God Himself**; **Eve** was a **part of Adam himself**)

Thus, **quantitatively**, there is **one Adam**, (*the husband of Eve*); and **qualitatively**, there are **two human (Adam) beings** (*Adam and Eve*).

(Note: **The head of Eve** was **Adam**, **the head of Christ** is **God, the Father** [1 Cor. 11:3])

Ultimately, let us read this quote from the Book of Proverbs:

“**Who has ascended into heaven, or descended? Who has gathered the wind in His fists? Who has bound the waters in a garment? *Who has established all the ends of the earth?* What is His name, and what is His Son’s name, if you know?” (Proverbs 30:4)**

So, what is the **name of God** and what is the **name of the Son of God**, if you know? **Jesus is**, without a shadow of doubt, **the Son of God**, the **Son of YHWH** who also bears **the name of YHWH**. (See Exo. 23:20-21; Psa. 110:1; Matt. 22:44-45)

Wherefore, **Jesus is qualitatively God**; **He is God in essence as He was brought forth from the bosom of His Father, yet our personal God is our Almighty Father in heaven alone—to whom we pray in Jesus’ Name.**

3. Third. The One Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit—the divine omnipresence of God Himself and not someone else, which is never an ontologically independent individual or a separate being apart from God—

1 Corinthians 2:11 says, “For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the **spirit of man** which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the **Spirit of God.**”

Let us begin with 1 Corinthians 2:11 for our premise.

Throughout the Bible, **if there is a Spirit of God, there is also a spirit of man**, not to mention the spirit of the devil (evil spirit).

However, under our Adventist brethren’s **tritheistic trinity** view, the **Spirit of God** is deemed to be **a separate being or an independent entity apart from God Himself.**

Following this logic, if the **Spirit of God** is a separate being or an independent entity **apart from God Himself**, then it is a logical necessity to maintain that the **spirit of man must also be a separate being** or an independent entity apart from man himself, right?

Here is the logic of the **tritheistic trinitarian view**, to wit:

Because **the Spirit of God has a will, intelligence, emotion, and all the attributes of a living person,** then it follows that **the Spirit of God must also be a person who is an independent being, separate and apart from the person of God himself.**

Applying this trinitarian logic to the **spirit of man vis-à-vis the Spirit of God**, it follows then that **the spirit of man must also be a person but another independent being** who is **separate and apart from the person of a man himself.** Why? **Because the spirit of man also has a will, intelligence, emotion, and all the attributes of a living person.**

Does the **spirit of man** also not have a **will, intelligence, emotion, and all the attributes of a living person**? Let us confirm.

Under the Bible, the **spirit of man** includes, but limits not to, the following attributes:

- It has a will (Mark 14:38; Matthew 26:41; Exodus 35:21)
- It can be grieved/vexed (Daniel 7:15; Isaiah 65:14, 54:6; Ecclesiastes 1:14,17)
- It can have joy (Colossians 2:5, Luke 10:21, 1:47)
- It can be troubled (2 Corinthians 2:13, John 13:21, Daniel 2:1, 3; Psalms 143:7; Job 21:4; Genesis 41:8)
- It can be refreshed (1 Corinthians 16:18; 2 Corinthians 7:13, Luke 8:55; 1 Samuel 30:12; Judges 15:19; Genesis 45:27)
- It Can be haughty/prideful or humble/patient (Isaiah 66:2; 57:15; Ecclesiastes 7:8; Proverbs 29:23, 16:18-19, Psalms 34:18)
- It can bless, pray (1 Corinthians 14:16, 14:14)
- It can judge, make decisions (1 Corinthians 5:3; Acts 19:21)
- It Can be stirred (Acts 17:16, Haggai 1:142; 2 Chronicles 36:22; 1 Chron 5:26)
- It Can groan, faint (John 11:33; Ezekiel 21:7)
- It Can be overwhelmed (Psalms 142:3, 143:4)
- It Can be anguished (Job 7:11; Exodus 6:9)
- It Can be sorrowful (1 Kings 21:5; 1 Samuel 1:15)

Now you see; so, let us now look at the parallelism between the **Spirit of God as a person** and the **spirit of man as a person**.

To reiterate, under the tritheistic trinitarian doctrine, the **Spirit of God** is a person **but a separate and independent being apart from God Himself**; yet on the other side, **the spirit of man, albeit deemed a person, is not, however, considered as a separate and independent being apart from man himself**.

Yet, to be coherent, if the **Spirit of God**, besides God, is **God the Spirit** who is ontologically independent or a different individual being, then it follows that the **spirit of man**, besides man, **must** also be **man the spirit** who is likewise ontologically independent and different individual, right?

So, did you see **an error** at first sight? Did you see a **theological and logical inconsistency therewith**? Did you see **the problem in separating the spirit of the person** from whom it belongs? Did you see that, whether we like it or not, **there conjures up a spiritualism doctrine**, which is contrary to the teaching of the SDA Church?

Furthermore, let us look at the **original language** if there is a contextual difference between the English translation and the original Greek text:

“τίς γὰρ οἶδεν ἀνθρώπων τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ; οὕτως καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐδεὶς ἔγνωκεν εἰ μὴ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ.” 1 Corinthians 2:11

(“for what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? **Even so** the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.”)

Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ vis-à-vis πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου:

Looking at the text, **Pneuma tou Theou** (the Spirit of God) and **Pneuma tou anthrōpou** (the spirit of man) were placed by Apostle Paul in direct parallelism, as it reads.

Did you notice the phrase “**even so**”? Does not the phrase “even so” mean “**in like manner**”?

The above-quoted text tells us that ‘**what man’s spirit is to man**’ is the same as ‘**what God’s spirit is to God,**’ does it not?

Now, tritheistic trinitarians would argue that it should be understood that the **Spirit of God is the Holy Spirit**, who is a **separate being and independent from God Himself**, while the spirit of man, from the man himself, is not a different individual being.

So, the question is, which part of the text whereupon Apostle Paul meant that the Spirit of God should be understood as **another being** separate from God himself, while the spirit of man is not?

Where did Paul say in his statement that **the Spirit of God is another individual**, while **the spirit of man cannot be another individual**?

Is it not a **fallacy from eisegesis** if and when the text should be construed contrary to its clear, obvious, unambiguous and unequivocal meaning?

Assuming arguendo that our other tritheistic trinitarian brethren would **deny** that **the Spirit of God is the Holy Spirit** in this case, in order to escape from their theological dilemma in 1 Corinthians 2:11, would that excuse, however, find favor in the sight of any theologian with a sound and reasonable mind? Would that assertion prevail over the standard of logical and theological consistency?

Indeed, **some tritheistic-trinitarian theologians claim that the Spirit of God in 1 Corinthians 2:11 does not refer to the Holy Spirit to escape from this quandary.** However, *in page 671, Volume 6 of the SDA Bible Commentary*, it unequivocally reads, with respect to the Spirit of God in 1 Corinthians 2:11: **“The reference is to the Holy Spirit.”**

Now, in light of that **explicit statement** that **the Spirit of God in 1 Cor. 2:11 refers to the Holy Spirit**, according to the SDA Bible Commentary, **in whom should we then believe?**

Would any tritheistic-trinitarian **apologist** really assert that **the aforequoted statement from the SDA Bible Commentary is erroneous?**

At any rate, **let us put this logic to a test.** Let us read these following verses:

“Now in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign, Nebuchadnezzar had dreams; and **his spirit was so troubled** that his sleep left him” (Daniel 2:1).

“**I, Daniel, was grieved in my spirit** within my body, and the visions of my head troubled me” (Daniel 7:15).

“Now while Paul waited for them at Athens, **his spirit was provoked** within him when he saw that the city was given over to idols” (Acts 17:16).

“When Jesus had said these things, **He was troubled in spirit**, and testified and said, “Most assuredly, I say to you, one of you will betray Me” (John 13:21).

Now, let us ask ourselves with these questions:

- ✓ In Daniel 2:1, when **Nebuchadnezzar's spirit (ruach) was troubled**, was it really Nebuchadnezzar who was troubled—or **someone else who was a separate being apart from himself?** (It might be **Nebuchadnezzar the spirit?**)
- ✓ In Daniel 7:15, when **Daniel's spirit (ruach) was grieved**, was it really Daniel who was grieved—or **someone else who was a separate being apart from himself?** (It might be **Daniel the spirit?**)
- ✓ In Acts 17:16, when **Paul's spirit (pneuma) was provoked**, was it really Paul who was provoked—or **someone else who was a separate being apart from himself?** (It might be **Paul the spirit?**)
- ✓ In John 13:21, when **Jesus' spirit (pneuma) was troubled**, was it really Jesus who was troubled—or **someone else who was a separate being apart from himself?** (It might be **Jesus the spirit?**)

I believe, you know the right answer.

The truth speaks for itself. Res ipsa loquitur.

Needless to say, the idea of "**man the spirit**" and "**God the Spirit**" is **contrary to reason**. It is erroneous to replace the "**spirit of man**" with "**man the spirit**" and the "**Spirit of God**" with "**God the Spirit**, in turn."

In view of the foregoing premises, it is an inevitable conclusion that the spirit of man refers, without a shadow of doubt, to the **mind, character, and personality** of **man**—to **man himself, not to someone else**.

Wherefore, concurrently, the Spirit of God incontrovertibly and indubitably refers to the **mind, character, and personality of God**—to **God Himself, not to someone else**.

Note: "**In giving us His Spirit, God gives us Himself [not someone else]**." (E.G. White, 7T 273.1, 1902 [brackets added])

Now, the next question is: "What about the "**another comforter**," the Holy Ghost (*parakletos*), in John chapter 14?"

That is an interesting question! You might ask, “**Did Jesus not say that the Holy Spirit is a different being to Himself** when He promised to send us ‘another Comforter’?” How could the word “**another**” not mean another **different being to Jesus Christ**?

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

So what did **Jesus** mean when **He** mentioned “**another Comforter**”? Was He not talking about **someone different to Himself**?

