

*A RESPONSE TO THE PAMPHLET  
"SHOULD YOU BELIEVE IN THE TRINITY"*

By  
*N.E. Barry Hofstetter, M.A., MDiv., Th.M.*  
© 2001

The pamphlet *Should You Believe in the Trinity* is online at the official Jehovah's Witness website, <http://www.watchtower.org/library/ti/index.htm>. Rob Bowman has published a book length response: *Why You Should Believe in the Trinity: An Answer to Jehovah's Witnesses*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989).

*Should You Believe It?*

This section adequately sets forth the issues. I would phrase it somewhat differently. To say God is other than what he says he is simply idolatry. This is the thrust of the second commandment (Ex 20:2). The minute we say that God is other than he has revealed himself to be, we dishonor God. Why are idols wrong? They attempt to reduce the divine to the human, the infinite to the finite, the incomprehensible to the simplistic (Rom 1:21-23). Nearly always, the redefinition of God involves denying some important aspect of who God is, and this is in effect blasphemy. The sinful human tendency is to lessen God, to make him easier to control, to make him manageable in human terms. Incidentally, as a Christian who takes the Scriptures seriously, I find the attempts by medieval Roman Catholics (among others) to depict pictorially the Trinity as nothing else than idolatry, a violation of the second commandment.

*How is the Trinity Explained?*

The main theme of this section is that the Trinity is difficult to understand, even contrary to human reason, and a number of quotes, mostly from Catholic sources, are quoted to illustrate that the Trinity is an incomprehensible mystery. To begin with, let us admit that there is a difference between what is illogical or unreasonable and what is beyond our understanding. For example, physicists tell us that certain building blocks of reality (quanta) are both waves and particles. How can they be both? The physicists themselves don't fully understand, but assume that one day we will have sufficient data to explain why a quantum can have the properties of both a wave and a particle. In other words, there is a solution to the problem that further research *may* supply. What I want to suggest to you is that the doctrine of the Trinity is like this. It is the only explanation that makes sense of what the Bible actually says about God, but God does not give us enough data to fit it all together. This does not mean that it is unreasonable, any more than electrical theory is unreasonable because an Australian aborigine doesn't understand or believe in electric light bulbs.

In fact, the Bible teaches that God himself is beyond our understanding. Christians have traditionally taught that God is infinite, and while JW's essentially deny God's infinity, they certainly believe that he is far greater than any human being.<sup>1</sup> Therefore we can never comprehend him in his totality, because we are far less than God. But in fact the Bible teaches that God is unlimited and we are limited. Consider Ps 145:3, and Isa 55:8-9:

Great is the Lord, and most worthy of praise; his greatness no one can fathom (New International Version, NIV). "For as the thoughts of you people are not my thoughts, nor are my ways your ways", is the utterance of Jehovah, "For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so my ways are higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts" (New World Translation, NWT).

And also Ps 147:4-5:

---

1. In online dialogue with Jehovah's Witnesses (JW's), I have been presented with the argument that God "voluntarily" limits his omniscience (see note 2 below). I have also been told by one highly educated JW that we should understand God's infinite nature as qualitative, not quantitative. According to the article "The Theism of Jehovah's Witnesses: Possible or Impossible?" by James Stewart at <http://www.rctr.org/journal>, The Countercult Apologetics Journal website, JW's also believe that God is physically located in space, and therefore cannot be everywhere at once. This appears to be the official teaching of the JW's on the subject, but I have also talked to many JW's who speak as though they believe that God is infinite.

He determines the number of the stars and calls them each by name. Great is our Lord and mighty in power; his understanding has no limit.<sup>2</sup>

Is it therefore any surprise that God might reveal things about himself that are difficult to understand? Read the final chapters of Job. Job may not have sinned in attributing evil purpose to God, but he did sin by presuming to understand God well enough to argue a case against him (Cf Job 1:22 and 42:1-6).

Are there other things in Scripture we have difficulty with? Consider this. Scripture reveals that God is all knowing, all-good and all-powerful. And yet, there is evil in the world. Why did God permit Satan to fall? Why did God create Adam and Eve with the full knowledge of what they would do and of all the subsequent misery and sorrow? Why didn't he create a world that would be perfect from beginning to end? In reference to Sodom and Gomorrah, praying about an issue very similar to this, Abraham said, "Will not the judge of all the earth do right?" (NIV)? Therefore, there is ultimate solution to the problem. What God has decreed and done is right. However, Scripture does not give us this answer. It does not tell us how a good God can even indirectly bring about evil and yet not be responsible. In strictly human terms, is this reasonable?<sup>3</sup> The Bible believer has to keep in mind Deut 29:29.

Look at Eph 1:3-14 and Rom 9:10-24 (and cf. I Pet 1:3-5). These passages clearly teach that people are predestined. That is, God has chosen a particular group of people from before creation to be his own. Therefore, if a person knows he is chosen, he can do what we wants, right? Scripture's answer to that is an emphatic "NO!" In fact, despite the fact that we are foreordained, chosen before the foundation of the world, either a vessel of wrath or salvation, Scripture treats our moral choices as real choices. The decisions we make are real decisions. Can you explain this one? Does Scripture give you enough information? I would venture to say that it does not. I would also say that again, there is an answer, but this answer is still in the mind of God, unrevealed to his people.<sup>4</sup>

Therefore, you see that Scripture does reveal certain things that are beyond ability of our reason, without further revelation, fully to reconcile. Remember, Scripture was not written to give us an exhaustive understanding of spiritual things, but to communicate to us what we need to know to be God's people. It therefore sometimes gives us truths which seem (on the surface at least) contradictory, without bothering to give us the additional information which would enable us to fit it all together (and maybe we couldn't understand the answer anyway). I would suggest to you that the doctrine of the Trinity falls right into this category. The Trinity is not unreasonable, but it is beyond our ability to understand totally, at least without further revelation which God has not chosen to give us. We will explore this more in the comments on later sections of the pamphlet.

### *Is It Clearly a Bible Teaching?*

This is the same as saying, "Why do Christians believe in the Trinity?" I note that the pamphlet saves a discussion on "Trinity Proof-Texts" to the end, so we won't deal with those in detail here (as these verses form part, but not all of the Biblical data on the subject). Instead of dealing exhaustively with the Biblical teaching on the subject, this publication instead quotes a number of scholars and leaves it at that. Rather strange, since Jehovah's Witnesses (JW's) would find themselves in disagreement with almost everything else that these scholars teach. For example, every source

---

2. The NWT rendering here is somewhat misleading, "His understanding is beyond recounting." While literally possible as a rendering, the force of the Hebrew (רַב־מִסְפָּר יִיָּס) *yn mispar* is that God's understanding is without measure (particular since the phrase is parallel with the previous verse, that God is able to name the stars).

3. The claim that man has free will, that God did not make robots, may have some merit to it, but it does not solve the problem. To state it in different terms, how can God "permit" evil and still remain good? If you see a crime being committed, and allow that crime to continue, you are responsible. Why, or how is God not responsible? Scripture makes abundantly clear that he is not, but it does not answer the questions of how and why.

4. The Biblical teaching of predestination is simply one aspect of its teaching on God's sovereignty. What God purposes he always accomplishes, and no individual or group can frustrate God's purposes. Cf. Is 46:9-10; Jer 1:9-10; Mt 13:13-15; Lk 50:50-55; Phil. 1:6 for different perspectives on God's ability to bring his purposes to pass.

quoted on p. 8 (except perhaps for some of the contributors to *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*) would deny the inerrancy and historicity of the Scriptures. They would disagree with most of JW's doctrine and much of traditional (conservative) Christian teaching. And there are also many scholars who would disagree with their conclusions (in fact, those cited by the pamphlet are often in the minority).

Secondly, what do the quotes mean? Consider the NIDNT quote on p. 8 Col. 2 para. 2: "As far as the NT is concerned, one does not find in it an actual doctrine of the Trinity." While this seems to support the pamphlet's argument, it really does not. What this means is that there are no statements in Scripture which expressly mention the Trinity and give a propositional definition, such as "The Trinity is three distinct persons in one God, equal in all the attributes of deity, sharing one substance."

Why then do Christians believe in the Trinity? Because the biblical evidence leaves them no choice. We do so because the unity of God is so stressed in the OT that we must say that God is one.<sup>5</sup> Even in the OT, however, there are suggestions about God's nature which would prepare one for receiving the doctrine of the Trinity, even though these are veiled, as so much of the OT revelation is.<sup>6</sup>

Revelation is also progressive. The NT gives us more than the Old. In Heb 1:1-3 there is a contrast between the revelation of the Hebrew times and the revelation which is given through Christ, which is superior, and of which the NT is the witness. The NT treats the Father as God, the Son as God, and the Spirit as God. We take these two great truths, the oneness of God stressed in the OT, and the threeness of God revealed in the New, and we conclude that God is three persons who are nevertheless one being, equal in power and glory, all three to be worshipped as one God (as indeed, the NT teaches).

Remember above that we said truth is chiefly given to communicate salvation and all it means to God's people? Note that most of the verses which are "prooftexts" for the Trinity come out of contexts where saving truth is being applied to the people of God. We learn about the Trinity as we see each person of the Godhead in administering salvation to the people of God. Yet Scripture only reveals what we need to know; it doesn't reveal the answers to all the philosophical problems we might imagine as we try to understand "intra-trinitarian relationships" or what it means to have three persons who are one being. However, what we don't or can't understand is no reason for denying what Scripture teaches. Also, note that what Scripture does teach about God, while not exactly easy, is not contradictory. Rightly understood, the Trinity is not, in formal terms, logically contradictory. I don't mean by this that we understand precisely how it all fits together; what I do mean is that once we see the Scriptural data clearly, and once we carefully define our terms, the formula "three persons, one God" is not logically self-contradictory. What are contradictory are statements like "Who ran the universe while Jesus was on earth if Jesus is God?" The question assumes that they are one person, which would be contradictory. We could look at the answer from more than one perspective. Certainly, God the Father and God the Spirit would be perfectly capable of running the universe while God the Son is incarnate on earth. However, this answer is somewhat deficient, for it ignores the nature of the Son as God. If indeed the Son is God, then he shares all the attributes of deity, including omnipresence. Christ as God was never absent from heaven, even while specially present in Christ as a human being. He is no more absent from heaven than when Jehovah made his Shekinah presence manifest over the mercy seat at the dedication of the temple, or during the exodus.<sup>7</sup>

### *How Did the Trinity Doctrine Develop?*

---

5. The stress on God's oneness in the OT is in part due to the pagan, polytheist environment of the Ancient Near East. If you study the passages which talk about God's oneness (such as the Shema in Dt 6:4) you will see that the emphasis is on God's uniqueness and singularity, not on his nature.

6. Consider Gen 18, where it is quite confusing exactly who Abraham is addressing. In Ex 24:9-11, in what sense do the Israelites see God? Consider also Is 7:14 and 9:6. A number of other texts could be cited, and some will be considered below.

7. In other words, if Jesus as Son of God is infinite, he can do more than one thing at a time, so that running the universe while incarnate in Jesus wouldn't be a problem. I have seen machine shop workers keep several different complex operations going at the same time. How much more an infinite God?

I would also like to comment on the subsection of the preceding, concerning whether or not the early church fathers taught the doctrine of the Trinity. First a general observation. Many of the quotes used in this section are out of context. Looking them up in the source will indicate that often they may be saying something quite different. Also, a number of the modern scholars cited hold to theories not accepted by the majority of scholars, or theories which have been out of date for quite a long time. Also, this section vastly oversimplifies a very complex subject, the development of doctrine, and particularly the doctrine of the Trinity, in the ancient church.

How does doctrine develop? We start with Scripture. All the elements are there. However, often our thinking may not be clear on a subject. We may have some vague ideas on an issue, but often what focuses our thinking is some sort of direct encounter with the problem. For example, we may have an idea that abortion is wrong. Suddenly we meet a person who is very strongly “pro-choice.” Soon we are searching the Scriptures to find out what they say about the sanctity of human life, and we find such passages as Ps 139. After the challenge, our thinking is much clearer than before. One thing that contributes to this dynamic is that Scripture does not give us a systematic teaching on any one subject. Instead, we have to look at a number of different verses from all of Scripture to get an idea of the complete biblical teaching.

On a larger scale, this is exactly what happened (and what continues to happen) in the church. For example, consider the formation of the canon. Everybody had a good idea of what the books of the Bible were quite early on in the church, although the boundaries were a bit fuzzy, some including one or two books we now reject, others wanting to cut out one or two we accept. Then along comes Marcion, who denies the validity of the OT, and accepts only Luke's Gospel and 10 Pauline epistles (radically edited). And he attracts thousands of followers! This drastically speeds up the church's thinking on the formation of the canon, what books are Scripture and what books are not, until we have our present list. What we have as the Bible was not firmly set until the end of the third century, yet neither you nor I question the validity of the canon, even though it took centuries to finalize.

The same is true for the Trinity. If you carefully read the church fathers, you will see all the elements for the doctrine of the Trinity are there. Ignatius, for example, speaks of Jesus being God in the flesh, united with Father, and as “ingenerate” (a technical term which in context means “uncreated”). These examples could be multiplied. Also, the fact that some of the early Christians may have used different language or had different ideas does not invalidate the truth; it only shows that their own thinking on the issue was not fully developed. In the first two centuries of the church, the emphasis was still on the unity of God versus the polytheistic religions of the ancient world. The early church theologians (such as Ignatius) had an idea of the plurality of God, but they did not care to develop it, lest Christianity be seen as a polytheistic religion. It was in response to people who denied the deity of the Son and the Spirit, or who denied that the Son and Spirit were separate persons (from each other and the Father), that the theological statements concerning the Trinity were formulated in the third and fourth centuries.

It's also true that this thinking took place in the larger context of the world around the early theologians, even as what is happening now in the world often controls the type of answers we must give people concerning what the Scripture says. These educated theologians used the language of their time to talk about God. This happened to be the language of Greek philosophy. They therefore used such terms as “person” or “substance” or “essence.” This does not invalidate the biblical truth that they expressed; it may mean that this truth may be better expressed, and there are many theologians who seek to do this.

A couple of more points on this chapter. Again, many of the scholars quoted are hostile to all biblical religion, and would say that much of the Bible is essentially false. This is particularly true of the authorities quoted on pages 11-12. Neither does the writer of the pamphlet inform the reader that the assertions made here are based on controversial and oftentimes outdated theories of the development of Christianity which are denied by many scholars, including a number of whom are hostile to biblical religion.

More importantly, in his discussion of triads, the writer of the pamphlet is making an invalid comparison. His argument at this point is that because some pagan religions have triads of Gods, therefore the doctrine of the Trinity is pagan. This is patently illogical. What must be compared is not only the idea of “three” but also what each religion says about the nature of its deity or deities. Even a cursory examination of the religions cited who use “triads” of gods will illustrate that what they believed is vastly different from what Christians came to formulate as the Trinity. In these religions, there are either three gods or one god who expresses him/her/itself in three ways, all of which is foreign to the Scripture and to Christians' formulation of the Trinity. This same critique may be made on the writer's discussion on the influence of Platonism. There is a great gap to bridge between Plato's philosophy and the church's final formulations

concerning the Trinity. There is no doubt about it: Platonism did have an affect on the theological thinking of the church. However, this does not invalidate the doctrine of the Trinity. The Trinity stands or falls on the basis of the Bible, in which there is no evidence that any Platonic influence ever occurred.

The study of the creeds and councils of the early church is a fascinating one, and well worth the time. The writers were certainly far from perfect people. Here, I will just note that what is important is not what people say the Bible says, but what the Bible actually says. I believe that the great creeds are true to Scripture, and that careful study will confirm this. The role of Constantine and the fact that certain people were persuaded only with reluctance shows that sinful human dynamics were operating. But thank God he has given us an infallible Scripture to “test the prophets.” Creeds and confessions are summaries or restatements of Scripture, and at the very best, when good, can be used as guides for the study of Scripture. But if a contradiction is found, then the creed must be revised. The Apostles' Creed (though it wasn't written by the Apostles) and the Nicene Creed among others have stood the test of Scripture and time.<sup>8</sup>

Therefore I would not say that the doctrine of the Trinity is an example of apostasy. Quite the opposite - it is an example of fidelity to Scripture in the midst of a number of different hostile conditions. Over a period of centuries, unbiblical thought and practice did infect the church to such an extent that it resulted in the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century. However, the Great Creeds were established before this. Though the seeds of apostasy had been sown, they would not come to full fruit for centuries after this time of early doctrinal formulation. At no time did the Roman Catholic Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church deny the Great Creeds, although in many other areas their understanding is unbiblical.

Why did the prophets not teach the Trinity in a developed form? For exactly the reasons stated above. Israel, surrounded by pagan nations, with her own propensity toward idolatry, was not ready for this truth. Also, this truth would not have made a great deal of sense apart from the revelation of redemption in Christ Jesus (Heb 1:1-3). The revelation of the Trinity was necessary to make full sense out of what God had done in Christ. The OT, written before the full revelation, but designed to prepare God's people for the coming of the Messiah, was not meant to reveal the Trinity, but to condition people for the full revelation to come in the NT (Lk 24:25-27; 44-49).

#### *What Does the Bible Say About God and Jesus?*

The plain truth of the matter is that people reading the Bible on their own did come up with the doctrine of the Trinity, though it took quite a while to think through all the implications of what the Bible taught. In terms of what this pamphlet says in this section concerning the OT I don't have much to argue. We've already gone over this in the above sections. The real question is whether there is anything in the OT which is inconsistent with the idea of the Trinity, or in fact are there statements which would lead one to accept the Trinity when that doctrine is revealed? I would say the latter. The OT obviously teaches the unity and uniqueness of God over against various pagan notions, and no Christian would argue against this.

I also agree that the Hebrew word **אֱלֹהִים**, *elohim*, does not by itself imply the plurality of God. It simply comes into the Hebrew language as one of the words for God. But the Hebrew Scriptures have a number of passages that stop and make one think about the nature of God, and greatly exercised the Rabbis as they attempted to make sense out of them. I have listed some in n. 6. As a further example, consider Ex 23:20-21

See, I am sending an angel ahead of you to guard you along the way and to bring you to the place I have prepared. Pay attention to him and listen to what he says. Do not rebel against him; he will not forgive your rebellion, *since my Name is in him* (NIV; emphasis added).

Who is this angel of the Lord, who bears the name of the Lord, and who must be treated as the practical equivalent of Jehovah? Compare this with Dt 18:18-19, where very similar language is used to describe the prophet who will take Moses' place:

---

8. Note that your own organization produces many publications which restate what the writers see Scripture saying. You use these as guides to study the Bible. Creeds and confessions are really the same thing: statements concerning what the Bible says. They should be used as summaries and guides to study Scripture, but not as a substitute for it. See Appendix 3 for three of the ancient creeds.

I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brothers; I will put my words in his mouth, and he will tell them everything I command him. If anyone does not listen to my words that the prophet speaks in my name, I myself will call him to account (NIV).

Interesting to say the least, and cf. Acts 3:22-23 where the latter passage is applied by Peter to Christ. A passage like this doesn't prove the fully developed doctrine of the Trinity, but it does suggest that there is more to the nature of God that is yet to be revealed. Other passages could be cited. And remember that the emphasis on God's oneness does not contradict his existence as three persons.

We now get into a discussion on Jesus. The biblical revelation concerning him is rich and varied. I agree with you that Jesus had pre-existence. Where we disagree is on the *nature* of that pre-existence.

First of all, neither Christian nor JW is going to disagree that Jesus was human (although others in the history of the church have done so — this is one of the errors combated in I John).<sup>9</sup> Matt 1:18-25 and Jn 3:13 adequately prove Jesus' pre-existence. Note also that Matt 1:18-25 terms Jesus as “God with us,” in a quote from Is 7:14. By itself, this verse could simply be interpreted to mean that God is present in saving power in the person of the Messiah. And it certainly means at least that. But in a later reference to the Messiah (9:6) Isaiah says

For there has been a child born to us, there has been a son given to us; and the princely rule will come to be upon his shoulder. And his name will be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Eternal Father, Prince of Peace (NWT).

All of these titles are simply telling us what a certain name means. Out of context, any unprejudiced reader would apply them to Jehovah, but in context they are used of the Messiah. Remember, there is no God but Jehovah - he shares his glory with no one (Is 42:8; 43:10-11; 44:6-8). Mighty God would make any monotheist think of Jehovah, and in the NT “Father” is never used of Jesus, only his Father. For Isaiah to say this is to show how closely he views the relationship of the Son and the Father. They are so closely identified that they share the same name.

The pamphlet then discusses Col 1:15ff and simplistically interprets “firstborn” (πρωτότοκος, *prōtotokos*) as “first-created.” In fact, as reference to any standard Greek lexicon will prove, the word in Greek, while it can refer literally to firstborn, comes to be used of anyone who is in a special position, either a position of special closeness to a father or a king, or a relationship of superiority to followers. Cf. Ps 89:27, where God says of the Davidic King “I will appoint him my firstborn” (NIV). Obviously, a literal meaning of firstborn won't do here, and the meaning is that God will highly exalt him. This is the meaning here; Jesus is in an exalted position over creation, because he is in fact the creator.<sup>10</sup>

Also, Jesus is called “the image of the invisible God.” This word translated “image” (εἰκὼν, *eikōn*) means in context “exact representation.” In other words, in Jesus the invisible God has become visible (Cf. Heb 1:3 and Jn 14:9). You may be interested to know, by the way, that in the formation of the doctrine of the Trinity, these were key verses which informed the church fathers. They saw these verses speaking of the equality of the Son with the Father, yet a term such as “image” suggesting a different person.

The pamphlet also discusses Col 1:15ff and its relationship to Proverbs 8. I fully believe that there is a relationship, and that Prov 8 does prefigure Christ in a general way. Christ is the perfect fulfillment of wisdom, the Word of God. But the primary teaching of Proverbs 8 is not about Jesus, but about wisdom. Wisdom is like this, therefore seek it. Seek God's wisdom. Paul picks up on this language, and points out that Jesus is the Wisdom incarnate (Cf. I Cor

---

9. This statement needs to be qualified. In discussing this with JW's online, I have been told that Jesus resumed his angelic nature (as Michael) at the resurrection and no longer has a human body. We will leave aside for the moment the radical violence this does to the gospel, but I think it is fair to state that we both agree that Jesus was human during his earthly sojourn.

10. Note the parallel statement in v. 18, that Jesus is the firstborn from the dead. Enoch and Elijah were taken directly into glory, never experiencing death, and Moses was perhaps resurrected (this is a possible inference from the Transfiguration - Cf. Mk 9), so that he is not literally the first one to partake of resurrection life (Cf. also Matt 27:51-53). But the resurrection of all is dependent on him (I Cor 15). The following clause emphasizes his preeminence, not his priority in time.

1:24). The point I am making is that Prov 8 is only an indirect reference to the Messiah. It can function as an analogy helping us to understand what Jesus is like, but the analogy doesn't hold true at every point. In fact, the language of Col 1 suggests the opposite conclusion to what this pamphlet teaches. The OT must be interpreted in the light of the NT.

In Rev 3:14, the Greek word translated "beginning" (*αρχή*, *archē* - incorrectly transliterated *arkhe* in the pamphlet) can bear several senses, depending on the context. It can mean "province" (an area which is ruled), "rule" (the abstract concept) or "beginning," either in the sense of "the beginning of a book" or "that which begins" i.e., source. Considering the close identification of Jesus with the Father in Rev (Cf. Rev. 1:8 with 1:17), and passages like Jn 1:3 and Col 1:16f, many translators (and I agree with them) feel that it is this last sense which is appropriate here (Cf. NIV Rev 3:14).

A number of OT scholars have suggested that Gen 1:26, and so forth, where the first person plural is used, is a plural of majesty, or perhaps Jehovah addressing the heavenly court. And certainly if the NT had not been written this would be a possibility.<sup>11</sup> But one question: whose image are we created in? According to Gen 1:27, it is his, that is God's, image, singular. If the plural of 1:26 includes Jesus as a lesser being, are we also created in the image of another created being? How can "our" image and "his" image be reconciled? According to the pamphlet's interpretation, "Let us make man in *my* image" would make sense, but not *our* image. In the light of NT revelation, in which the Father and the Son are equally God but distinct persons, such a "contradiction" is easily reconciled.