Well, let us see what Jesus said two verses later (John 14:18); Christ says clearly, “**I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you.**”

Oh, is this “**another comforter**” none other than Christ Himself in **another form** (Spirit form)?

Let us see what the Spirit of Prophecy says about this:

“But **Jesus** had assured them that **He** would send the **Comforter**, **as an equivalent for His visible presence.**” (Ellen G. White; Spirit of Prophecy, Vol. 3, p. 256)

“**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 omnipresent.**” (Ellen G. White, Manuscript Releases, vol. 14, p. 93)

“**The Holy Spirit is [Christ] Himself, divested of the personality of humanity...**” (Ellen G. White, Lt119, February 18, 1895 [Brackets added])

“The **Holy Spirit** is **Christ Himself, divested of the personality of humanity...**” Ask yourself this question, “**if Ellen White never meant that the Holy Spirit is Christ Himself who once clothed Himself with humanity, why did she say that the Holy Spirit is Christ Himself, “DIVESTED” of the personality of humanity?**” “**Would the Holy Spirit**

divest Himself of the personality of humanity if never did He once clothe Himself with humanity?” Of course, the answer to that is obvious.

Notice, Jesus stated in John 16:13 thus: “However, when He, **the Spirit of truth**, has come, He will guide you into all truth...”

Who is the Spirit of truth according to the Spirit of Prophecy?

“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.” (Ellen G. White, 14MR 179.2)

“Jesus comes to you as the SPIRIT of TRUTH; study the mind of the Spirit, consult your Lord, follow His way.” (E.G. White, 2MR 337.1)

“**Christ** was about to depart to His home in the heavenly courts. But He assured His disciples that He would send them **another Comforter**, who would abide with them forever. To the guidance of this **Comforter** all who believe in **CHRIST** may implicitly trust. **HE is the SPIRIT OF TRUTH**, but this truth the world can neither discern nor receive.” (E.G. White, 12MR 260.1)

“How shall I bear impressively the commission Christ has given to His people—the privilege of being workers with the **SPIRIT OF ALL TRUTH manifest in the flesh—the DIVINE SON OF GOD, clothed with humanity**, a channel devised and prepared to be continually receiving and imparting the heavenly current? **Himself the overflowing fountain**, He receives to communicate to all those who will accept the gift.” (Ellen G. White; Ms125-1906.13)

It is clear in the Spirit of Prophecy that the **Holy Spirit** (as “another Comforter”) and the **Spirit of Truth** is **Jesus Christ Himself**.

The **question** is, **are these statements of Mrs. White in accordance with the Bible?** To confirm, let us see how the disciples understood what Christ was talking about.

John 14:22 says, “**Judas** saith unto him, not Iscariot, **Lord**, **how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?**” Notice, his question is **not “Who?”** but it is “**How?**”; he also says “**thou**” and “**thyself**” regarding **Christ, not someone else.**”

As you can infer, **Judas and the disciples** were not wondering “**WHO**” would come to them as another Comforter, **but they did wonder “HOW” Christ would be coming back to them.**

Did you know that Jesus was speaking in **figurative language** when He talked to the disciples? (See John 16:25) Have you ever realized that Jesus, in many times, spoke in the **third person** as He refers to the Son of Man/Son of God, with which **He was not referring to someone else** but to **HIMSELF**? Have you noticed Jesus identified Himself in the **THIRD PERSON** by referring to Himself as the **Son of Man/God**, the **Lamb**, the **Messiah**, although all of which point out to no less than **Jesus Christ**?

The Spirit of Prophecy also acknowledges **the third-person perspective of Jesus**:

“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.**” (The Desire of Ages, p. 800.1)

An example of **Christ’s appearance in another form** was demonstrated on His way to Emmaus, which can be found in Mark 16: 12; the text says:

“After that **He appeared in another form** unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country.”

Another use of the word “**another**” while having the same reference can be found in 1 Samuel 10:6, wherein prophet Samuel tells Saul:

“And the Spirit of the LORD will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into **another man.**”

Now, a question arises in respect of 1 Samuel 10:6, “was prophet Samuel referring to **another being** other than Saul when he said about ‘**another man**’ in the passage?” Of course, the answer to that is obvious.

Furthermore, John did not use the term “**Heteros**” to describe the “**Parakletos**.” “**Heteros**” is a variant term for “**another**” in Greek which means “**another of a different kind**.” On the contrary, the Greek term used by John for the “**another comforter**” is **ALLOS** [*allon*] **Parakletos**. **Allos** means “**another of the same kind and quality**.” Thus, it can mean “**another form but the same being**.”

Meanwhile, our tritheistic trinitarian brethren often quote John 14:16 as a proof-text that the “**another (ἄλλος, allos) comforter**” cannot be Christ Himself but a **different being**.

Nevertheless, let us contextually examine how John used “**another (ἄλλος, allos)**” in **another passage of the same book** (John 18:15-16):

“And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and so did **another disciple**. Now that disciple was known to the high priest, and went with Jesus into the courtyard of the high priest. But Peter stood at the door outside. Then the other disciple, who was known to the high priest, went out and spoke to her who kept the door, and brought Peter in.”

Now, is John not speaking in the third person when he talked about “**another disciple**” in the passage? Is John referring to someone else when he talked about “**another disciple**” in the passage?

It is John himself speaking in the third person; Ellen White affirms that it is indeed he:

“Simon Peter had followed Jesus, **and so had another disciple. That disciple, John**, ‘was known unto the high priest, and went in with Jesus into the palace of the high priest. But Peter stood at the door without. Then went out that other disciple, which was known unto the high priest, and spake unto her that kept the door, and brought in Peter.’” (Ellen White; Review and Herald; December 26, 1899, par. 3)

Is this not the same principle of perspective when Jesus was saying that He would give “**another [allos] parakletos**”? Was Jesus really referring to another being other than Himself as He spoke about the **promised comforter**?

Nevertheless, let us further exhaust our analysis between **Jesus** and the “**Another Comforter**” under John 14. Take a look at this table:

Jesus	Another Comforter
“the world seeth Me no more” (Verse 19)	The world “seeth Him not” (Verse 17)
“I in you” (Verse 20)	“He dwelleth with you” (Verse 17)
“I will come to you” (Verse 18)	“He will be in you” (Verse 17)
“Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world” (Matt 28:20)	“He may abide with you forever” (Verse 16)

Moreover, you can also see that, John, being the **same author** of **John 14** and **1 John 2**, consistently maintains that “Jesus is the one and the same **PARAKLETOS** (Παράκλητον).” Apostle John says: “...[B]ut if anyone sins, we have a **paraklétos** [**comforter, advocate**]), **Jesus Christ the righteous.**” (1John 2:1)

The intertextuality between John’s writings gives rise to the link: that the “**Allos Parakletos**” in John 14 and the “**Parakletos**” in 1 John 2 is identified as no less and no other than Jesus Christ.

Furthermore, the Spirit of Prophecy maintains the same consistency with respect to the fact that “we only have **one mediator** between God and man, **Jesus Christ** (1 Timothy 2:5):

“And **Jesus** said He would give us the **Comforter**. What is the **Comforter**? It is the **Holy Spirit of God**. What is the **Holy Spirit**? It is the **representative** of **Jesus Christ**; IT is our **Advocate** that stands by our side and places our petitions before the Father all fragrant with His merits.” — (E.G. White, Reflecting Christ, 285.4, 1985).

“If you have **sin** of a private character, **confess it to Christ**, **who is the only mediator** between God and man. “If any man sin, we have an **advocate** with the Father, **Jesus Christ the Righteous.**” (E.G. White, GCDB, February 26, 1897)

“**Jesus alone** is our **Redeemer**, our **Advocate**, and **Mediator**; **in Him** is **our only hope** for pardon, peace, and righteousness.” (E.G. White, Signs of the Times, August 22, 1892)

It is clear from the above-quoted statements under the Spirit of Prophecy that there is only **one mediator, Jesus Christ** who is in the **Heavenly Sanctuary**, and **He ministers on earth by His Spirit**. The Spirit of Prophecy explicitly states it:

“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.” (Ellen White; DA, 166.2)

Furthermore, let us look into these explicit statements under the Spirit of Prophecy:

“The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ; it is His representative.” (Ellen White, 13MR 313.3, 1895)

“Christ is withdrawn only from the eye of sense, but He is as truly present by His Spirit as when He was visibly present on earth.” (Ellen White; ST April 7, 1890, par. 6)

“When trials overshadow the soul, remember the words of CHRIST, remember that HE is an unseen presence in the PERSON of the Holy Spirit...” — (Ellen G. White, DG 185.2, 1897)

“It is not safe to catch the spirit from another. We want the Holy Spirit, which is Jesus Christ.” (Ellen G. White, Letter 66; April 10th 1894)

In view of the pieces of evidence, **the comforter is NOT ANOTHER BEING; He is Jesus Christ HIMSELF** with a glorious influence and power, after He ascended to His father and took off His **CUMBERED HUMAN BODY**, so that He could thereby become **omnipresent**.

Yet, the Spirit of Prophecy also states:

“Christ gave His representative, the third person of the Godhead, the Holy Spirit.” — (Ellen G. White, CTr 301.4)

Now, a question arises: if the **Holy Spirit** is **the third person of the Godhead**, then it must be **another being** other than **Jesus Christ**, is it not?

This is really an interesting question; but **did you notice** that Ellen White wrote “third person **OF** the Godhead” rather than “third person **IN** the Godhead”?

You might say that such preposition does not make any difference. But **does it not really make any difference?**

Grammatically speaking, “**OF**” means “**belonging to**” or “**relating to**”—a preposition that denotes **possessive** or **indicative reference**. Whereas, “**IN**” means a preposition that is used to indicate “**inclusion, position, or location.**” (Merriam-Webster Dictionary)

Did you notice that **orthodox** or **tritheistic** trinitarians would say “there are three persons **IN** the Godhead” rather than saying “there are three persons **OF** the Godhead”?

Did you notice that it is **grammatically infirm** to use the prepositional phrase “**OF** the Godhead” if and when orthodox/tritheistic trinitarians would mean to say about a ‘**Triune God Trinity**,’ inasmuch as the **Tripartite Godness or the Three God-beings concept** can only be said correctly by saying “there are three persons **IN** the Godhead”—not that “there are three persons **OF** the Godhead”?

Compare:

“When God is **IN** the family”

vis-à-vis

“When God is **OF** the family.”

Do these two statements mean the same?

More precisely, compare:

“Third Person **IN** the family”

vis-à-vis

“Third Person **OF** the family”

Do the statements above mean the same? Obviously, “**OF**” is not an appropriate preposition in respect of identifying an **individual’s ontological relationship or position**, in relation to the context set forth.

Under the Original Biblical Language, the term for “**Godhead**” is “**theotēs**” [in Greek] which simply means **divinity or deity**—**not about plurality of beings**. Apparently, Ellen White wrote "third person **OF** the **Godhead**" to mean that the **Holy Spirit** is, **possessively, OF** the **Godhead [or deity]**, rather than saying “third person **IN** the **Godhead**” which could be **tritheistic** or **consubstantial** in meaning, in which “**Godhead**” would be used as a **collective term**, to the extent that the Holy Spirit would be deemed a **third God-being** that would be called “**God the Holy Spirit.**”

A question now arises: who is the **third person** of the **Godhead**? Is He really a **third being** called **God the Holy Spirit**?

Parenthetically, do you remember why Ellen White asserts that the Holy Spirit is really a **person**? Do you remember the **pantheistic ideas** she refuted concerning the Holy Spirit as an **omnipresent divine substance**?

That sets the context; and hereinbefore, we have already discussed that it is erroneous and unbiblical to bifurcate or separate **the Spirit of God** from **God** in order to create **another God-being**.

Now, who is this **third person OF** the **Godhead**? Let us see if whether He is really **another being—a third God-being**.

The Spirit of Prophecy says:

“**Sin** could be resisted and overcome **only** through the mighty agency of the **third person OF the Godhead**...” (E.G. White, The Desire of Ages, 671.2, 1898)

Notice what the statement says: “**Only** through the **mighty agency** of the **third person** of the **Godhead**.” It says **ONLY**. Only what? Again, **ONLY** through the **mighty agency** of the **third person** of the **Godhead that SIN** could be **resisted** and **overcome**.

At any rate, many of our trinitarian brethren end with the above-quoted statement, by which they conclude that **ONLY** through **this third-person** who is **considered** as a **third God-being (through whom ALONE)** we can **overcome sin**.

But the question is, if the “**third person**” is really an entirely and ontologically **different being**, how is it then that the Spirit of Prophecy declares that **Christ** or **His Spirit** is the **ONE** who **helps** us **resist** and **overcome sin**?

The Spirit of Prophecy speaks:

“There is **no power in you APART from Christ**, but it is your privilege to have **Christ abiding in your heart** by faith, and **He can OVERCOME sin in you**, when you cooperate with His efforts.” (Ellen White; OHC, 76.5)

“**Jesus ALONE has power to save from sin, to free from the power of evil**; and to doubt him who has laid down his life for us, is to grieve and insult the Father...” (Ellen White; RH, Feb 10, 1891)

“The **ONLY defense against evil is the indwelling of Christ** in the heart through faith in His righteousness.” (Ellen White; DA, 324.1)

“With **His Spirit Christ** sends a reconciling influence and a **power that takes away SIN**.” (Ellen White; RH, May 19, 1904)

Again, if “**Sin could be resisted and overcome ONLY through the mighty agency of the third person of the Godhead**,” how is it then that **Jesus ALONE has power to save from sin, to free from the power of evil**, and that the **ONLY defense against evil is the indwelling of Christ** in the heart through faith in His righteousness? **Could it be that the third person OF the Godhead and Jesus Christ are one and the same being?**

The Spirit of Prophecy also has the answer to that question:

“**Jesus is present in the Person of His representative, the Holy Spirit**, reviving the hearts of the humble and contrite ones.” (Ellen White; 12MR 145.2)

“When trials overshadow the soul, remember the words of **Christ**, remember that **He is an unseen presence in the Person of the Holy Spirit**.” — (Ellen G. White, DG 185.2)

The Spirit of Prophecy also explains why the **Holy Spirit** is called the **third person**:

“The **Holy Spirit** is the **Comforter**, in **Christ's name**. **He personifies Christ, yet is a distinct personality.**” (Ellen White; 20MR, 324.2)

So, the **Holy Spirit** is a **person** because it **personifies** the **omnipresence** of **Christ**. Let us read this aforementioned statement again:

“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.**” (Ellen G. White, 14MR 179.2)

Clearly, the **Holy Spirit** is the **Comforter**; it is the **PERSONAL omnipresence** of the **Spirit of Christ**.

Do you remember what **Jesus** said in Matthew 18:20? He said, “For **where two or three are gathered together in My name, I am there in the midst of them.**”

Can you now imagine How **Jesus** is **omnipresent** by his Spirit—how **He** can be **present** when **two** or **three** are **gathered together** in **His name**?

Let us also read this aforementioned statement again:

“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.” (Ellen White; DA, 166.2)

You now see it. That is how **Christ's power** of omnipresence works.

Nevertheless, let us expound our analysis with respect to the idea that the **Holy Spirit personifies** **Jesus Christ** as **distinct personality**.

Let us have an analogy about “**two (2) beings = three (3) persons.**”

Let us have a comparison between the **Heavenly Trio** and, let us call the other, the **Triotarian Firm**—

The **Heavenly Trio** consists of:

1. **One God**, the Almighty Father in heaven, who gave us His only begotten Son (E. G. White, Testimonies Volume 8, p. 268);
2. **One Lord**, Jesus Christ, the Son of the Almighty God, who is God in infinity but not in personality (E.G. White, UL 367.4; Ms140, Sept 27, 1903); and
3. **One Spirit**, the omnipresence of God, which also personifies Jesus Christ, yet a distinct personality (Ellen G. White; Education, 132.2; YI, par. 5, 1897; Ms 93, 1893, par. 8).

In the **Heavenly Trio**, there are **two divine beings**, yet there are **three persons**. (**Two [2] divine beings yet three [3] economic persons**)

How could that be possible? Let us now apply our analogy.

Suppose, in the **Triotarian Firm**, there are **two business partners**; so, there are **two individual beings** here, and these **two individuals** are **persons**, right?

Now, how about the **Triotarian Firm**, is it not a **person**?

Before we answer that, are there not many **categories of persons** in the realm of **language**? For instance, does not **personification** per se produce a **person**, albeit not a **being**? Another one, is a grammatical **first-person** or **third-person** not a **person**, albeit not a **being**?

Anyway, did you know what a **juridical person** is?

“A **Juridical Person** is a non-human legal entity; it refers to any organization (partnership or corporation) that is **not a single natural person** but is authorized by law with duties and rights and is recognized as a **legal person** and as having a **distinct personality or identity**.” (Dictionary)

Now, is the **Triotarian Firm** not a **Juridical Person**? Does not a **partnership** between **two (2) persons** create a **juridical person** that becomes a **distinct personality**?

Obviously, in the **Triotarian Firm (partnership)**, there are **two (2) persons** who formed the partnership (**two [2] individual beings**), yet this **partnership**, which **they had formed, created a juridical person** that **can act as a person**—who can likewise deal with any business or legal transactions as a **distinct personality**.

Here, in this **partnership-business firm**, there are **two (2) individual beings** yet there are **three persons**, to wit:

1. A **Business Partner**;
2. A **Business Partner**; and
3. The **Business Firm**.

So **how many persons** are there? **There are three (3) persons: two (2) natural persons and one (1) juridical person.**

But **how many beings** are there? **There are only two (2) personal beings yet there are three (3) persons.**

The Spirit of Prophecy says:

“The Father and the Son alone are to be exalted.” (Ellen White, YI, 1898);

“By the Spirit the Father and the Son will come and make their abode with you. [John 14:23 quoted]” (E.G. White, BEcho; 1893);

The Bible also says:

“Truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ.” 1 John 1:3;

“Jesus answered and said to him, ‘If anyone loves Me, he will keep My word; and My Father will love him, and We will come to him and make Our abode with him.’” John 14:23

Hence, our **fellowship** is with the **TWO Divine Beings on the Throne: God and His only begotten Son**, and **They will dwell in us by Their One Spirit**—by their **power of omnipresence**—thru their **third-person** manifestation.

At this time, we have already known that the **Holy Spirit** is **the Spirit of Christ** while it is also **the Spirit of God**. (See Romans 8:9-11)

But a question arises, “how could the **Holy Spirit** be the **Spirit of Jesus the Son** while it is also the **Spirit of God, the Father**?”

The Spirit of Prophecy gives a clear answer to that question:

“The **Father** gave **HIS Spirit** without measure to **HIS Son**...”
(Ellen G. White, RH, 1908);

“From eternity there was a **complete unity between the Father and the Son**. They were two, yet little short of being identical; **two in individuality**, yet **ONE IN SPIRIT**, and heart, and character.” (Ellen G. White; YI, par. 5; 1897);

“Let them be thankful to God for His manifold mercies and be kind to one another. They have **one God and one Saviour**; and **ONE SPIRIT—the Spirit of Christ**—is to bring unity into their ranks.” (E. G. White, Testimonies Volume 9, p. 189)

“The **Holy Spirit, which proceeds from the only begotten Son of God**, binds the human agent, body, soul, and spirit, to the perfect, divine-human nature of Christ.” (Ellen G. White, Review and Herald, April 5, 1906)

“The greatness of God is to us incomprehensible. “**The Lord's throne is in heaven**” (Psalm 11:4); **yet by His Spirit He is EVERYWHERE present**. He has an intimate knowledge of, and a personal interest in, all the works of His hand.” (Ellen G. White; Education, 132.2)

“**By the SPIRIT the Father and the Son will come and make Their abode with you**. [John 14:23 quoted]” (E.G. White, BEcho; 1893);

In John 14:1, Jesus says, “Let not your heart be troubled; you believe in **God**, believe also in **Me (His Son)**.”