In the following sections, much could be resolved if we remember that Jesus is both fully human and fully God, one person, yet without confusing (or mixing up) his human nature and his divine nature. Jesus' humanity does not lessen his deity (in him dwells bodily all the fullness of deity - Col 2:9) nor does his deity make him any less human. We might look at it this way: Jesus, fully God, took on to himself everything that was fully human.<sup>12</sup> As a result, each nature of Jesus has properties which are peculiar to that nature. Therefore, as man, Jesus could be tempted. And Scripture never says that he could have fallen. What was required was a "second Adam" (Rom 5; I Cor 15) who could be the perfect representative as the first Adam was the imperfect representative. As all men are fallen in Adam so all men live in Christ, because Christ was perfectly obedient. This was what was required. Therefore, whether or not he could have fallen is irrelevant, though I believe that Jesus was predestined to succeed. This does not make his temptation and his suffering any less real!

In fact, what was required is that the mediator be acceptable to both God and man. As a human being, we can be "in Christ" even as we were "in Adam." As God, Christ can perfectly represent God in the transaction of salvation. Rather than making him too big a mediator, the fact that he is the God-man makes him the perfect mediator, because both parties are equally represented. Remember, sin is an offense toward an infinite God, and that infinite God must be represented perfectly in the mediation. In Jesus, man is perfectly represented to God and God is perfectly represented to man.

Just a few words on the next section. Both Vine and Kittel (if quoted correctly) are on the wrong track with the meaning of "only-begotten." The compound elements are as suggested, but checking the lexicons will show that by the time the NT was written the term has come simply to mean "unique."<sup>13</sup> Also, in the ancient church, the theologians came to the conclusion that "begotten" did not mean "created," that in fact it meant "eternal generation" so that the obvious scriptural truth of the uncreated nature of Jesus would be preserved. Also, the human analogy, like all analogies when pressed too far, loses its validity if pushed. Sure, a human father precedes a son, and for a time that son is in an "inferior" position to the father. But he might grow up to be smarter and stronger than his father, and have greater accomplishments to his credit. The fact that Jesus is called the Son and the Father the Father shows that they are indeed different persons. It also suggests that the closest analogy to their relationship in the Trinity is the relationship of Father and Son (more on this below). But other Scriptures inform us as to their equality in essence/being.

---

11. According to the Hebrew grammars, such as Gesenius, plurals of majesty are not normally used with first person plurals, so that construction is actually unlikely here.

12. We arrive at these conclusions much the same way as we derive our understanding of the Trinity, by comparing a number of different Scriptures. Scripture speaks in a number of places of the deity of Jesus (see the references cited and explained throughout these notes), but it also speaks frequently of his humanity (contrary to the teaching of the JW's, he retains this humanity even in his resurrected state - Lk 24:36-43; 1 Tim 2:5).

13. Vine and Kittel, while still helpful at times, do not reflect the most recent lexicographical research.

As to whether Jesus claimed to be God, we will examine this under the later chapter “What about Trinity ‘Proof Texts?’” But what does the pamphlet mean by citing Jn 1:18 in this context? It seems to be saying that Jesus is not God because no one has ever seen God, but the very next words in the verse assert that Jesus has seen him (and hence can reveal him). Perhaps they mean that since no one has seen God, and they have seen Jesus, that Jesus is therefore not God. Yet seeing Jesus is the same as seeing God (Jn 14:9; Col 1:15; Heb 1:1-3; cf. Jn 20:28).

## IS GOD ALWAYS SUPERIOR TO JESUS?

I note that in this section a number of Scriptures are cited out of context and a number of others which give a different perspective are not cited at all. First of all, a few general comments.

In the first subsection, "Jesus Distinguished from God" had the writer(s) kept in mind the fundamental definition of the Trinity, he would not have written this. Jesus is a different person than the Father. He shares the same nature and substance, but as a separate person he can speak to the Father and be spoken too; he can (and does) have a relationship with the Father that involves “I” and “you.” Saying that Jesus is the same person as the Father is a heresy known as modalism or monarchianism (advanced in ancient times by such people as Sabellius). The Bible rather teaches that he is one God in being, subsisting in three persons who have relationships with each other. The Scriptures quoted are simply evidence that Jesus is a separate person. They prove, as it were, one half of the Trinity doctrine, that Jesus is a separate person. In forming a doctrine, *all* of the scriptural data must be examined. Many verses, some already examined, point to the equality of the Son (and the Spirit) with the Father.<sup>14</sup>

In fact, the next subsection gives insight into the nature of the relationship of the Father and the Son, though not into their being. Remember what was said above, that the closest analogy of the relationship between Jesus and the Father is the relationship of Son to Father. As one being, one essence or substance, they are equal in power, eternity and glory. They are equally worthy of worship. But in terms of their relationship, as this relationship has been revealed to us in their saving activity toward us, there is an order. Jesus submits to the Father, and the Spirit submits to them both. This has nothing to do with their deity; it has everything to do with their relationship as persons. And of course, this “division of labor” implies no contradiction of will whatsoever.<sup>15</sup> Subchristian medieval catholic theology (as expressed in a variety of passion plays) sometimes portrays God the Father as reluctantly persuaded by Jesus to forgive sinners. Nothing could be farther from the truth! In fact, Scriptures such as Jn 5:19; 6:38 and 7:16 do not prove that Jesus is inferior to the Father (though they do suggest his willing submission to and willing dependence on the Father); rather the emphasis is on the unity of will between the Father and Jesus. Jesus is the one who knows the Father's will better than anyone else, and who does the Father's will without question. In fact, at least one implication (and, contra Calvin, I think there are more implications) of Jn 10:30 is that Jesus and the Father are absolutely united in will and purpose. To summarize the argument, there is no contradiction between Jesus' equality with the Father in terms of his being and his willingness to submit in the person of the Son. The Scriptures quoted by the pamphlet do not prove that the persons of the Godhead are not equal, they simply prove that there is an order in their relationships as they relate to humanity.<sup>16</sup>

It is true that Jesus is viewed as God's servant, as the Scripture quoted in this section prove. But note, as the argument above suggests, that service does not mean inequality (Phil. 2:5-11). An employer and employee might be equal in intelligence, they might be equal before the law, but one chooses voluntarily to serve the other. Moreover, in the context of prayer, how are Christians instructed to pray? Scriptures such as Jn 14:12 indicate that we are to pray in the name of Jesus. To pray in the name of a god, in ancient times, is to pray according to his will, purpose and authority. So

---

14. Mark 10:18 does not support the contention made. As far as the "rich young ruler" was concerned, Jesus was a human teacher (the full revelation of Jesus' person was just beginning). Jesus, in typical middle eastern teaching style, rebukes him and makes him think about what he is really saying. He does not deny his deity; he rather wants the young man to reflect on who God is, especially in relationship to what he is asking.

15. This “division” is often referred to as “economic,” as in the phrase “the economic Trinity.”

16. I have been stressing how they relate in reference to their saving relationship to us because that is the context in which Scripture does so. This relationship is analogical, i.e. by way of analogy. This is the only way we can begin to understand it. The closest analogy between the First and Second Persons of the Trinity is the analogy of Father and Son. The Spirit will be discussed below.

closely related are the will, purpose and authority of Jesus and the Father that to pray in the name of Jesus is equivalent to praying in the name of the Father.

Much of what was said above, particularly with reference to the incarnation and the relationship of the persons pertains to this next subsection. As a human being, Jesus could pray as a human being. As the Son, the second person of the Trinity, he could submit to the Father, the first person, without compromising his equality with the Father. It was the man Jesus who died, not the second person of the Trinity, and it was the sinless human spirit of Jesus that he committed to the Father. It was the human Jesus who experienced the total wrath of God revealed from heaven so that his people might experience instead eternal life. Scripture does not give us all the details as to how these truths fit together: it simply gives us the data and invites us to confess with Thomas concerning Jesus “My Lord and my God.”

The study of the miracles that Jesus performs is a fascinating one. Jesus does more and greater miracles than any of the other prophets and than the apostles (who are Christ's post-resurrection representatives, empowered by the Spirit).<sup>17</sup> Miracles are meant to reveal, and in the case of Jesus, particularly to reveal the presence of the kingdom of God with Jesus as the King. I believe that the way Jesus does the miracles he does and the types of miracles he does prove that he is the ultimate prophet, priest and king (and thus indirectly point to his deity), but I would have to write a paper many times longer than this one to prove it. As one example, you might want to consider Mark 2:1-12, where Jesus, by healing the paralytic, proves that he has the prerogative of forgiving sins, something no other prophet or apostle ever claimed, because this power, as the Jews rightly noted, belonged only to God. Note that Jesus does not proclaim this forgiveness in the name of Jehovah or his Father, but exercises it on his own authority (and this is what really troubled his hearers).

In this subsection, “Jesus Had Limited Knowledge,” I merely refer you back to the discussions above on the incarnation. In his human nature, Jesus could have limited knowledge. Nobody really knows all the details about how the two natures of Jesus relate, only that there is no intermixture even though they are combined in one person.<sup>18</sup> As truly human, Jesus could also grow in obedience, though note that in this growth Jesus never sinned. With regard to Revelation 1:1, the fact that Father is pictured as giving the revelation does not necessarily imply that the Son didn't know about this revelation; it simply pictures the Father as commissioning the Son to pass on that revelation. We've already noted how in the Gospel of John the Son is pictured as having perfect knowledge of and perfect agreement with the Father's will.

In the next section, consider what Jesus' humility meant. As God, he becomes human. He does this to redeem his sinful people from an eternity of separation from God. As Phil 2 puts it, he suffered even to the point of the most humiliating death possible in the ancient world, a death reserved for slaves and the worst sorts of criminals, death on a “torture stake.” His exaltation has to be seen in terms of his humiliation. It is all bound up in what the incarnation means. In the exaltation, Jesus receives back all the honor and privileges that he voluntarily gave up to become a man. Though we don't have time to explore the connection here, there is a thread of biblical thought (seen particularly in the Gospels and Acts) which links Jesus' exaltation particularly to his office of Messiah as the Davidic King. From this perspective (see e.g. Mt 28:18-20 cf. Ps 2) Jesus exaltation is seen as his enthronement, his reception of the crown rights over his people and ultimately the universe. In Paul, as we've seen, his exaltation is seen in contrast to his humiliation, and in Hebrews<sup>19</sup> it is viewed in terms of his heavenly session (seated at the right hand of God). Both of the latter therefore emphasize Jesus' equality with the Father, whereas the Gospels and Acts emphasize his fulfillment of the Davidic Kingship. I note that in the comment on Heb 9:24 the pamphlet once again accuses Christians of being modalists. Jesus is not the same person as the Father; he is nevertheless one God with him.

---

17. In other words, the miracles done by the apostle's are really the miracles of Christ, done by the Spirit through Christ's representatives the apostles. They are used to validate the message of Christ as it is announced throughout the world. The miracles of the prophets, used to validate their message, also look forward to the time when Christ will be present in power. I have not proved this, but careful study will show the assertion to be true.

18. I would say that Jesus, as a human being, had not had this revealed to him. I think it is fair to say that the human nature of Christ is finite, and therefore is limited in knowledge to what the divine nature reveals to him. This could also apply to Rev 1:1 discussed below, though I don't think it does.

19. I note that the writer(s) of the pamphlet makes Paul the author of Hebrews. Actually the epistle is anonymous, and scholars disagree over who the author was.

I would like to see a copy of this article from the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. We've already answered many of the charges it makes, and will answer them more fully in our examination of the Scriptural data below. If the article is cited correctly, then we will see that the Bible refutes it. I also suspect that the scholar denies the truth of Scripture in general. I Cor 15:24 is another Scripture that reveals that Jesus is in a relationship with the Father that includes order and distribution, and even something similar to what we call submission, but this does not challenge his equality with the Father which is taught in other passages of Scripture. The issue of whether or not Jesus claimed to be God will be examined in more detail below (and has been partially looked at above).

I do, however, want to comment briefly on Jn 14:28. We have noticed before in John how Jesus submits to the Father and obeys him, but this does not contradict who he is in his being. "The Father is greater than I" must be understood in this context. In terms of their present position, the Son in his humiliation, the Father still in heaven, the Father may be considered greater. The Father's glory is in the Spiritual realm unveiled. The Son has hidden his glory until his exaltation. And as the Son has chosen, from all eternity, to submit to his Father, the Father may be called greater. This does not make him any less God, any more than a colonel who obeys a general is any less human. In being he is just as human as the general, but the general is greater due to his position and office. So the Son is no less God than his Father.

## THE HOLY SPIRIT - GOD'S ACTIVE FORCE

We have talked quite a bit so far about human analogies that must be used to understand divine truth. The analogy of the father and son are a primary analogy used to help us understand the relationship of Jesus and the Father (though Scripture uses other analogies as well). For understanding the Spirit, Scripture uses a number of different analogies, perhaps because the Spirit has fewer items in creation which correspond to him in a direct way. It is true that the Hebrew and Greek terms for "spirit" originally referred to breath or wind, perhaps viewing God's Spirit in his power and unpredictability (cf. Jn 3:8), but they have lost that connotation when applied to God's Spirit.<sup>20</sup>

In fact, I have no problem characterizing the Spirit of God as God's active force. It is certainly used that way in Scripture. When God accomplishes something Scripture often pictures him as doing it with the involvement of the Spirit. However, I would say that the Spirit is more than simply an impersonal force. It is the Person who particularly applies God's power in a variety of situations.

If we examine all the Scriptural data in context, we are forced to come to the conclusion that God's Spirit is in fact a person. It is true that the writers of Scripture sometimes use the literary device of personification to communicate truth in an especially vivid way, and the pamphlet quotes some of those Scriptures. However, a comparison between the way such things as sin or wisdom is personified and the way in which the Scripture (and particularly the NT)<sup>21</sup> speaks of the Spirit will demonstrate that the Spirit is not simply personified in a literary way, but is actually viewed in a personal way, i.e. as a person.

For example, sin is pictured in a variety of ways in Scripture, and compared to rulers and robbers (or demons, as the NEB has it), as the pamphlet correctly notes. However, it is obvious that these are just comparisons. Sin is never treated consistently as a person. The Holy Spirit, however, is. This comes out especially clearly in the Gospel of John and the Pauline Epistles. Read carefully John chapters 14-16. In 14:15-17 and 26, The Spirit is shown to be the replacement of Jesus. Instead of Jesus, the church is going to have the Spirit. We know that Jesus is personal; the parallel strongly argues for a personal replacement. How is the Spirit described? Don't just look at the nouns — though Counselor (NIV; NWT "helper") is a very personal term — but look at the verbs. The Spirit can be accepted, he can be

---

20. A Hebrew or Greek speaker would no more have thought of "breath" or "wind" when using these terms in these contexts than you would think of breathing when you talk about your own spirit, or God as Spirit (Jn 4:24), even though the English word spirit comes from the same Latin root from which we get spiration, inspiration, and expiration. We have to examine how the word is used, not its etymology.

21. Most of the citations of scholars in this section (with one exception) refer to the OT. Even in the OT, there are hints as to the personality of the Spirit, though what is chiefly in view in the OT is the Spirit as God's power working his purposes in the world. But the OT revelation is incomplete without, though never inconsistent with, the NT. The NT must control our interpretation of the Old. What was said above about the NT's treatment of Jesus applies also to the Spirit.

seen, and he can be known. Of course, so may abstract concepts, such as the Gospel, but the Spirit can also remain in us and we in him (this is identical to our relationship with Jesus: John 15:4). This is all language used of personal relationship. In v 26, the Holy Spirit, sent by the Father (even as Jesus was sent) teaches and brings things to mind, even as Jesus all along has taught the disciples (in fact v 27 shows that it is Jesus' teaching of which the Spirit will remind them). In 15:26 the Spirit testifies of Jesus, even as the disciples are also instructed to testify. The Greek (μαρτυρήσει, *marturēsei*) may be translated "give witness or testimony" something that only a person is capable of doing.

Much the same may be observed in chapter 16:5-15. The helper comes even as Jesus goes, and Jesus sends this helper even as he was sent. What does he do when he comes? He convicts (NWT "gives convincing evidence") the world. The word so translated (ἐλέγξει, *elengxei*) refers to supplying evidence which results in a verdict of "guilty", which is again something that only a person can do. The Spirit will also guide his disciples into all truth and speak the truth which he hears. Only a person can both speak and hear. It is true that he only speaks that which he hears, but this is the same as Jesus, who only reveals what the Father reveals and does the Father's will perfectly, as discussed above. Again we see that the Spirit is precisely parallel in his function with regard to the Church as Jesus. Note that at the end of this passage, we have a powerful testimony to the deity of Jesus as well. The Spirit literally will glorify Jesus. While this at least means that he will glorify Jesus by revealing him as he is, the use of the term elsewhere and the following verse indicate that the reference is deeper than this (though it certainly includes this). The Spirit will make known Jesus' glory, a glory which in turn Jesus shares with the Father, because all things which belong to the Father belong also to Jesus, including the glory which belongs to the Father. Yet we know that Jehovah shares his glory with no one (Is 42:8; Cf. Jn 17).<sup>22</sup> Again, only a person can glorify another person, and only a personal being can receive and declare, but the Spirit does all these things. Nor is there any suggestion here that the language is intended figuratively.

Does that sound like an impersonal force? Yes, the Spirit is often compared to impersonal things, but Jehovah in the OT is compared to a rock, or a chicken that protects her flock. This does not mean he is these things, or, for example, that he cannot speak because he is like a rock, but rather each metaphor emphasizes one or two important truths about God. So it is with the Holy Spirit.

Scripture teaches us important truths about the Spirit by these analogies. But Scripture also gives us truth about the Spirit which is more direct, such as the passages we have been considering. Another passage you may want to examine (and I note is left out in the pamphlet's consideration) is I Cor 2:9-16

However, as it is written: "No eye has seen, no ear has heard, no mind has conceived what God has prepared for those who love him" - but God has revealed it to us by his Spirit. The Spirit searches all things, even the deep things of God. For who among men knows the thoughts of a man except the man's spirit within him? In the same way no one knows the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God. We have not received the spirit of the world but the Spirit who is from God, that we may understand what God has freely given us. This is what we speak...in words taught by the Spirit.... The man without the Spirit does not accept the things that come from the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him...

Notice again the verbs of which the Spirit is subject. He searches, he knows and he teaches. Note the objects of especially the first and second verbs. What does the Spirit search? Even the deep things of God. What does the Spirit know? Even the thoughts of God. As infinite as God is, the Spirit of God has exhaustive knowledge of his innermost thoughts. Once again, the Spirit is presented to us as a person, yet a person who is as intimately related to God as the spirit within a man is related to a human person, and as man's spirit is co-extensive with him, so is God's Spirit co-extensive with him. And you might want to ask this question: is man's spirit an impersonal force?

Another interesting passage in this regard is II Cor 3:17-18.

---

22. A study of the word glory in this chapter is fascinating. It may be defined as the splendor of God's character and purpose. So close is the union of God's people with Jesus, that they reflect this glory in a very unique way, so that we may be said to share in that glory. The Son actually possesses the Father's glory; he is then said to give us that glory in the sense that we, as God's people, reveal his character and purpose in a special way. It is particularly tied in with the unity of God's people. The glory in chapter 16, however, is the glory which is peculiar to the Father and the Son, which the Spirit will reveal to God's people.

Now the Lord [NWT Jehovah] is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom. And we, who with unveiled faces all reflect the Lord's glory, are being transformed into his likeness with ever increasing glory which comes from the Lord, who is the Spirit.

The expression here is different from John 4:24, where Jesus claims that "God is Spirit" (without the article, in either English or Greek). Nor is Paul confusing the persons of the Father and the Spirit. Rather, he is making such a close identification of their work as to say that when the Spirit works, Jehovah works, and when Jehovah works, so does the Spirit. In other words, the Spirit is a practical synonym of Jehovah, and Jehovah a synonym of the Spirit.

One more, this time from the synoptic Gospels. In Matt 12:31-32 Jesus says:

And so I tell you, every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven men, but the blasphemy against the Spirit will not be forgiven. Anyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but anyone who speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come.

This is the famous "unforgivable sin" passage, and in context this blasphemy seems to be attributing the works of the Spirit to another spirit, Satan, and utterly denying the Kingdom of God. This is certainly an extreme form of blasphemy. But in Scripture, how is blasphemy defined? Consider Exod 20:3 "You must not take up the name of Jehovah your God in a worthless way..."(NWT). That's as good a definition of blasphemy as any, and the case in Matt 12 is simply a concrete realization of this. Blasphemy is saying false things about God, but in the Matt 12 passage, it is saying false things about the Spirit. Compare this with Acts 5:1-11, where lying to the Holy Spirit is equal to lying to God, and bears the penalty of death.<sup>23</sup>

There are a number of other passages that could be considered, but time is limited. Some will be discussed in the last section below. One thing I want to point out. Using the logic of this pamphlet, I can argue that Satan is not a spirit, but an impersonal force of evil within us. It's true that Scripture sometimes uses personification to talk of Satan, but that is only a literary device meant to show us how powerful this force really is. Therefore Satan is not an external adversary, but a principle within ourselves which must be combated, the principle of evil. However, most JW's and Christians will find this argument unconvincing, and will point out a number of Scriptures in which Satan is unambiguously presented as a personal spirit-being by the words used to describe him and by the verbs of which he is subject (though no where does Scripture come right out and say "Satan is a personal spirit-being"). Scripture similarly describes the Spirit of God as a person who is equal to God the Father and Jesus the Son.

#### *Note on the pronoun "he" in reference to the Spirit*

The pamphlet's comment on p. 22 under "The 'Helper'" (first para.) is correct as far as it goes. Greek nouns have something that English nouns have lost: grammatical gender. There are in Greek masculine, feminine, and neuter nouns. In English we do not have these categories: rather we have personal and impersonal nouns. People (and sometimes animals) are considered personal and referred to with gender qualified pronouns "he/she" and so forth; things do not and are referred to by the impersonal, gender free "it" (ships as "she" is a holdover from the time when English nouns did have grammatical gender). The problem is that often impersonal nouns in Greek will be masculine or feminine, but in translation we have to render them with the impersonal pronoun in English (a fact which gives beginning Greek students no end of trouble). For example, "truth" in Greek is grammatically feminine, but must be referred to in English as "it" (though the Greek pronoun will be feminine). "Trinitarian translators" are not trying to obscure the use of the neuter pronoun by translating it as "he." It is only grammatically neuter, not necessarily impersonal. Because of the strongly personal descriptions of the Holy Spirit in passages such as John 14-16, it is felt necessary to use a personal pronoun in English (and since God is usually described as masculine, "he" is employed). It is the context and the thing the pronoun refers to which must determine its translation into English, not the grammatical gender.

---

23. The sin of Ananias and Sapphira is very similar to the sin of Achan, who took spoils from Jericho under the ban and hid them, thus not only disobeying the ban but lying to God (Josh 7).

## What About Trinity "Proof Texts"?

Hopefully by now, even if you do not yet agree with the biblical teaching of the Trinity, you at least realize that the doctrine of the Trinity rests on more than just a few proof texts. We have looked at a number of passages which are not normally considered proof texts and seen how consonant they are with a trinitarian understanding. Before reading any farther, why not stop and pray that the Almighty Jehovah God will by his Spirit grant you true understanding as you consider from a different perspective the Scriptures discussed in the pamphlet?

As to the sources quoted by the pamphlet, I could easily assemble a host of commentators and scholars who disagree with their interpretations, at least as cited here. Rather, let us examine the texts cited, and judge each case by its own merits.

### *2 Cor 13:13 and 1 Cor 12:4-6*

Look at what is actually being said in these passages. In the first passage, there are six nouns; three are in the nominative, or subject case, and three are in the genitive case (which in English is often translated with the preposition "of")<sup>24</sup> and used to modify the three nominative, or subject nouns. The three nominative nouns are grace, love and fellowship. The three genitives are the Lord Jesus, God and the Holy Spirit. In this particular instance, the three genitive nouns are used to indicate the source of the three nominative nouns. Jesus is pictured as the source of grace (elsewhere in Scripture it often speaks of the grace of God); God is the source of love, and the Spirit the source of fellowship. Note that the three pairs of nouns and genitives are grammatically parallel and equal. Parallelism in the Scriptures is one way of using different clauses to define each other. In other words, by using this parallel construction in his closing benediction, Paul is essentially saying that Jesus, God, and the Holy Spirit are equal. The blessings of grace, love and fellowship come equally through each one. In no way are these three subordinated to one another.<sup>25</sup> Similar parallel constructions deal with the Father and the Son and may be found, for example, in Paul's greetings, such as at Eph 1:2 "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." That word "and" is quite telling. It does not say "through" the Lord Jesus Christ or use some other subordinating word. Rather, it puts the two on equal footing as the source of grace.