In view thereof, we believe in and exalt **two divine beings: God and His dearly beloved Son—in One Spirit**.

Clearly, the **ONE Spirit** of the **Father** and **Son**, the **Holy Spirit**, is **Their personal omnipresence**, and this **Spirit of God** also **personifies God's Son** as a **distinct omnipresent personality**. (This will be expounded hereinafter)

Thus, if you look at **Scripture** and **Inspiration**, there are **three categories** of **texts** which deal with **God/Divinity/Deity**:

1. Texts that speak of the **One God** (Oneness)
2. Texts that speak of **Two Divine Beings** (Twoness)
3. Texts that speak of **three persons** (Threeness)

Stated otherwise, the **Spirit of Prophecy** and the **Bible** declare that:

- a) There is **One** who is called **God** (the **Almighty Father** [Mal. 2:10, 1 Cor. 8:6, etc.]);
- b) There are **two divine beings** (**God** and the **only begotten Son of God**); yet
- c) **Divinity/deity** is shared by or manifested in **three economic persons** (**Father, Son, and Holy Spirit**) who are **working** for the **redemption** of fallen humanity.

The **three** (3) **categories** are, to wit:

1. The **first category** deals with the **Most High, Sovereign, One God—the Father** (Mal. 2:10; 1 Cor. 8:6, etc.).

Note: this is the **ultimate headship/sourceship category**.

2. The **second category** deals with the ontological **beings/individuals** who inherently possess the substance of divinity - the **Father and Son** (John 1:1; John 14:1).

Note: This is the **relational category**.

3. The **third category** deals with the **divine modes of operation/workforce**

Note: This is the **economic and divine offices category**.

The **three modes** of divine activity are, to wit:

1. What the **Father** is doing in **His** immediate **bodily proximity** (the **Father** **bodily located** on the **throne**);
2. What the **Son** is doing in **His** immediate **bodily proximity** (the **Son** **bodily located in the Heavenly Sanctuary** as our **High Priest**); and
3. What the **Father and/or Son** are doing **distant** from **Their** **bodily location** (their **ONE omnipresent Holy Spirit**—their **omnipresence** and **manifestation** in the **third-person**)

Note: inasmuch as the **activity**, that the **Father** and **Son** are doing distant from their **bodily location**, is **PERSONAL**, it is right to call it a “**PERSON**”; and this is where the **analogy** of the “**avatar**” or “**third-person perspective**” in a video game comes in.

Again, the Spirit of Prophecy says:

“By the SPIRIT the **Father** and the **Son will come** and make their **abode** with you. [John 14:23 quoted]” (E.G. White, BEcho; 1893)

“The greatness of God is to us incomprehensible. “The Lord's throne is in heaven” (Psalm 11:4); **yet by His SPIRIT He is everywhere present**. He has an intimate knowledge of, and a personal interest in, all the works of His hand.” (Ellen G. White; Education, 132.2)

With respect to the immediately preceding number (3), a question might arise concerning this **statement**:

“What the Father and/or Son are doing distant from Their bodily location (their ONE omnipresent Holy Spirit—their omnipresence and manifestation in the third-person)”

You might ask, “how could the **Father** and **Son** **simultaneously act** with **One Spirit**? They must each have **different spirit** **respectively** so that they can **individually act** and **be omnipresent**, right?”

Well, we have already set forth the **premises** in respect of how the **Father** and **Son** are **omnipresent** inasmuch as they have **ONE SPIRIT**, according to **inspiration** and **scripture**.

The **personality** of **God's Spirit**, being the omnipresent power of God, is undoubtedly **infinite**. Imagine, **Jesus, by His Spirit, can be personally present** with you at your exact location while **He can** also be with me **personally** at my exact location at the same time, not to mention that **He is infinitely present among billions of people** around the world as a **personality** that can address to the problems of each and every person.

And **wherever Jesus** can be, also can the **Father** be, by their **ONE Spirit of omnipresence**. The **Father** and **Son** are present **everywhere** by their **SPIRIT**.

God, the Father, can be totally **present** in your midst while **He** can also be **present** in my exact location, while **His Son too can**—at the same time—by **Their One Spirit**.

Now, does that destroy the idea of the **One Spirit of God**?

Do you believe that, **if His Son is present in you, God, the Father, is also present in you?**

Is it not that **if the Son's presence is everywhere, the Father's presence is also everywhere** by their **ONE Spirit**?

Thus, the **distinct personalities** of the **Father** and **Son**, respectively, is **not a problem** at all, because with **Their One Spirit**, the **Father** and **Son's presence is everywhere**. Succinctly, **everywhere the Son is present, so is the Father present everywhere (but not in a pantheistic sense)**.

REMEMBER, when you **PRAY**, actually you do not, in a sense, pray to **three God-beings**.

Do you **realize** that you (1) **begin** your prayer by addressing your petition first to **God (the Almighty Father of Jesus in Heaven)**? And then (2) you ask **God Himself to dwell in us by His Spirit**? And **finally** (3) you **close your prayer in the name of God's Son, Jesus, the mediator** between God and humanity, **through whom alone you can come to the God, the Father, in Jesus' name?**

Thus, the **tritheistic trinity** is **not really upheld** by our Adventist brethren **during prayer**. It is so prospective that our **Adventist brethren's belief** in the **trinity** can just be **rectified** without a need of a **total overhaul**.

The Tritheistic Trinity version in the SDA Church

The “**Tritheistic Trinity Version**” is presently the **popular view** held by many brethren in our church today, although many of our brethren also inadvertently or subconsciously subscribe to the **ontological-consubstantial catholic/orthodox trinity doctrine** (One Supreme Being in one indivisible substance in three hypostases), or even to the **oneness-modalistic trinity of Sabellianism** (One Supreme Individual occupying three roles or modes of manifestation).

In the **tritheistic** concept of **triunity**, there is **One God in three persons/beings: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit**; **each of whom is fully God, co-equal and co-eternal.**

Our history tells us that our beloved Seventh-day Adventist Church officially accepted this **quasi-catholic trinity** version in **1980**, **more than a hundred years** reckoned from the inception of our church organization.

The forerunner of the admission of the **quasi-catholic version** of the trinity was unarguably **Leroy Edwin Froom**, according to our Church History.

“The **Trinitarian understanding of God**, now part of our fundamental beliefs, **was not generally held by the early Adventists.** Even today a few do not subscribe to it.” (Adventist Review, January 6, 1994 p.10, 11)

“**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.** More specifically, **most would not be able to agree to belief number 2, which deals with the doctrine of the trinity.**” (Ministry, October 1993 p.10)

Apparently, today, many of our brethren cannot even precisely explain what the **trinity doctrine** is, insofar as all they only know is that there is a **Father**, a **Son**, and a **Holy Spirit**, according to the Bible.

Now, having already delved into the background and foreground of the **Heavenly Trio**, let us now examine what the **tritheistic version** of the **trinity** is.

Here are the **statements** from our prominent **Adventist Theologians** regarding the **trinity**:

“A **plan of salvation** was encompassed in the covenant made by the **Three Persons of the Godhead, who possessed the attributes of Deity equally**. In order to eradicate sin and rebellion from the universe and to restore harmony and peace, **one of the divine Beings** accepted, and **entered into, the role of the Father**, another the **role of the Son**. The remaining divine Being, the **Holy Spirit**, was also **to participate** in effecting the plan of salvation. All of this took place before sin and rebellion transpired in heaven. (Gordon Jensen; Adventist Review, October 31, 1996, p.12)

“By **accepting the roles** that the plan entailed, the divine Beings lost none of the powers of Deity. With regard to their eternal existence and other attributes, they were **one and equal**. But with regard to the plan of salvation, there was, in a sense, **a submission on the part of the Son to the Father.**” (Ibid)

“To me this signifies the **interchangeableness of the members of the Godhead** since they are one in action and purpose.” (J.R. Spangler; Review & Herald, Oct. 21, 1971)

“**Imagine a situation** in which the **Being** we have come to know as **God the Father** came to die for us, and the One we have come to know as Jesus stayed back in heaven... **NOTHING WOULD HAVE CHANGED** except that **we would have been calling Each by the name we now use for the Other.**” (Roy Adams, Adventist Review associate editor, Sabbath School Bible Study Guide, Lesson for April 10, 2008)

“The **sonship of Jesus**, however, is **NOT ONTOLOGICAL, but functional**. In the plan of salvation **each member of the trinity has accepted a particular role.**” (Gerhard Pfandl, Biblical Research Institute, June 1999).

“**Entirely through Their own initiative, the Godhead arranged for one** among them **to become a human being...** They surrendered **a portion of Themselves—the Divine Son**—to become the **Saviour** of the world.” (Edwin R. Thiele, Adult Sabbath School Bible Study Guide, 4th Quarter 1998)

While the **Three Divine Persons** are **one**, **They have taken different ROLES or POSITIONS** in the Godhead's work of creation, redemption and loving administration of the universe. The **Father** has assumed overall leadership, the **Son** has subordinated Himself to the leadership of the Father, and the **Spirit** is voluntarily subordinate to both the Father and the Son" (Woodrow Whidden; The Trinity, p. 243)

In light of those statements, these prime **questions** arise, viz:

1. Are these **statements** really **in accord** with the **Bible** and the **Spirit of Prophecy**?
2. Can these **statements** even find **support from** or **ascription to** the **Spirit of Prophecy** and the **Scriptures**?