In 1 Cor 12:4-6, the situation is slightly different but very similar. The Spirit, the Lord, and God are all equally involved in the distribution of spiritual gifts among the Corinthians. Each one seems to have his own sphere of activity in gifts, ministries, and workings.<sup>26</sup> They are distinguished by their activities, but are put on an equal plane. Each person of the Godhead is involved in some aspect of the application of salvation (and gifts are just one aspect of salvation) to the people of God. It is the same Spirit, the same Lord, and the same God who each has his own particular work to do with regard to spiritual gifts. It is possible that the last phrase, "the same God who works all things in all" is a summary of the above, so that the phrase actually modifies (in sense) all three persons, although God the Father is particularly responsible for whatever "workings" are. There is a similar passage in Eph 4:4-6, where Paul is discussing the unity of the church. There is one Spirit, one Lord and one God, and a careful study will indicate that he is again using his terminology in a parallel fashion to indicate equality.

---

24. Where English uses word order and prepositions to indicate the use of a noun in the sentence, Greek changes the ending on the word. The endings of the nouns are called cases. There are four major cases in Greek: The nominative, genitive, dative and accusative. Of these, the genitive and dative are the most fluid, and may be, according to the context, translated by any one of several prepositions in English, even when that preposition is not present in the Greek. For more information, consult any beginning Greek grammar, such as J. Gresham Machen, *New Testament Greek for Beginners*, (Ontario: Macmillan, 1923), 24-25, and the chart in Appendix 1 of this paper.

25. For that matter, which would be subordinate to the other - grace, love or fellowship?

26. These are probably not different types of gifts, but the same gifts viewed from the different perspective of the Father, Son and Spirit.

*Matthew 28:18-20*

The pamphlet is correct. This verse does not give a propositional statement concerning the Trinity any more than any other verse in Scripture does. It does, however, add to the evidence supplied by the rest of Scripture. Earlier in the pamphlet, in reference to the Spirit, the argument is made that “name” is equivalent to “authority.” This completely ignores the immediate context. Often enough “name” can have this implication. We are instructed to pray in the name of Jesus; a Roman soldier might have given commands in the name of Caesar; a modern policeman might tell a thief to “halt in the name of the law.” But notice the word just preceding “into,” “baptize.” The nations are to be baptized into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. One of the major implications of baptism in the NT is repentance; another is entering into a personal relationship with God. “Baptize into the name of” therefore means to “cause to enter into a relationship with” what or whom the subject is baptized into, and this relationship is one characterized by wholehearted commitment to obedience; it implies a shift of allegiance. The preposition translated “into” when used in such contexts indicates movement into the sphere of relationships. Hence the word “name” here doesn't mean authority, but is used to represent the person. The only conclusion we can draw in the light of the linguistic evidence is that the Father, the Son and the Spirit share one name. The believer is equally baptized into all three. Let me suggest that in the OT the name that would be used is “Jehovah.”<sup>27</sup>

*Matthew 3:16 and I John 5:7 (KJV)*

I don't have a lot to say here, except that in the light of all the other evidence in Scripture for the Trinity it is difficult not to see the Trinity in a passage such as this. By itself, the passage does not prove the Three are one; this must be inferred from other passages such as discussed above and below. The descent of the Holy Spirit is the public anointing of Jesus for his ministry; it is the Spirit's empowering Jesus for ministry much as he empowered the prophets of old. Remember that Jesus is also functioning in the very human office of the Messiah; as God he had a relationship with the Spirit from all eternity, but in his humility, in the offices of prophet, priest and king, it was necessary for him to identify with his people and receive a public anointing and approval for his ministry.

I agree that I John 5:7 (KJV) is a much later addition. It appears only in the Vulgate (the ancient Latin translation) and a few other ancient translations. Of the six Greek manuscripts in which it appears, none are earlier than the 13<sup>th</sup> century, and two were copied in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, apparently so that Erasmus, the first editor of a printed Greek text, would include the passage in the second edition of his Greek testament (he had refused to do so in the first edition because he could find no Greek manuscript with the verse; the Catholic church then “discovered” two such manuscripts!).

*John 10:30*

There is no doubt that at the very least in this passage Jesus' unity with the Father in terms of thought and purpose is underscored. This is easily discerned from the context. But note that the unity which is suggested is unity of thought and purpose concerning the saving activity of God. In v. 28 it is Jesus, not the Father, who gives eternal life. The Father's hand and Jesus' hand function the same. What the Father has given Jesus is greater than all other things. All of these ideas lead up to the statement that “the Father and I are one.” While this statement, as Calvin rightly observes, does not directly state that the two share one essence, it does, from the context leading up to it, suggest strongly an equality between the Father and Son concerning their respective roles in the salvation and preservation of God's people, which in turn implies the deity of both.

The writer of the pamphlet completely misinterprets the following verses. He claims that in 31-38 Jesus denies the Jews interpretation. But does he? A careful reading will reveal that Jesus' response is much subtler than this. He first of all points out that his works are good, which of course implies that the doer is good and worthy of no punishment such as the Jews want to inflict. In response to their charge that Jesus is blaspheming by making himself out to be equal with God (they may have been thinking that Jesus was setting himself up as a rival God) Jesus does not give a straightforward “no, your wrong, I wasn't saying anything of the kind, I just meant that God was my Father because he created me a few

---

27. See the appendix 1, “Thoughts on the Trinity?”

thousand years ago.” Instead he gives an answer that is designed to make them think about what his equality with (yet distinction from) the Father might mean. He argues from the lesser to the greater. If the scripture can call mere humans “gods”<sup>28</sup> then what about the one who has an absolutely unique relationship with the Father, a relationship best designated by the term son? The Father has set him apart and sent him into the world to perform his saving office. In fact, the Father dwells in the Son and the Son in the Father. Again, Jesus gets back to the fundamental equality that was suggested by the context above. And once again the Jews get the point and seek to kill him, for any mere man claiming equality with God is blaspheming, and must receive the death penalty. While sonship in itself does not necessarily imply equality, the language used of Jesus' sonship here and elsewhere strongly suggests a uniqueness and an equality that exists only between these two.

John 17 has been dealt briefly with above. Here I will remind the reader that the unity of the Father and the Son is pictured as both the model for the believers' unity and also that which actually brings it about. Another way of saying this is to say that our unity is analogical of the unity found within the Trinity, but like all analogies, is not identical with it. When believers are dwelling together in harmony and love, that unity should reflect who God is in his own unity (Jn 17:20-23; cf. Jn 13:34-35).

#### *John 5:18*

The answer to this is very similar to the above, so that we will not dwell on this passage long. First of all, the language of dependence does not necessarily suggest inequality in terms of being; it does suggest strongly voluntary submission, a role of service which the Son eternally and willingly has in relationship to the Father. Jesus wants the Jews to realize that he is not claiming to be the Father nor is he claiming to be a separate God. He wants them to think about this relationship. In fact, Jesus' answer stresses a relationship so close that we have to say for all practical purposes that Jesus is God. The Father reveals *all things* to the Son. Whatever the Father does Jesus does. The Son raises the dead to life even as the Father. The Father has entrusted all judgment to the Son. Then observe the concluding clause of v. 23: “that all may honor the Son *just as* they honor the Father.” All of these parallel statements reveal that the Father and Son function in parallel and equal fashion. Again, Jesus stresses not only dependence on his Father (he is a separate person) but functional equality (He does the sorts of things which in the OT are particularly reserved for Jehovah). And not only do they function in an equal fashion; they are to be treated in an equal fashion (cf. Is 42:8).<sup>29</sup>

#### *Philippians 2:6*

The pamphlet has correctly argued the point of the passage. The Christians in Philippi are to have the same humility that Christ exhibited. How remarkable was this humility? Jesus existed in the “shape” (Gr., μορφή, *morphē*) of God. He did not consider equality with God either a) something to be grasped or b) something to be held on to. Option “a” would look at things in terms of his humiliation. There is a sense, discussed above, in which during his incarnation Jesus could say “the Father is greater than I.” Jesus did not grasp for that kind of equality but willingly endured being treated as a mere man, a slave, who suffered a slave's torture and death. He had all the rights and privileges of God, but did not grasp for them. With regard to option “b” this translation would merely emphasize the equality which he never gave up: He was always equal to the Father in being, but he voluntarily submitted himself in the incarnation. He did not need to hold on to the outward trappings of deity. By the way, the quote from Martin does not support the pamphlet's point (and I suspect, neither does the quote from the *Expositor's Greek Testament*). Martin, a convinced trinitarian, is arguing for option “a.”

There is much more in this passage that we could discuss. Entire books can and have been written about it. But here note the last verse of the passage, 2:10-11. Here language written by Isaiah of Jehovah is directly attributed to the Son — Is 45:23.

---

28. *Θεοί* (*Theoi*) in Greek and אֱלֹהִים (*elohim*) in Hebrew (Ps 82:6). There has been a great deal of discussion in the history of interpretation on exactly what *elohim* meant in Ps 82:6. It is obviously a highly metaphorical application, but its precise nuance does not affect the point Jesus is making.

29. See Appendix 2, “Equality and Subordination in John 5.”

John 1:1 and John 8:58 are two of the most frequently disputed texts between Evangelical Christians and JW's, due to the very clear statements that both make with regard to Christ's deity. The observations below are far from complete, and I therefore recommend some reading beyond this response.

*John 1:1*

Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.

*En archē ēn ho logos, kai ho logos ēn pros ton theon, kai theos ēn ho logos.*

In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. [most standard published translations]

In the beginning was the word, and the Word was with God, and the word was a god. [NWT]

The main issue, reasonably well summarized by the pamphlet, is that θεός, *theos* (God) in 1:1c is anarthrous: it lacks the definite article (often translated “the” in English). According to the argument presented by the pamphlet, it is therefore fine to translate this usage of *theos* using the English indefinite article “a/an,” especially since Greek has no indefinite article. Additionally, the pamphlet suggests that because this use of *theos* may be understood as qualitative (or adjectival), that it should be translated “divine” and that this is equal to “a god.”

Now, it's very easy to get bogged down in grammatical technicalia at this point, and unless one has formally studied ancient Greek for at least a year, confusion ensues. Allow me simply to communicate some basic ideas. While it is possible to translate the anarthrous noun using the indefinite article in English in some contexts, it is not always desirable or even possible to do so. In point of fact, the Greek definite article is not precisely equivalent to the English definite article, and the lack of the definite article does not always equate to the indefinite article in Greek.<sup>30</sup> When teaching beginning Greek, I am often asked about the appropriate translation of the article. I reply “All things being equal (i.e., if the rest of your translation is correct), if the article makes sense, leave it in. If it sounds awkward, then leave it out or otherwise modify your translation.” Now, students don't like this at first, because it sounds hopelessly subjective, but after they have worked with it a while, they realize it really works.<sup>31</sup> The first time they see the article with a proper name, and realize that the translation “he preached in the name of **the** Jesus” (Acts 9:27) just doesn't work, the students begin to get it.

Essentially, the lack of the article in front of *theos* in 1:1c does not imply that the word is a lesser divine being than the Father, but rather that he has the quality or nature of God. This is really what many of the translations quoted in the pamphlet are actually saying: “the word was divine” = “the word is God.” The real question here is not the specific word order, or even the lack of the article, but the meaning of the word *theos* as John uses it. A review of the various usages in John will determine that John never uses the term to refer to any other but God the Father, except John 1:1c. This suggests strongly that for John *theos* does not have the meaning “a god,” but rather refers to God understood as the single supreme being. This is consistent both with John's background as a monotheistic Jew and what he would have learned about God after becoming a disciple of Jesus.

In other words, the burden of proof is on the JW to prove that John did indeed intend to communicate that Jesus was only a lesser divine being of some sort. Here is where the grammar comes into play. Decontextualized, it might be possible to read the text in the way that the NWT translates it. Understood in the light of John's entire gospel, it becomes

---

30 Even in ancient Greek, if a writer really wished to stress the indefinite nature of the noun, he could modify it with the adjective τις (*tis*). In modern Greek, the indefinite pronoun is ένας (*enas*). Interestingly enough, the modern Greek translations of the NT do *not* employ the indefinite article in translating John 1:1, suggesting that historically native Greek speakers have never viewed *theos* as indefinite.

31 From the teacher's point of view, it also has the advantage of not having to spend several hours lecturing on all the possible uses of the article! Then the teacher may explain usages as they arise, which makes better sense to the students once they have intuitively arrived at the correct translation.

impossible to do so. In fact, if John simply wanted to say in Greek that “the word was God,” he happened to choose precisely the best way to phrase it in Greek.<sup>32</sup> For John, there is no other *theos* than the true *theos*, and for him in that light to claim that the word has equality with that *theos* is a remarkable thing indeed. Additionally, most grammarians agree that the lack of the article before *theos* in the final clause is designed to indicate that the Word is a separate person from God listed in the second clause (“the Word was with God”) but is still equal to him. He is as much God as God with whom he had pre-existence.

*John 8:58*

εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, πρὶν Ἀβραάμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμί.

*eipen autois Iēsous Amēn amēn legō humin, prin Abraam genesthai egō eimi.*

I tell you the truth, “Jesus answered, “before Abraham was born, I am!” [NIV]

Jesus said to them: “Most truly I say to YOU, Before Abraham came into existence, I have been.” [NWT]

The main issue surrounding the translation involves the translation of the main clause, the grammatically simple phrase ἐγὼ εἰμί (*egō eimi*). The majority of published translation have “I am.” The NWT, with support from certain lesser known translations, has “I have been.”

It is very doubtful that John 8:58 has as its background Ex 3:14 only. You might want to compare Ps 90:2, where the grammatical structure is identical in the Greek (LXX) translation of the OT, which is also a faithful rendering of the Hebrew text. Part of the background may also be the “I am” statements of Isaiah, such as 41:4; 43:10; 46:4 and 52:6. In all of these, the LXX translates the Hebrew אֲנִי הוּא (*ani hu*) with the Greek ἐγὼ εἰμί (*egō eimi*). The main point is that the terminology is applied to Jehovah God in the OT, but Jesus applies it to himself in the New.

As to the translation of *ego eimi*, these are very simply the Greek words “I am” something a beginning Greek student learns in the first chapters of his textbook. Jesus is obviously teaching his pre-existence here, with language which in the OT is applied to Jehovah exclusively. Some translators have used the English perfect to translate this, feeling that this better captures the force of Jesus' eternal pre-existence. By the way, the Jews would not have stoned Jesus for simply claiming pre-existence or even antiquity; they would stone him for claiming to be equal to God, and thus abusing the name of Jehovah.

With John 8:58 in particular, I think much of the difficulty is the focus on the simple grammatical form to the exclusion of John and his purpose in writing his gospel. What I mean is that the text cannot be separated from the entire context of the gospel, and that the general reading strategy which the gospel requires must be specifically applied at 8:58.<sup>33</sup> Part of that reading strategy must recognize that John, for all his grammatical simplicity (in fact, that simplicity is, I believe, a deliberate stylistic choice), is an extremely careful writer who organizes his text and provides details all directed toward his purpose in writing, producing a deliberately crafted and artistic work, no part of which is irrelevant to his purpose. Our failure to recognize this is in part, I think, due to our failure to consider the genre of the text, and to look for literary formulations and constructions which are not native to John's genre. Once we begin to recognize the unique nature of this genre (gospel = theological narrative), then we begin to see the unique literary forms which John employs in support of his purpose. This includes the various “I am” statements, which should not be isolated either as theologically charged or semantically neutral, but seen in the light of John's use of “thematic building,” or allowing the

---

32 “Colwell’s Rule” has been misused by more than one evangelical scholar in defense of the proper translation of John 1:1c. The rule, like all “rules” in any language, is descriptive, not prescriptive, and attempts to tell only why in Greek the article is omitted, not how it should be properly translated, which is more a function of the context.

33 A reading strategy is how the author intends the readers to understand the text. John tells us that his purpose in writing the gospel is in order that the reader believes that Jesus is the Messiah and the Son of God, and therefore obtain eternal life (John 20:31). Both Christ and Son of God in John imply Jesus’ deity, so this is in part what John wants us to get out of his book. We read his gospel with this purpose in mind, and John writes his gospel to expound these very truths.

earlier portions of the gospel to provide the foundation for later development, which in turn informs the reader about what John intends in those earlier portions. This approach, I think, yields far more hermeneutical fruit than the barebones grammatical-historical used by many commentators, and will tend to guard against the external imposition of theological bias as well. In other words, each of the “I am” statements is used in such a way that it contributes toward painting a picture of Jesus.<sup>34</sup> The picture we see inevitably leads us to consider that Christ is much more than just a human being, that in fact he is in God incarnate, both completely human and completely divine.

These are just a few a few notes to stimulate your thinking on these verses. Let me recommend this book: Robert M. Bowman *Jehovah's Witnesses, Jesus Christ and the Gospel of John* (Baker, 1989). The commentaries by D.A. Carson (Eerdmans, 1990) and Beasley-Murray (Word, 1987) are also very helpful.

I am in wholehearted agreement with the theme of the last section of the pamphlet. Let us worship Jehovah on his own terms, as he has revealed himself. The above should help you to realize that his revelation of himself is far richer and deeper than you have been taught.

---

<sup>34</sup> See appendix 5 for a list of these statements.

## Appendix 1

### *Thoughts on the Trinity*

In an online discussion group, the question below was presented. This essay was my response.

“Is a confession of the Trinity necessary for salvation?”

In a sense, the answer is both yes and no. To come to Christ, there are no doctrinal preconditions, other than those listed in the Scriptures quoted in the essay above. One does not have to have a mature, full blown doctrine of the Trinity in order to confess Christ as Lord! However, the confession of Jesus as Lord is in principle a Trinitarian confession. If one comes to an understanding which denies this essential truth about God, it is fair to say that one has never, in fact, confessed Jesus as Lord.

Consider the first 3 commandments:

Ex 20:3 Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Ex 20:4 Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness [of any thing] that [is] in heaven above, or that [is] in the earth beneath, or that [is] in the water under the earth: Ex 20:5 Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God [am] a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth [generation] of them that hate me; Ex 20:6 And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments. Ex 20:7 Thou shalt not take the name of the LORD thy God in vain; for the LORD will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.

The first two commandments instruct us that false worship is essentially a capital offense, deserving of God's wrath. We are not to worship any God except the true God, and we are not to make images of God. If in fact God has revealed himself to be Trinity, then to deny that he is Three-in-One is to do exactly what the first two commandments forbid, and that is setting up a false god. The third commandment is actually related to this. Taking God's name in vain is not simply using God's name as a swear word, the way it is popularly understood, but invoking God's name for purposes inconsistent with who he has revealed himself to be. What greater form of blasphemy is there than to apply the name of God to a false god, to pray in that false name, to put oneself under the authority of that false name? A serious offense indeed.

Have you ever wondered why it is that we don't receive the full blown revelation of God as Trinity until the NT? One popular conception is essentially historical-cultural: the people of God in the OT were so surrounded by idolatry, that there had to be a major emphasis on the Oneness of God (Deut 6:4). However, that explanation doesn't quite satisfy (though it certainly was a factor), since idolatry was every bit as rampant in the ancient Roman world of the NT as it was in the ancient Near Eastern context in which the OT documents were written.

Rather, all that is revealed about God concerns the redemption of God's people, and all the tremendous revelation that we receive about God is in order that we love and worship him rightly. The revelation of the Bible is tied to the history of redemption, and is therefore progressive, tied to the great deeds God does in history to redeem his people. The people of God didn't get it all at once, but in each successive stage of redemptive history, God revealed more about himself, his eternal plan, and his purposes for his people.

And each stage of redemption is dependent on what has come before, and is consistent with it. The oneness (uniqueness) of God in the OT was a tremendously important truth. The Israelites' redemption did not depend on the various gods of the ancient world, but on the one true God, who is God alone. But even in the OT, there are hints, such as at Isa 9:6ff, that God, with regard to his being, is not simply uni-essential, but that there is differentiation in his being. In the NT, with the full revelation of God's plan of redemption, we receive the most complete revelation

of God. Jesus Christ is the absolute fulfillment of God's plan, the centerpiece and culmination of history, and through God's revelation in Christ (Heb 1:1) we learn far more about God than even the wisest OT saint. God does not cease to be one, but learn that the Father is God, Jesus is God, and that the Holy Spirit is God, yet each is treated as separate person with his own roles and responsibilities in the salvation of God's people. Perhaps the high point of this revelation is Matt 28:18-20:

*Matt 28:19*  
*A Trinitarian Proof Text?*

Mt 28:18 And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Mt 28:19 Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Mt 28:20 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. Amen.

First, a few comments to put the verse into context, and then to some specific considerations of the phrase in question.

This passage is generally known as “The Great Commission” and provides the church with the legal basis necessary to conquer all nations by the proclamation of the Gospel. While certainly, as the second person of the Trinity, Jesus had all the authority and power of God, he is invested, in his office as the Messiah, now the resurrected and ruling Lord, with a special authority over the nations (cf. Psalm 2; Rom 16:25-27). The word translated “authority” above (better than what the KJV has, “power,” cf. NIV, ESV, and other modern versions), is the Greek εξουσια (*exousia*), which means “legal” or “proper authority.” On the basis of that authority, Jesus then gives his “marching orders” to the church. The actual imperative (command form) is the word translated “make disciples” μαθητευσατε (*mathēteuseite*). The words translated “go” and “baptizing” are in Greek participles of means: they unpack how the action of making disciples is to be accomplished. Note the close connection here between baptism and making disciples, a connection that is sometimes overlooked in the modern church.

This brings us to our primary consideration. The object or reference of the baptism is indicated by a prepositional phrase: “in” (εἰς, *eis*) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.?

1. Notice that “name” is singular grammatically. It is one name essentially shared by the three following individuals referenced.
2. Although the implication is one of “authority” or “relationship” the word “name” still means name. In this context, the “final words” of Jesus before his ascension, in which Jesus is instituting a covenant sign for his people on the same level as circumcision for OT Israel, what name might one expect? Matthew is the most Jewish of the gospels, and if he had wished to mention the divine name of Yahweh, this would have been about the best place to do so. Instead, he says “of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”
3. The grammatical construction here underscores the point. A bit of explanation: Where English nouns depend on word order and prepositions to obtain their usage in a sentence, Greek nouns often change the ending of the word. These endings are called “cases.” Let’s use “Christ” as an example:

<i>Greek</i>	<i>Transliteration</i>	<i>Case</i>	<i>Translation/Use</i>
Χριστος	<i>Christos</i>	Nominative	Subject
Χριστου	<i>Christou</i>	Genitive	of Christ
Χριστω	<i>Christō</i>	Dative	to or for Christ
Χριστον	<i>Christon</i>	Accusative	Direct object <sup>35</sup>

---

35. This is oversimplified for ease of explanation. There are additional uses and translations for all these cases, and Greek has a number of prepositions (such as εἰς) the objects of which may go into any of the oblique cases; the genitive, the dative, or the accusative depending on the meaning of the preposition.

All three of the nouns above are in the genitive case, sometimes simply called the “of” case, because, 95 percent of the time, if you supply the English preposition “of” you translate the word correctly. There are different usages of the genitive case: for example, it is used of the possessive, and we often use ‘s or s’ to translate it: In the phrase “God’s church” in Greek, God would be genitive, του θεου εκκλησια (*του Theou ekklēsia*). It can be used to show quality or description: a man of good character, ανθρωπος της αγαθης αρετης (*anthropos tēs agathēs aretēs*). In Matt 28:19, the three nouns in the genitive explain or define the word “name,” ονομα (*onoma*), and hence the usage is called the “epexegetical” genitive. What does the name consist of? How do we define it? Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Now, one more bit of evidence to drive home the point. Before each of these words in Greek is the word “and” και (*kai*) and the definite article “the” (here in the genitive case to agree with the nouns modified, του). This underscores that the persons represented by each name are distinct, and yet the fact that all three are in the epexegetical genitive demonstrates that they share the same name. If the special, covenant name of God in the OT was Yahweh (Jehovah), then the special, covenant name of God in the NT is “Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.”

Now, this still falls short of a formal definition of the Trinity, but the grammatical evidence and the statement in context (Jesus is instituting a new covenant initiation ceremony to replace circumcision) provide rather strong support for the doctrine.

There are many, many more Scriptures which could be considered...