The **Spirit of prophecy** speaks concerning these questions:

"Before **accepting** any **doctrine** or **precept**, we should **demand a plain 'Thus saith the Lord' in its support.**" (Ellen White; GC, 595.1)

"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.**" (Ellen White, YI, July 1, 1897)

"In this age of the world there is **no safety in departing from a plain "Thus saith the Lord,"** however wise and correct the **human assumption** may **appear**. Tradition in names and books is nothing. God's word is everything. The **wisdom** of the **wisest man** that lives is **foolishness if it swerves** one jot or tittle from the word of the **living God**. God lives, God reigns, and He declares, "Them that honor me I will honor." **Of those who place their sophistry above a plain "Thus saith the Lord," God says, "I will make their wisdom foolishness."** (Ellen White; BTS, May 1, 1913, par. 3)

At any rate, under the **tripartite concept of God** or the **tritheistic trinity** version, there are **three God-beings** who took **roles** that are **arbitrarily decided**

and even **interchangeable**, wherein **each** of whom is **ontologically independent** from one another as **fully God**, to wit:

1. **First. God the Father**, a **metaphorical** Father; otherwise identified as an **unreal** or merely **role-playing Father**, who demonstrated an **acting role** of a heartbroken individual who should yield His only unreal, unbegotten begotten, metaphorical son.

“The **Father** merely **entered** into a **role** with which to become a **Father** of Jesus (Adventist Review, October 31, 1996, p.12).”

“God the **Father's paternity** and **Christ's Sonship** are only **metaphorical** and **not in a real sense** (The Trinity, ‘Biblical objections to the trinity’ page 106, 2002).”

2. **Second. God the Son**, a **metaphorical** and an **unreal, unbegotten** [begotten] **Son**, who volunteered to play the **role** of, if not suicidal, a fallen hero.

“**Jesus Christ** is **only a son in a metaphorical sense** (Ángel Manuel Rodriguez, Biblical Research Institute).”

“**Christ's Sonship** should be regarded **metaphorically** and **not** in a **real sense** (Woodrow Whidden, The Trinity, ‘Biblical objections to the trinity’ page 106, 2002).”

3. **Third. God the Holy Spirit**, the **Third Actor** who signed the contract for “The Story of Redemption Drama Series”; He is the **Spirit of God** or otherwise known as the **Holy Ghost**, and He [what, which, it] is **not part** of God Himself but is an ontologically **different individual—separate** from God Himself, **an individual** who has always been given and breathed upon anyone crying “Abba Father”; and this **being** is also known as the “**UNFORGIVING member**” of the Triune God. So, that, if someone **blasphemes** this Third Being, tritheistic trinitarians would say, “**beware**, you may sin against either the Father or the Son, but if you do so to the **Holy Spirit**, ‘Woe unto you!’”

Note: “The **Holy Spirit** is the **Third Person** of the Godhead who also took a **role** in the plan of redemption (Gordon Jensen, Adventist Review, October 31, 1996, p.12)”

Notice what the Spirit of Prophecy says concerning the **Sin** against the **Holy Spirit**:

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

With regard to the **immediately preceding number**, apparently, the **sin against the Holy Spirit** does not actually prove the existence of a **Third-Being God** who is **unforgiving**, but the **sin against the Holy Ghost** pertains to the **blasphemous conduct** by which the **Jews mocked God's Son** and **attributed the works of His Father to Satan**; hence, it is the gross, grievous, and utter display of contempt against the **Most High**. Thus, the context thereof was never about a superior-unforgiving Third God-being, but about the unforgivable degree of sin.

Did you see the **theological infirmity** of creating a **third God-being** called **God the Holy Spirit**? It makes an arbitrary exception to the strict egalitarianism or absolute co-equality concept about the three God-beings. Why? Because there would appear a **superior god** among the **three beings** who is the **unforgiving one**.

Yet, our **orthodox/tritheistic trinitarian** brethren might want to argue that such an **exception** to the **co-equality**, in terms of **tolerance** and **forbearance** among the **three God-beings**, is due to the **role of God the Holy Spirit**.

Assuming *arguendo* that **God the Holy Spirit** has a more **sensitive personality** because He has, say, a more intense and complicated role, is it not **inconsistent** with the **perichoresis concept** of the **orthodox/tritheistic trinity**, in which the **three God-beings** may just **overlap** their **roles** for they are **absolutely co-equal and interchangeable**?

How does it make sense then that you **may** be able to **blaspheme** the **First** and **Second God-beings**, but “**woe unto you!**” if you do it to the **Third God-being**—because you will **not be forgiven**? Does the **Third God-being (God the Holy Spirit)** really have a more **complicated** and **sensitive** role compared to that of “**God the Father**” and “**God the Son**”? Is this theory even supported by scriptures?

In any case, our **tritheistic trinitarian brethren** primarily **rely** on **Matthew 28:19-20** as their **key text** in respect of their **trinitarian view**. In this text is the **great commission** wherein Jesus said that **all authority** is given to Him and He thereby **instructed** His disciples to **baptize** “in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” This they call as the **juxtaposition** of the equality of the **Three God-beings** of the **ONE GOD**.

Indeed, Matthew 28:19-20 explicitly says that there is a **Father**, a **Son**, a **Holy Spirit**. But does the **verse** say that the **three** constitute **ONE God**? Some might want to use **1 John 5:7** as a **proof-text** to confidently say **yes**; unfortunately, they do not know the text’s origin. Nevertheless, our own SDA Biblical Research Institute (**BRI**) advised Adventists **not to use 1 John 5:7** or otherwise known as the **Comma Johanneum**, because it has been **proven** to be an **interpolated text** by **Erasmus** who had been pressured by the Roman Catholic Church in the early sixteenth (16th) century—the reason why it is **nowhere** to be found in the **original manuscripts**.

Let us also see if whether the Spirit of Prophecy says “the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit constitute **One God** in light of **Matthew 28:19**:

“Before **He** left them, Christ gave His followers a positive promise that after His ascension He would send them the Holy Spirit. ‘Go, ye therefore,’ He said, ‘and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of **THE FATHER (A PERSONAL GOD)** and of **the Son (a personal Prince and Saviour)**, and of the **Holy Ghost (sent from heaven to represent Christ)**; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.’ [Matthew 28:19, 20.]” (Ellen White; Ms 41, 1897, par. 34)

Very clear! The **Father** is **OUR PERSONAL GOD**; the Son is **our Personal Prince and Saviour**; and, the **Holy Spirit** of God is Christ’s **Own Representative**.

Perspicuously, the **Spirit of Prophecy** does not speak of a **Tripartite God** nor about a concept of **three God-beings**. On the contrary, it is so clear that **our personal God** is the **Almighty Father** in heaven **to whom** we pray in Christ’s **name**.

At any rate, **God’s Holy Spirit’s personification** of **Jesus Christ**, through which He can be **omnipresent** by **His distinct personal representative**, has already been **explicated hereinbefore**.

Nonetheless, let us reiterate what the **Spirit of Prophecy** states:

“The Holy Spirit is the Comforter, in Christ's name. He personifies Christ, yet is a distinct personality.” (Ellen White; 20MR, 324.2)

“The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ; it is His representative.” (Ellen G. White, 13MR 313.3, 1895)

“The Holy Spirit is [Christ] 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.” (Ellen G. White; Lt119, 1895 [Bracket Supplied])

However, our **tritheistic trinitarian brethren** use the **reductio ad absurdum insinuation** with which to contend that, if the **Holy Spirit is God and His Son's own one Spirit**—or that the **Holy Spirit is God and His Son's omnipresence**, then the **Holy Spirit** will just be a **superfluous or redundant inclusion** in the **threefold name** under Matthew 28:19-20; besides, they also assert that the “**name**” of the **Holy Spirit** is **not** just about **authority** but also a **proof** of an **ontological individuality** and **co-equality** among the **three beings**.

Well, to answer it rhetorically, suppose I state thus: **“In the name of the President, the Executive Secretary, and the General Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church...”**

First, does my **statement** express an **idea** that the **President**, the **Executive Secretary**, and the **GC of the SDA Church** are **co-equal in one name**? Does it?

Second, does my **inclusion** of the **GC of the SDA Church** in the statement make it **superfluous and redundant**? Is it **erroneous** for me to say **“in the name of the General Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church?”** Is it?

Third, inasmuch as I say **“In the name ... of the GC of the SDA Church,”** do I technically mean to say then that the **General Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church** is an **ontological individual being**? Do I?

Nonetheless, at least, we may say that the **GC of the SDA Church** is a **person**—**a JURIDICAL PERSON, but not an ontological individual being.**

Meanwhile, our **tritheistic trinitarian brethren** also **rely** upon the **baptism scene** where (1) **there was Jesus baptized by John**, and (2) **there was a Spirit of Someone, namely, God, which descended like a dove**, and (3) **there was a voice saying, “This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.”**

Earlier herein, we already discussed the **fallacy of bifurcating God and His Own Spirit** so that **the latter** could be made a **third God-being**. With that, we now understand and regard the **Spirit of God** as **He Himself** and **not a third God-being**.

So now, let us see if whether the Spirit of Prophecy says that there were **three God-beings** in the baptism scene:

Never before had angels listened to such a prayer as Christ offered at his baptism, and they were solicitous to be the bearers of the message from the Father to his Son. But, no; **direct from the Father** issues the **light of His glory**. The heavens were opened, and **beams of glory rested upon the Son of God**, and **assumed the form of a dove**, in appearance like burnished gold. The **dove-like form** was **emblematical of the meekness and gentleness of Christ**. While the people stood spell-bound with amazement, their eyes fastened upon Christ, from the opening heavens came these words: **“This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.”** The words of confirmation that **Christ is the Son of God** was given to inspire faith in those who witnessed the scene, and to sustain the **Son of God** in His arduous work. Notwithstanding the **Son of God** was **clothed with humanity**, yet **Jehovah**, with **His Own voice**, assures **Him of His sonship with the Eternal**. In this **manifestation to His Son**, **God accepts humanity as exalted through the excellence of His beloved Son.**” (Ellen White; SOP, V.2, p. 60.2)

Were there **three God-beings** mentioned in the above-quoted statement? Was the **dove-like form** a **third God-being** as it reads therein? Was not the **dove-like form God’s own glory** but rather a **third God-being**? Apparently, the **answer thereto is needless to say**.