## Appendix 2

### *Equality and Subordination in John 5*

JOHN 5:17-47

In John 5:17-47, Jesus debates with the Jews concerning his miracle of healing on the Sabbath. This passage is quite rich, but we will be concentrating particularly on what the passage contributes to our understanding of the significance of Jesus' works to his person and relationship with the Father.

Indeed, this is the theme of the entire passage. In verse 17, Jesus defends the works which he does (including healing on the Sabbath and commanding the healed man to take up his bed) by the relationship of his works to the Father's works, with important implications for his relationship to the Father. Jesus states the relationship in two parallel clauses, which are literally translated "My Father works until now and I work." It is quite probable that this paratactic statement is meant to emphasize the parallelism of the activities, and hence the equality of the work (John elsewhere is quite capable of showing subordination, either by the use of clauses or participles). Perhaps a good dynamic equivalency would be "Even as the Father works until now, so do I." This suggests that the relationship of the Father and Son is a close intimacy with respect to the work which they share, and thereby suggests a relationship of equality. It also validates that which Jesus does. The Father may have indeed "rested" on the Seventh day, but this does not mean that he ceased from all activity. God manifestly continues to sustain the universe on the Sabbath day, and if the proper implications be drawn from Scripture, engages in a whole host of other activities as well. One of the implications drawn from this passage is that the work of redemption also continues. However, what is in view in this discussion is the relationship which is suggested.

Certainly there is nothing in the phrase that contradicts this idea of equality. In fact, the Jews sought to kill him, not only because of Sabbath-breaking, but because "he called God his [own, ἴδιον] Father, making himself out to be equal to God." In his use of the singular (the Jews sometimes called God "our" Father) Jesus is in fact claiming a special relationship with the Father, a relationship that can only be characterized as Father-Son. Surely Jesus' comments on the parallel work of himself and the Father contribute to the Jews' correct understanding of what is implied about their relationship. Their response is that Jesus is guilty of the death penalty for claiming equality with God, a charge which would certainly be subsumed under the general heading of "blasphemy" (cf. John 10:33-39). It may well be that the Jews felt that Jesus, in claiming equality with the Father, was setting himself up as some sort of rival God, a possibility to which the Jews, living in the context of a pagan environment, would have been well sensitized. In the rest of the passage, Jesus qualifies what he has said. He does not deny his equality with the Father, but he attempts to teach the Jews that this relationship is a legitimate one in which he himself plays a certain very definite role. And significantly, we note that Jesus' work is the Father's work. The work which Jesus does (and this discussion is explicitly related to the healing miracle which has just preceded) reveals a relationship of equality to and dependence on the Father. This is in particular a relationship of economic equality (the Father and the Son do the same sorts of activities) with nevertheless ontological implications. At the same time, the relationship is one best characterized by the relationship between Father and Son, a distinctly personal role differentiation which implies a type of subordination.

Verses 19-29 explicate this. Jesus' relationship to the Father, in terms of role, is one that is perfectly appropriate to a Son. Jesus is a dutiful, obedient Son who only acts in accord with the purpose of his Father. He does not act on his own, but he does that which he sees his Father doing. The Father loves the Son and shows (present tense, δείκνυσιν) to him all things which he does. The term all things (πάντα) should be underscored. There is nothing in the context which might suggest a metaphorical usage of the term "all," such as when we say something like "I told you everything I did last Tuesday" when obviously this does not mean absolutely everything. Rather, this πάντα is meant comprehensively, an interpretation which is underscored by the anarthrous usage of the substantive. There is nothing that the Father withholds from the Son. There is an implicit (almost explicit) claim to deity here. Only the Son of the Father is capable of comprehending and doing all things that the Father himself does. Indeed, what the Jews have seen is only a tithe compared to what will be done.

This is emphasized by the following. Note the types of works with which the Son is entrusted (and of course, these logically are only a subset of "all"). The works particularly highlighted are works of an eschatological nature, the raising of the dead and the final judgment. The Son is responsible for what in the OT and in most of the inter-testamental literature is seen as solely the provenance of the Father, the Day of the Lord. As the Father raises the dead and brings to

life whom he pleases, so the Son. As the Son is the trusted agent of the Father in creation (1:3ff) so the Father has entrusted all judgment to him. And for what reason has the Father done this? So that the Son might receive the same type of honor that is due to the Father. Failure to honor the Son is failure to honor the Father. In other words, the Son does the works of the Father, and therefore is to be honored to the same extent as the Father.

Indeed, the criterion for obtaining eternal life and avoiding eschatological judgment is belief in Jesus. Jesus is the one who controls the resurrection. Here, the voice of Jesus is emphasized. It is at Jesus' speech that the dead will hear his voice and live. While time and space would fail us to exhaust the Biblical-theological background of this, it will be noted that even as the speech of the Father is efficacious (Cf. Gen 1; Isa 55:10-11; Jer 25:30-31; Ezek 37:4-6, et al.) so also is the speech of the Son.

Note also that what is in effect covenant relationship with the Son is what is in view. In other words, the same type of relationship with Jahweh which saves in the OT is the type of relationship which the believer must have in Jesus. As in the OT one cleaves to Jahweh alone, abandoning vain idols and hoping in him alone for salvation both material and spiritual (cf. Exod 6:6-8; 20:1-26), so the believer in the NT trusts only in Jesus, guarding himself from idols (cf. 1 John 5:21).

John makes this relationship between the Father and Son even more explicit. The γάρ supplies the reason or ground for the preceding thought. Vs. 26, "For just as the Father has life in himself, so he grants to the Son to have life in himself." Godet comments:

Here is the boldest paradox which it is possible to declare. Life in himself, what in theology is called aseity, self existence, given to the Son.<sup>36</sup>

Broader systematic concerns aside, why is the Son able to call the dead to life? The reason is that he has life in himself. This life is the same life that the Father has, ὡςπερ being used here of a direct equation. Since the Son has life, he may give it to whom he will, and this life that he has is the same life as the Father. The Father and the Son share the same life. In view of such passages as 1:1-18 and 8:58, which clearly teach the eternal pre-existence of the Son, this life is not something which was given at a particular point in time, but has been shared by the Son and the Father from all eternity.

This ontological relationship frames the context for the functional as well. Not only has the Son been granted life from the Father from all eternity, but he also has been granted authority "because he is the Son of man." Certainly, whatever one may consider the origin of the "son of man" sayings in the synoptics, John here references the apocalyptic vision of Dan 7 as the background for this statement. Not only is the reason for the granting of this authority the relationship between the Father and the Son, but it is also the role to which the Son has been called, the role of the judge of all the earth. The Son of man will speak and the dead will come forth from the grave, some to everlasting delight, others to eternal torment.

Verse 30 perfectly restates the theme statement of the passage (v 19) and supplies the transition for the next statement (which, however, is not a new subject but another approach to the same theme). The Son is not able to act on his own, but instead seeks the will of the Father. The use of ἐμὸν rather than the pronoun μου emphasizes the possessive: "not *my* will." The judgment that he hears from the Father he enacts. While this language certainly suggests the obedience of the Son to the Father, it seems to suggest more than simple obedience, especially considering the overall context of the chapter. To borrow the language of Paul in Col 1:15, we see that the Son is the perfect image (εἰκὼν) of the Father, or in the language of the author to the Hebrews, the perfect representation (1:3, χαρακτήρ) of God. We might say that the Son flawlessly represents the Father in terms of both the Father's will and his activity.

The witness theme must be understood in this context. All along, Jesus' defense of the works that he does has been from the perspective of his relationship with the Father. Now he invokes witnesses, first the witness of John, a bona fide prophet. If John is a valid prophet, his witness must be true, for a true prophet simply speaks as the mouthpiece of Yahweh, at the risk of severe penalty for doing otherwise (Deut 18). But what if, for the sake of argument, John were a false prophet? Significantly for our purposes, Jesus has a greater witness. God the Father witnesses directly on behalf of Jesus with out any intermediary. As Carson correctly points out, the evidence for this witness is Jesus himself.<sup>37</sup> The

---

36. Frederic Louis Godet, *Commentary on John's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1978), p. 476.

37. D.A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), p. 261-263.

argument is that if Jesus truly so perfectly represents the Father in purpose and activity, then the works which Jesus does will no doubt corroborate the interpretation which he gives to those works. And this is exactly the reality of the situation. “The very works which the Father has given me to do give witness concerning me that the Father has sent me.”

This section closes with the witness of Scripture, and particularly Moses, a theme that does not directly concern us here. However, it may be noted that in the view of the Jews of this period, Scripture was the verbatim words of God (cf. 10:34-35, in which Jesus reminds the Jews of what must be a commonly held assumption). The Scriptures give testimony to Christ. Moses, the premier prophet of the Old Covenant, the author of the Torah, the one with whom God spoke face to face, accuses (καταγορέω — note the unmistakable legal term) the Jews for their unbelief. Their guilt is compounded by the fact that under normal circumstances they are willing to accept trustworthy human testimony, but the most secure testimony of all, God's testimony, given through John, the works of Jesus, and the Scriptures they reject. The implication is also present that the words of Jesus as the *revelator Dei* (here his self interpretation) perfectly coincide with his works. Both his words and his works are given to him by the Father (7:16-18), represent the purpose of the Father, and are in complete accord with one another.

A rapid survey of thematically related passages will reveal the accuracy of this interpretation. Nowhere else in the Gospel do the works of Jesus receive such exhaustive treatment, but the relationship of Jesus to the Father is frequently referenced. In the passage closest to 5:17-47, 10:31-42, the Jews attempt to stone Jesus because of blasphemy, because he has claimed a special position of sonship with regard to the Father. As in John 5, Jesus does not correct them, but corrects their misunderstanding of what this legitimate relationship with the Father involves. Jesus brings up the miracles he performs as evidence that what he says and does must be mutually interpretative, and specifically that what he does confirms what he says. On his relationship with the Father see also 7:28-29; 16:15; 17:1-19. On the relationship of works to character and nature, cf. the clear implications of 8:39-47.

In conclusion, we may note that the works of Jesus are integrally related to the relationship that Jesus has with his Father and the purpose for which he is sent. Jesus' works, which are particularly (although not exclusively) his miracles, are revelatory of this relationship. Through them the Father witnesses to the true nature and purpose of the Son. The relationship that the Son has with the Father is a relationship of equality and complete dependence, but dependence nuanced in such a way as to perfectly reveal the Father. The accent falls on Jesus' perfect agreement with the Father and work on his behalf. Jesus, in fact, as the Son, has become the premier prophet who perfectly reveals the person, will and activity of the Father.

### ***Bibliography***

Beasley-Murray, George R. *John, Word Biblical Commentary*. Waco, TX: Word, 1987.

Bruce, F.F. *The Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

Carson, D.A. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.

Plummer, Alfred. *The Gospel According to St. John*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981 (reprint: 1882).

Ridderbos, Herman. *The Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

## Appendix 3 Ancient Creeds of the Christian Faith

Cults that make claims with regard to the Bible nearly always make unbiblical claims with regard to the nature of God, the nature of Christ, and salvation. The following are Christian credal and catechetical statements which were themselves forged in controversy with various heresies.

### **The Chalcedonian Creed (451 A.D.)**

We, then, following the holy Fathers, all with one consent, teach men to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in manhood; truly God and truly man, of a reasonable [rational] soul and body; consubstantial [co-essential] with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the Manhood; in all things like unto us, without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the Godhead, and in these latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, according to the Manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably; the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one Person and one Subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, and only begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; as the prophets from the beginning [have declared] concerning Him, and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself has taught us, and the Creed of the holy Fathers has handed down to us.

### **The Nicene (Constantinopolitan) Creed (381 A.D.)**

We believe in one God, the Father, the Almighty, of all that is, seen and unseen.

We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, eternally begotten of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, of one Being with the Father.

Through him all things were made.

For us and for our salvation he came down from heaven: by the power of the Holy Spirit he became incarnate from the Virgin Mary, and was made man.

For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate; he suffered death and was buried.

On the third day he rose again in accordance with the Scriptures; he ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father.

He will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead, and his kingdom will have no end.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son.

With the Father and the Son he is worshipped and glorified.

He has spoken through the Prophets.

We believe in one holy catholic and apostolic Church.

We acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins.