We also already discussed **Christ’s Sonship** hereinbefore; meanwhile, in the above-quoted text, the Sonship of Christ is once again affirmed. **God personally declared** that **“Jesus is His beloved Son, in whom He is well pleased.”**

Earlier, we found out that, under the **tritheistic trinitarian doctrine** of our fellow Adventist brethren, the **Sonship** of Jesus Christ is merely a **metaphor** and **not in a real sense**; besides, whereunder, the **Father** and the **Son** are merely **role-playing**.

Okay, my question is, “was **God, the Father**, merely **role-playing** or **pretending** to be a **Father** when **He** said **before Jesus** and **all who witnessed** the event: “**This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased**”?

Did those who witnessed therein really think that **God** was just **role-playing** or **pretending** to be a **Father** while referring to **Jesus** as merely a **metaphorical son** who also was cooperating in **pretending** or **role-playing** as a **Son**?

Under the New Testament, the "Son of God" is acknowledged by:

- a) **Angels** - (Luke 1:32)
- b) **Satan** - (Matthew 4:3; 4:6)
- c) **Demons** - (Matthew 8:29; Mark 3:11)
- d) **Disciples** - (Matthew 14:33; John 6:69)
- e) **Peter** - (Matthew 16:16)
- f) **Nathanael** - (John 1:51)
- g) **Healed blind man** - (John 9:35)
- h) **Martha** - (John 11:27)
- i) **High Priest** - (Matthew 26:63)
- j) **Chief Priests** - (John 19:7)
- k) **Hecklers** - (Matthew 27:40)
- l) **Centurion** - (Matthew 27:54)

Each of the abovementioned persons categorically acknowledged Jesus as the **Son of God**; and the question is, did they **mean** to acknowledge **Jesus** as merely a **metaphorical Son of God**?

Take for instance, in **Matthew 16:15-16**, **Jesus** had said to His disciples, “**But who do you say that I am?**” Then Peter answered and said, “**You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.**” **Let us look over again**, (**Jesus asked His disciples who did they think He is**). Now, what was the **answer** of **Peter**? Did **Peter answer** and say, “**You are the Christ, a metaphorical Son of a Metaphorical Father (God)**”?

Well, **stated otherwise**, do you think that **Peter** really **had in mind** that **Jesus** was **not a real Son of God** but merely a **metaphorical Son**?

The Spirit of Prophecy also says:

“Think ye that the Father yielded up His dearly beloved Son without a struggle? No, no.’ It was even a struggle with the God of heaven, whether to let guilty man perish, or to give His darling Son to die for them...” (Ellen White; Early Writings, p. 127.1)

Honestly, do you think that God was just role-playing when He struggled to yield up His darling, dearly beloved Son? Would you honestly say that God was just a role-playing Father who showed Himself to be struggling in yielding up a merely role-playing metaphorical Son? Does it not hurt your heart when you regard the sacrificial love of God as a mere result of the role-playing between a metaphorical Father and a metaphorical Son? Please contemplate upon this.

Moreover, the Spirit of Prophecy also speaks concerning Lucifer’s jealousy over the heavenly authority and Sonship of Michael who was ‘like the Most High’:

“Satan sought to undermine the confidence of the angels in God’s government. He desired the place occupied by Christ, having it in his mind, if he gained this position, to make an effort to take the place of God.” (Ellen White; Ms 37, 1903)

(Note: “Place of Christ” and then “Place of God”)

“Christ was the only begotten Son of God, and Lucifer, that glorious angel, got up a warfare over the matter, until he had to be thrust down to the earth.” (Ellen White; Ms 86, 1910)

Seriously, if Lucifer's warfare was over Christ being the “only begotten Son of God,” and yet Christ’s Sonship was only in a metaphorical sense, then Satan's warfare was only over a metaphorical sense! Does that make any sense?

Was Lucifer really jealous over a metaphorical Sonship of Christ? Throughout the story about “the fall of Lucifer,” did Ellen White ever speak about a metaphorical Sonship of which Lucifer became jealous? Is that not a merely invented idea to destroy the personality of God and His Son?

At any rate, is God not a real Father to His Son? And is the Son not a real Son to His Father? Is it really true that they are merely role-playing? And is it true that their relationship is merely metaphorical?

The Bible speaks concerning this:

“Who is the liar? It is whoever denies that Jesus is the Christ. Such a person is the antichrist—denying the Father and the Son. No one who denies the Son has the Father; [but] whoever acknowledges the Son has the Father also.” (1 John 2:22-23)

The **Spirit of Prophecy** also speaks concerning this:

“Angels were expelled from heaven because they would not work in harmony with God. They fell from their high estate because they wanted to be exalted. They had come to exalt themselves, and they forgot that their beauty of person and of character came from the Lord Jesus. This fact the angels would ‘obscure,’ that Christ was the ONLY BEGOTTEN SON OF GOD, and they came to consider that they were not to consult Christ. One angel began the controversy and carried it on until there was rebellion in the heavenly courts among the angels.” (E.G. White; Letter 42, 1910).

(Note: that is why, until now, Christ’s Sonship is being obscured)

“He who denies the personality of God and of His Son Jesus Christ, is denying God and Christ. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father. If you continue to believe and obey the truths you first embraced regarding the personality of the Father and the Son, you will be joined together with Him in love.” (E.G. White; RH, par. 19, 1906)

And what **doctrine** denies the **personality of God and His Son** which is denying **God and Christ**? Ellen White's husband explains:

“Here we might mention “the Trinity,” which does away the personality of God, and of His Son Jesus Christ, and of sprinkling or pouring instead of being ‘buried with Christ in baptism,’ ‘planted in the likeness of his death’: but we pass from these **fables to notice one that is held sacred by nearly all professed Christians, both Catholic and Protestant.”** (James White, RH, p. 85, 1855)

James White mentions the **Trinity**—the trinity which does away with the personality of God and His Son; and this Trinity is that which is held by nearly all professed Christians, both Catholic and Protestant. Apparently, this **Trinity**,

which is **condemned by Ellen White's husband**, is the **ontological-consubstantial trinity doctrine** of the **orthodox/catholic church**.

The **ontological-consubstantial** trinity doctrine of the orthodox/catholic church clearly **does away** with the **personality** of our **God** and of **His Son** by rendering **God** and **His Son**, as well as the **Holy Spirit**, to be a **single indivisible ONE being**; in which case, “the **Father**, the **Son**, and the **Holy Spirit**,” are regarded to be the **three (3) hypostases** which comprise the **ONE indivisible supreme being**.

Does that not **destroy** the **personality** of **God** and **His Son** who are clearly **distinct beings** in accordance with scripture and inspiration?

The **Spirit of prophecy** says:

“From eternity there was a complete unity between the **Father** and the **Son**. They were **two**, yet little short of being identical; **two in individuality**, yet **one** in spirit, and heart, and character.” (Ellen G. White; YI, par. 5; 1897)

“**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**.” (Ellen White; PP, p. 34.1)

In view thereof, **God** and **His Son** are **distinct individual beings**; hence, as what **Ellen White's husband** asserted, the **ontological-consubstantial trinity** **destroys** the **personality** of **God** and **His** only begotten **Son**.

Furthermore, the **orthodox/tritheistic trinity** view of many **Adventist brethren** also does away with **Christ's risk of eternal loss**.

The **Spirit of Prophecy** says:

“**Satan** in heaven had **hated Christ** for **His position** in the courts of **God**. He **hated Him** the **more** when he **himself** was **dethroned**. He **hated Him** who **pledged Himself** to **redeem** a race of **sinner**s. Yet into the world where Satan claimed dominion God permitted His Son to come, a **helpless** babe, subject to the **weakness** of **humanity**. He **permitted Him** to meet **life's peril** in common with every human soul, **to fight** the battle as every child of humanity must fight it, at the risk of failure and eternal loss.” (Ellen White; The Desire of Ages, p. 49.1)

Under the **orthodox/tritheistic trinity**, the Godness is a tripartite indivisible essence, and with that, there could not be a **risk of eternal loss**, inasmuch as, under this view, only Christ's mere humanity could die and it could not be more than that.

Well, would you agree that the **sacrifice of Christ** was just a **death of a mere human being**? Would you agree that the **life sacrificed to die for us and pay the penalty of sin** was just a **death of a mere human**? (See Philippians 2:5-11)

Did you know that, under the **orthodox/tritheistic trinity view**, only the **humanity of Christ died** while **His divinity** was **left in heaven** because, it is argued, that the **divinity of Christ**, which could **not die**, was **left in heaven**?

Did you notice a **spiritualism** (immortal soul) concept of this view? Did you notice that this **view** conjures up an idea that **Jesus** left a **conscious immortal personality in heaven** by virtue of **divinity**, while He **died** on **earth** for **three days**?

That is the result of the **tripartite concept of the One God**, wherein **God must be three** in order to strictly maintain **Godness**. That is why, "**Christ's risk of eternal loss**" cannot be appreciated and valued under the **tripartite Godness theology**.

Seriously, when **fallen humanity** was **held** by **Satan** in a **cruel bondage**, from which **no man** could **free himself**; that is to say, when we were **lost**, and should have been **eternally lost**, the **dearly beloved Son of God**, **notwithstanding**, at the **risk of losing His own existence**, came to this wicked world, suffered and died to set us free—to **redeem** us from **eternal loss**! Contemplate upon this.

In any case, our **orthodox/tritheistic** trinitarian brethren's **favorite arguments** are the following, to wit:

- a) The **Elohim Plurality** argument;
- b) The **Echad Oneness** argument; and
- c) The "**Us**" **pronoun** in Genesis 1:26
- d) The "**God is love**" = **three (3)** Theory

Let us deal with these **one by one**.

- a) **The Elohim Plurality argument.** Our **orthodox/tritheistic** trinitarian brethren use the **Elohim** argument to prove that **God** is not just **our Almighty Father in heaven**, but **He is three beings**.

Well, does **Elohim** (אֱלֹהִים) really prove that God is composed of **three personal God-beings**? The word **Elohim** is the **plural form** of the word “El.” But does it really render **God** as a **tripartite** concept?

At any rate, has not **Elohim** been used throughout the **Old Testament** as a **term** that **addresses a single (1) person**?

Let us see in **Exodus 7:1**, the text says:

“And the **LORD** said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a **god** [*Elohim H430*] to Pharaoh: and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet.”

Now, did Moses become a tripartite being when he was made Elohim to Pharaoh? Did Moses become more than one (1) person?

If you can see, even at this level, the Elohim argument has already collapsed. Yet, for the sake of understanding the term **Elohim**, let us move further to **Exodus 11:3**, it says:

“And the **LORD** gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians. Moreover, the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh’s servants, and in the sight of the people.”

If you notice, God said to Moses, **I will make you an Elohim to pharaoh**; it means thus, “Moses was made very great,” is that not correct?

Apparently, **Elohim** has been used to describe a **singular Being** in the sense of a **plural of majesty** (as in the case of Moses), or either to describe a **plurality of Beings**. Thus, **Elohim** is one of **Plural Intensity**, not one of quantity—similar to **panim** (face) that is **plural intensive** but **singular in reference**.

Well, is not **Elohim** the **Hebrew word** used for the pagan “gods” in the old testament? Obviously, in the **Hebrew language**, **Elohim** can refer either to **God** or to **gods**. And apparently, a tripartite deity reading of the plural word Elohim is foreign to the Hebrews or Jews.

By the way, in Daniel 3:25, **Nebuchadnezzar** saw the “**Son of God**” in the fiery furnace. The **Spirit of Prophecy** made it **certain** that **that** was the “**Son of God**” not “son of the gods”; **Daniel and his companions knew and taught** about the **Son of God**.

Now, as you see, Daniel 3:25's "son of Elohim" is translated in two ways, viz, (1) "Son of God" and (2) "son of the gods," insofar as the word **Elohim** can either be used to mean about **the Lord God** or the **pagan gods**.

Nonetheless, the Spirit of Prophecy explains why **King Nebuchadnezzar** recognized the **Son of God** in the fiery furnace:

"How did Nebuchadnezzar know that the form of the fourth was like the Son of God? He had heard of the Son of God from the Hebrew captives that were in his kingdom. They had brought the knowledge of the living God who ruleth all things." (Ellen White; The Review and Herald, May 3, 1892)

Thus, in the **Hebrew context**, if and when **Elohim** is used in reference to the **Lord God Almighty**, it does not denote a tripartite concept of deity; on the contrary, it rather operates, at the very least, in the context of a **plurality of majesty**—similar to **Moses'** plurality of majesty when he was made **Elohim** by the true and living Elohim of the Bible.

Did you notice that "I, Me, My, He and Him" are the **singular personal pronouns** used in respect of **Elohim**? The word **Elohim** in all places used of **God** is also accompanied by verbs with the singular person. And more clearly, is **Elohim** not **translated** in the **New Testament** as **Theos** which is unquestionably **singular**? Unequivocally, with that, does not Theos therefore mean that God is a singular being and not a plurality of three God-beings? Apparently, you know the answer.

At any rate, you might ask why our Almighty **God** and pagan **gods** in **Hebrew** are both called "**Elohim**"? However, did you also realize that the **Greek term** for both **God** and pagan **gods** is "**Theos**"?

So, you see, the term **Elohim/Theos** is a generic term for any supreme being that is deified or acknowledged to be the creator and ruler of all the universe—whether that be the **Elohim/Theos** of the **Bible** or the **Elohim/Theos** of the **pagans**.

In view of which, the deifying terms **Elohim**, **Theos**, **God**, or whatever term is used with respect to a **Supreme Being**, depending on the language, are used by any person who believes in a **Supernatural Being**—whether that **deity** be **true** or **false**. For that reason, **1 Corinthians 8:5-6** says:

"For even if there are so-called gods, whether in heaven or on earth (as there are many gods and many lords), yet for us there

is one God, THE FATHER, of whom are all things, and we for Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and through whom we live.”

Absolutely, among the many so-called gods, for us, there is but ONE GOD. Who is He? He is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

b) **The Echad Oneness argument.** Our orthodox/tritheistic trinitarian brethren use the **Echad** argument to prove that our **Almighty God’s oneness** consists of **three (3) God-beings**.

“Echad” is translated as “one” in Deuteronomy 6:4: “Hear O Israel: the **LORD** our God is one LORD.”

For our **orthodox/tritheistic** trinitarian brethren, they regard **echad** (אֶחָד) as a **plural oneness** or **unity**. These brethren of ours contend that **YHWH** is **one** in a sense of **plural unity** because the **term** for **one** used in **Hebrew** is **echad** instead of **yachid** (יָחִיד).

By the way, according to **Strong’s Concordance**, **yachid** (יָחִיד) means “only,” “only one,” and “solitary”; whereas, **echad** (אֶחָד) simply means “one” or “numerical one.”

Well, according to Hebrew scholars, **echad** can also mean “one in unity.” Alright, but is this not the same principle in English where “one” can either mean a numerical one or unity? Is it not also the same principle in Greek where heis (εἷς) can semantically function as either a numerical one or united oneness sense?

Well then, is it really a valid contention that **God** must be understood in a **plural sense** because the term (“one”) used in Israel was **echad** instead of **yachid**? Does **echad** really mean that **YHWH** consists of **three God-beings**? Does this “echad oneness” really prove a **tripartite concept** of oneness?

Apparently, our orthodox/tritheistic **trinitarian brethren** take the **meaning** of **echad** from a few passages that show **unity** type **oneness** and transfer its meaning to Deuteronomy 6:4. For instance, in Genesis 2:24, it is said: “...the two shall become one [echad]”; this **echad** oneness in Genesis 2:24 is **superimposed** into the meaning of echad in Deuteronomy 6:24, so that the meaning might appear to be thus: “Hear O Israel: the **LORD** our God is a unity of Three God-beings.”

Was that really how the “**Shema**” was understood by **Moses** and the **Israelites**? Was not the **Shema** in **Deuteronomy 6:4** a simple and clear message

that the **God of Israel** is **ONE YHWH**—in **contrast** with the **pagan gods** served **outside** of Israel—rather than it should mean to be **tripartite God-beings**?

Our **orthodox/tritheistic trinitarian** brethren contend on the standpoint that **yachid** (יָחִיד) should have been the **term** used by **Moses** instead of **echad** (אֶחָד). Well, is this **contention** even **tenable**? Would **yachid** (which means “**only**,” “**only one**,” and “**solitary**”) be really the **appropriate term** that should have been used by Moses in Deuteronomy 6:4 **instead** of the simple numerical **one** “**ECHAD**”?

Anyway, does the **context** of **echad** in Deuteronomy 6:4 have something in it to demonstrate **plurality** of **three God-beings** with **oneness unity**? Apparently, it takes to commit a **fallacy of equivocation** to **superimpose** the **oneness unity** sense on Deuteronomy 6:4’s **echad**.

If echad absolutely means oneness unity, then what about the [echad] **one** in Genesis 2:21:

“And the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took **one** (**echad**) of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof.”

Alright, does that **echad** mean **unity**? Does it now mean that **one** of Adam’s ribs is a **oneness unity**? Would it not sound ridiculous?

Did you notice that our **orthodox/tritheistic trinitarian brethren** would **surreptitiously** use the **echad oneness** in **Genesis 2:24** to be **superimposed** on the **echad** singularity of **YHWH** in **Deuteronomy 6:24**? Why would not they apply the clear **numerical** and **singular** “**echad**” in **Genesis 2:21** to **Deuteronomy 6:4**?

Ultimately, let us look into the “**echad[s]**” in **Joshua 12:9-24**:

“⁹The king of Jericho, **one**; the king of Ai, which is beside Bethel, **one**;¹⁰ The king of Jerusalem, **one**; the king of Hebron, **one**;¹¹ The king of Jarmuth, **one**; the king of Lachish, **one**;¹² The king of Eglon, **one**; the king of Gezer, **one**;¹³ The king of Debir, **one**; the king of Geder, **one**;¹⁴ The king of Hormah, **one**; the king of Arad, **one**;¹⁵ The king of Libnah, **one**; the king of Adullam, **one**;¹⁶ The king of Makkedah, **one**; the king of Bethel, **one**;¹⁷ The king of Tappuah, **one**; the king of Hopher, **one**;¹⁸ The king of Aphek, **one**; the king of Lasharon, **one**;¹⁹ The king of Madon, **one**; the king of Hazor, **one**;²⁰ The king of Shimronmeron, **one**; the king of Achshaph, **one**;²¹ The king of Taanach, **one**; the king of Megiddo,

one;²² The king of Kedesh, **one;** the king of Jokneam of Carmel, **one;**²³ The king of Dor in the coast of Dor, **one;** the king of the nations of Gilgal, **one;**²⁴ The king of Tirzah, **one:** all the kings thirty and **one.**”

Now, the simple question is, “do the “**echad**” words **above** mean **oneness unity**? To make it simpler, in **verse 9**, for instance, the king of Jericho is **one** (echad), right? So, was the king of Jericho not **ONE** in **numerical/quantitative sense**? Or, the king of Jericho was **ONE** in a **sense of plural unity**? The answer is needless to say, is it not?

Incandescently, the “echad plural unity argument” of our **orthodox/tritheistic trinitarian brethren** is a **fallacy from flawed semantics**. Clearly enough, the **echad oneness proof-text** fails to prove that **God** is composed of **three God-beings** in **one**.

c) **The “Us” pronoun in Genesis 1:26**. Our **orthodox/tritheistic** trinitarian brethren use the Genesis 1:26 argument to prove that the “Us” pronoun in the text proves that God is a **plurality of God-beings**.

Well, the question is, “does the ‘Us’ **pronoun** in the text prove that **one God-being** was **speaking** to His other **two Co-God-beings**?”

In **Proverbs 8:22-31; 30:4, 1 Corinthians 8:6, John 1:1-3, Colossians 1:16-17**, is it not clear that **God, the Father**, created **everything, all things, through Jesus Christ**, inasmuch as **Jesus** was the **voice**, the **word**, and the **wisdom** of **God, the Almighty Father**?

Is it not clear **throughout** the **Bible**, especially in **Proverbs 30:4**, that there were only **two divine beings** involved **during** the **creation**? Is **Jesus Christ, the Son**, not the express **image** of **His Father**, according to **Hebrews 1:3**? Is it not discernible that it was **God** who **said** to **His Son**, “let us make man in **our own image**, after **our likeness**”?

Let us look into the **Spirit of Prophecy** to shed light on this question:

“**God, in counsel with His Son**, formed the **plan of creating man in their own image.**” (Ellen White; RH, 24 Feb. 1874)

“**The Father and the Son** engaged in the mighty, wondrous work they had contemplated, of creating the world. ... And now **God said to His Son**, “Let us make man in **our** image. [Genesis 1:26 quoted]” (Ellen White; 1SP, 24.1,2)

“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**.’” (Ellen White; 1SP 24, 25)

“But when God said to His Son, “Let **us** make man in **our image**, **Satan** was jealous of Jesus.” (Ellen White; EW, 145.1)

“The Father and the Son had **rested** upon the **Sabbath** after **Their** work of creation.” (Ellen White; DA, 769)

“The Father and the Son rested after **Their** work of Creation.” (Ellen White; MS 25, p. 3, 1898)

Without a shadow of doubt, the **Spirit of Prophecy** and the **Bible** are so **clear** and **unequivocal**; perspicuously, there is **not** a single **need** to **elucidate** every **text** that unambiguously **clarifies** that it was **God** who spoke to **His Son** in Genesis 1:26: “Let **US** make man in **OUR image**, **after OUR likeness**.”

In view of the foregoing, there is not a single text throughout the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy that there were three (3) God-beings who spoke to each other during the creation.

- d) The “**God is love**” = **three (3)** Theory. Our **orthodox/tritheistic trinitarian brethren** use the **love = three** argument to argue that there must be at least **three beings** so that God could be love, because “love must be expressed in order to be **love**.”

Well, the questions, to begin with, are: “is God love because He consists of three beings?” Is it even a Biblical explanation that God is **love** by reason of the theory that God is **three in one**?” “Did the Bible ever say that God is love because He has a tripartite essence or that God is composed of three God-beings?” “Does this theory even have a Biblical verse or a “thus saith the Lord” reference?”

In any case, our **orthodox/tritheistic trinitarian brethren** anchor their **theory** on the **philosophical premise**: “love is an action word, and love can only be love if it is expressed to another.”

Now, does this **philosophical premise** really and justifiably describe God’s character as **love**?

According to the Spirit of Prophecy, “**God is love; God is, in Himself, in His essence, love** (Ellen White; TM, 265)”¹; moreover, ““**God is love,’ and in all His works, in all His dealings with mankind, His character is revealed** (Ellen White; Ms 21, 1900).”

In light thereof, **God is intrinsically, in Himself, love**; and His love is not dependent on another nor does His existence depend upon anyone or anything, in accordance with the principle of God’s aseity or God’s self-existent nature in Acts 17:24, 25 and Psalms 90:2.

Now, let us test the aforementioned **love definition** or **secular philosophical premise** of our orthodox/tritheistic trinitarian brethren if it is coherent or logically consistent.

Again, they say, “love is an action word, and love can only be love if it is expressed to another.”

Apparently, this premise, if applied to God, would propound that, “God’s love must be put in action, for God cannot be love unless He expresses love to another.”

So, with that idea, it is posited that love is **not inherent** in **God** Himself, **neither** is it **intrinsic** in Himself **nor** an **essence** that is **within Himself**, but God only becomes love after He puts Himself in action. Is that a **philosophically tenable** idea? Is that even a sound **theological** theory?

Well, let us further dissect this idea if this can be countenanced under the **lens** of **Biblical Theology**. Alright, let us analogize that definition with the nature of a **venomous spider**.

Okay, ask yourselves, is a venomous Spider **inherently venomous** in itself, or it has to **bite someone** before it can be regarded **venomous**? What do you think? In a parallel sense, ask yourselves, is **God inherently love** in **Himself**, or He has to **love another being** first **before** He can be **love**? What do you think?

Certainly, **love is a principle that gives rise to an action**; not that love itself is an action. Why? Because an action might even appear to be love, yet not in substance—but only in form!

For sure, the answer to that preceding question is needless to say. However, our orthodox/tritheistic brethren further **theorize** that **God, to be love, requires three beings**. Again, is this **Biblical**? Does this have a **Biblical-textual support**?

Well, this theory postulates that **God's love is a selfless love** and, accordingly, it requires a **minimum of three**. So, this reasoning basically suggests that **two people** might have love with **each other**, but it is **only** when **there** is a **third** to share among that love is **truly revealed**, where **each person** can **submit** to the **other two** to love each other.

According to this theory, “with just two people, no sharing of one another with anyone else is necessary, so you can easily be possessive and selfish. With that, you **need a third person** in order to be **selfless**. Thus, in order to experience a selfless sense of self, each one needs a third party to which attention may be deferred.”

Wow, that might sound plausible, right? But, is that theoretical idea really in accord with the Biblical doctrine of love [agape]?

The Bible says, in Ephesians 5:28, that **husbands** must “**love**” (**agape**) their **own wives**. Now, does this mean that marriage must include a third equal participant? Does this mean that, in order to selflessly love, there must be a **third co-equal party**, pursuant to that reasoning set forth above?

Definitely, you have already perceived that the “**selfless love equals three**” is an **erroneous** and **incoherent theory**, not to mention that **neither** a single **Biblical text** nor a single “**thus saith the Lord**” reference speaks in favor of which.

The fourth (4th) chapter of 1 John is explicit about God's love and the truth on why God is love. If we were to look into the Bible to inquire “How do we know that God is love?” we would not receive answers with regard to a numerical “three.”

Ultimately, **God is love**: it is **His natural** and **intrinsic character**—to love:

“Beloved, let us love one another, for **love is of God**; and everyone who loves is born of God and knows God. He who does not love does not know God, for **God is love**. **In this the love of God was manifested toward us, that God has sent His only begotten Son** into the world, that we might live through Him. **In this is love**, not that we loved God, but that **He loved us and sent His Son as an atoning sacrifice for our sins**. (1 John 4:7-10)

EPILOGUE

Wherefore, as established by clear and convincing evidence, in accordance with the metanarrative of the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy, we uphold a **divine triunity**, the **Triotarian-Economic Triunity** wherein we have:

1. **One God**, the Almighty Father in heaven, our personal God, who gave us His only begotten Son, to whom we pray in the name of His Son Jesus Christ our only mediator and advocate (E. G. White, Testimonies Volume 8, p. 268);
2. **One Lord**, Jesus Christ, the Son of the Almighty God, who is God in infinity, in nature, in essence, in substance, which He inherited from His Father—thus, He is God in substance but not in personality (E.G. White, UL 367.4; Ms140, Sept 27, 1903); and
3. **One Spirit**, the omnipresence of God, which also personifies Jesus Christ as a distinct personality or agency of divine activity (Ellen G. White; Education, 132.2; YI, par. 5, 1897; Ms 93, 1893, par. 8).

In view of the **Triotarian-Economic Triunity** under the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy, we do not have **three God-beings** (as in tritheistic trinitarianism), but we have: **one God**, the **Father**, who is our Almighty Father in heaven, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—the Almighty God in personality, to whom we pray in Jesus’ name; and **one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God**, our Prince and Savior, who also has the substance of Godness which He inherited from His Father, yet Christ is not God in personality (like Eve who was Adam in Substance, yet she was not “Adam” in personality); and **one Spirit**, the personal one omnipresent Holy Spirit of God which also personifies Jesus Christ as a distinct personality and agency on earth, while Christ ministers in the heavenly sanctuary at the same time. These **three (3) heavenly personalities** are in **economic unity** for the plan of **redemption**. Thus, we exalt **God** and **His Son** alone inasmuch as our fellowship is with God and His Son; and by Their One Spirit, They will come to us and make Their abode in us.

Now, by virtue of this document, like the call of Ellen White for a resolution in the 1888 Minneapolis Conference, I hereby join the voices that call for our beloved Church’s action to revisit the doctrine of the Trinity and rectify what is needed to be rectified.

Let me close with a statement from the **Spirit of Prophecy** which is timely and relevant to this circumstance:

“**Christ** prayed that His **disciples** might be **one** even as He and His Father are **one**. In what does this **unity** consist? This **oneness** does not exist because everyone has the **same disposition**, the **same temperament**, and thinks in the very **same channel**. All do not possess the same **degree of intelligence**. All have not the same **experience**. In a church there are **different gifts** and **varied experiences**. In temporal matters there are a great **variety of ways** of management, and yet these **variations** in manner of labor, in the exercise of gifts, **do not create** dissension, discord, and disunion. One man may be conversant with the **Scriptures**, and some **particular portion** of the **Scripture** may be especially appreciated by him; another sees another **portion** as very **important**, and thus one may present one **point**, and another, another **point**, and both may be of highest **value**. This is all in the **order** of God. But if a man makes a mistake in his interpretation of some portion of the Scripture, shall this cause **diversity** and **disunion**? God forbid. We cannot then take a position that the unity of the church consists in viewing every text of Scripture in the very same light. The church may pass **resolution upon resolution** to put down all **disagreement** of opinions, but we cannot force the mind and will, and thus root out disagreement. These **resolutions** may **conceal** the **discord**, **but they cannot quench** it and establish **perfect agreement**. Nothing can perfect unity in the church but the spirit of Christlike forbearance. Satan can sow **discord**; Christ alone can harmonize the disagreeing elements. Then let every soul sit down in **Christ's school** and **learn of Christ**, who declares Himself to be **meek** and **lowly of heart**. Christ says that if we **learn of Him**, **worries will cease** and we shall **find rest** to our souls.” (E.G. White; Manuscript 24, 1892).

May the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the companionship of the Holy Spirit, be with us all. Amen. (2 Corinthians 13:14)

Blessings,

Dexter Aldwin M. Perral