We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

### **The Athanasian Creed (mid 5<sup>th</sup> Century)<sup>38</sup>**

We worship one God in trinity, and trinity in unity, neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance. For the person of the Father is one; of the Son, another; of the Holy Spirit, another. But the divinity of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit is one, the glory equal, the majesty equal. Such as is the Father, such also is the Son, and such the Holy Spirit.

The Father is uncreated, the Son is uncreated, the Holy Spirit is uncreated. The Father is infinite, the Son is infinite, the Holy Spirit is infinite. The Father is eternal, the Son is eternal, the Holy Spirit is eternal. And yet there are not three eternal Beings, but one eternal Being. So also there are not three uncreated Beings, nor three infinite Beings, but one uncreated and one infinite Being.

In like manner, the Father is omnipotent, the Son is omnipotent, and the Holy Spirit is omnipotent. And yet there are not three omnipotent Beings, but one omnipotent Being. Thus the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God. And yet there are not three Gods, but one God only. The Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Spirit is Lord. And yet there are not three Lords, but one Lord only.

For as we are compelled by Christian truth to confess each person distinctively to be both God and Lord, we are prohibited by the Catholic religion to say that there are three Gods or Lords. The Father is made by none, nor created, nor begotten. The Son is from the Father alone, not made, not created, but begotten. The Holy Spirit is not created by the Father and the Son, nor begotten, but proceeds. Therefore, there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Spirit, not three Holy Spirits.

And in this Trinity there is nothing prior or posterior, nothing greater or less, but all three persons are coeternal and coequal to themselves. So that through all, as was said above, both unity in trinity and trinity in unity is to be adored. Whoever would be saved, let him thus think concerning the Trinity.

---

<sup>38</sup> It is unlikely that Athanasius himself wrote this, but most likely was composed by an unknown author in the Augustinian tradition.

**Appendix 4**  
*Uses of Theos in John*

John 1:1 Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.  
John 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.  
RSV

John 1:1 Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.  
John 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.  
RSV

John 1:2 οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν.  
John 1:2 He was in the beginning with God; RSV

John 1:6 Ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος, ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ, ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης.  
John 1:6 There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. RSV

John 1:12 ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,  
John 1:12 But to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God; RSV

John 1:13 οἱ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν.  
John 1:13 who were born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God. RSV

John 1:18 θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.  
John 1:18 No one has ever seen God; the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known. RSV

John 1:18 θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.  
John 1:18 No one has ever seen God; the only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has made him known. RSV

John 1:29 Τῇ ἐπαύριον βλέπει τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτόν καὶ λέγει, Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου.  
John 1:29 The next day he saw Jesus coming toward him, and said, "Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world! RSV

John 1:34 καὶ ἐώρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.  
John 1:34 And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God." RSV

John 1:36 καὶ ἐμβλέψας τῷ Ἰησοῦ περιπατοῦντι λέγει, Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.  
John 1:36 and he looked at Jesus as he walked, and said, "Behold, the Lamb of God!" RSV

John 1:49 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ, Ῥαββί, σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.  
John 1:49 Nathan'a-el answered him, "Rabbi, you are the Son of God! You are the King of Israel!"  
RSV

John 1:51 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεφρότα καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.  
John 1:51 And he said to him, "Truly, truly, I say to you, you will see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." RSV

John 3:2 οὗτος ἦλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ῥαββί, οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας διδάσκαλος· οὐδεὶς γὰρ δύναται ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖν ἢ σὺ ποιεῖς, ἐὰν μὴ ᾗ ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ.  
John 3:2 This man came to Jesus by night and said to him, "Rabbi, we know that you are a teacher come from God; for no one can do these signs that you do, unless God is with him." RSV

John 3:2 οὗτος ἦλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ῥαββί, οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας διδάσκαλος· οὐδεὶς γὰρ δύναται ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖν ἢ σὺ ποιεῖς, ἐὰν μὴ ᾗ ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ.  
John 3:2 This man came to Jesus by night and said to him, "Rabbi, we know that you are a teacher come from God; for no one can do these signs that you do, unless God is with him." RSV

John 3:3 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.  
John 3:3 Jesus answered him, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God." RSV

John 3:5 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.  
John 3:5 Jesus answered, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." RSV

John 3:16 Οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχη ζωὴν αἰώνιον.  
John 3:16 For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him should not perish but have eternal life. RSV

John 3:17 οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα κρίνη τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῆ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ.  
John 3:17 For God sent the Son into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world might be saved through him. RSV

John 3:18 ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν οὐ κρίνεται· ὁ δὲ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται, ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.  
John 3:18 He who believes in him is not condemned; he who does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only Son of God. RSV

John 3:21 ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα φανερωθῆ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ὅτι ἐν θεῷ ἔστιν εἰργασμένα.

John 3:21 But he who does what is true comes to the light, that it may be clearly seen that his deeds have been wrought in God. RSV

John 3:33 ὁ λαβὼν αὐτοῦ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐσφράγισεν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀληθὴς ἐστίν.  
John 3:33 he who receives his testimony sets his seal to this, that God is true. RSV

John 3:34 ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ, οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν τὸ πνεῦμα.

John 3:34 For he whom God has sent utters the words of God, for it is not by measure that he gives the Spirit; RSV

John 3:34 ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ, οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν τὸ πνεῦμα.

John 3:34 For he whom God has sent utters the words of God, for it is not by measure that he gives the Spirit; RSV

John 3:36 ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον· ὁ δὲ ἀπειθῶν τῷ υἱῷ οὐκ ὄψεται ζωὴν, ἀλλ' ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν.

John 3:36 He who believes in the Son has eternal life; he who does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God rests upon him. RSV

John 4:10 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Εἰ ᾔδεις τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων σοι, Δός μοι πεῖν, σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας αὐτὸν καὶ ἔδωκεν ἄν σοι ὕδωρ ζῶν.

John 4:10 Jesus answered her, "If you knew the gift of God, and who it is that is saying to you, 'Give me a drink,' you would have asked him, and he would have given you living water." RSV

John 4:24 πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν.

John 4:24 God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth." RSV

John 5:18 διὰ τοῦτο οὖν μᾶλλον ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἔλυεν τὸ σάββατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγεν τὸν θεὸν ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ.

John 5:18 This was why the Jews sought all the more to kill him, because he not only broke the sabbath but also called God his Father, making himself equal with God. RSV

John 5:18 διὰ τοῦτο οὖν μᾶλλον ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἔλυεν τὸ σάββατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγεν τὸν θεὸν ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ.

John 5:18 This was why the Jews sought all the more to kill him, because he not only broke the sabbath but also called God his Father, making himself equal with God. RSV

John 5:25 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν ὅτε οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσουσιν τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσουσιν.

John 5:25 "Truly, truly, I say to you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live. RSV

John 5:42 ἀλλὰ ἔγνωκα ὑμᾶς ὅτι τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.

John 5:42 But I know that you have not the love of God within you. RSV

John 5:44 πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες, καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε;

John 5:44 How can you believe, who receive glory from one another and do not seek the glory that comes from the only God? RSV

John 6:27 ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρωσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην ἀλλὰ τὴν βρωσιν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἣν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑμῖν δώσει· τοῦτον γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἐσφράγισεν ὁ θεός.

John 6:27 Do not labor for the food which perishes, but for the food which endures to eternal life, which the Son of man will give to you; for on him has God the Father set his seal." RSV

John 6:28 εἶπον οὖν πρὸς αὐτόν, Τί ποιῶμεν ἵνα ἐργαζώμεθα τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ;

John 6:28 Then they said to him, "What must we do, to be doing the works of God?" RSV

John 6:29 ἀπεκρίθη [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα πιστεύητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος.

John 6:29 Jesus answered them, "This is the work of God, that you believe in him whom he has sent." RSV

John 6:33 ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ.

John 6:33 For the bread of God is that which comes down from heaven, and gives life to the world." RSV

John 6:45 ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, Καὶ ἔσονται πάντες διδασκτοὶ θεοῦ· πᾶς ὁ ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μαθὼν ἔρχεται πρὸς ἐμέ.

John 6:45 It is written in the prophets, And they shall all be taught by God.' Every one who has heard and learned from the Father comes to me. RSV

John 6:46 οὐχ ὅτι τὸν πατέρα εἶδρακεν τις εἰ μὴ ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, οὗτος εἶδρακεν τὸν πατέρα.

John 6:46 Not that any one has seen the Father except him who is from God; he has seen the Father. RSV

John 6:69 καὶ ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.

John 6:69 and we have believed, and have come to know, that you are the Holy One of God." RSV

John 7:17 ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσεται περὶ τῆς διδασχῆς πότερον ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἢ ἐγὼ ἀπ' ἑμαυτοῦ λαλῶ.

John 7:17 if any man's will is to do his will, he shall know whether the teaching is from God or whether I am speaking on my own authority. RSV

John 8:40 νῦν δὲ ζητεῖτέ με ἀποκτεῖναι ἄνθρωπον ὃς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα ἣν ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ· τοῦτο Ἀβραάμ οὐκ ἐποίησεν.

John 8:40 but now you seek to kill me, a man who has told you the truth which I heard from God; this is not what Abraham did. RSV

John 8:41 ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν. εἶπαν [οὖν] αὐτῷ, Ἡμεῖς ἐκ πορνείας οὐ γεγενήμεθα· ἓνα πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν θεόν.

John 8:41 You do what your father did." They said to him, "We were not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God." RSV

John 8:42 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Εἰ ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἦν ἠγαπᾶτε ἂν ἐμέ, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἤκω· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπ' ἑμαυτοῦ ἐλήλυθα, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλεν.

John 8:42 Jesus said to them, "If God were your Father, you would love me, for I proceeded and came forth from God; I came not of my own accord, but he sent me." RSV

John 8:42 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Εἰ ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἦν ἠγαπᾶτε ἂν ἐμέ, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἤκω· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπ' ἑμαυτοῦ ἐλήλυθα, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλεν.

John 8:42 Jesus said to them, "If God were your Father, you would love me, for I proceeded and came forth from God; I came not of my own accord, but he sent me." RSV

John 8:47 ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούει· διὰ τοῦτο ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀκούετε, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστέ.

John 8:47 He who is of God hears the words of God; the reason why you do not hear them is that you are not of God." RSV

John 8:47 ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούει· διὰ τοῦτο ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀκούετε, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστέ.

John 8:47 He who is of God hears the words of God; the reason why you do not hear them is that you are not of God." RSV

John 8:47 ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούει· διὰ τοῦτο ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀκούετε, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστέ.

John 8:47 He who is of God hears the words of God; the reason why you do not hear them is that you are not of God." RSV

John 8:54 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Ἐὰν ἐγὼ δοξάσω ἑμαυτόν, ἡ δόξα μου οὐδὲν ἐστίν· ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ δοξάζων με, ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐστίν,

John 8:54 Jesus answered, "If I glorify myself, my glory is nothing; it is my Father who glorifies me, of whom you say that he is your God." RSV

John 9:3 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Οὗτε οὗτος ἥμαρτεν οὔτε οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ.

John 9:3 Jesus answered, "It was not that this man sinned, or his parents, but that the works of God might be made manifest in him." RSV

John 9:16 ἔλεγον οὖν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων τινές, Οὐκ ἐστίν οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι τὸ σάββατον οὐ τηρεῖ. ἄλλοι [δὲ] ἔλεγον, Πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος ἀμαρτωλὸς τοιαῦτα σημεῖα ποιεῖν; καὶ σχίσμα ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς.

John 9:16 Some of the Pharisees said, "This man is not from God, for he does not keep the sabbath." But others said, "How can a man who is a sinner do such signs?" There was a division among them." RSV

John 9:24 Ἐφώνησαν οὖν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ δευτέρου ὃς ἦν τυφλὸς καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Δὸς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ· ἡμεῖς οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλὸς ἐστίν.

John 9:24 So for the second time they called the man who had been blind, and said to him, "Give God the praise; we know that this man is a sinner." RSV

John 9:29 ἡμεῖς οἶδαμεν ὅτι Μωϋσεὶ λελάληκεν ὁ θεός, τοῦτον δὲ οὐκ οἶδαμεν πόθεν ἐστίν.  
John 9:29 We know that God has spoken to Moses, but as for this man, we do not know where he comes from." RSV

John 9:31 οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἀκούει, ἀλλ' ἐάν τις θεοσεβῆς ἦ καὶ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιῇ τούτου ἀκούει.

John 9:31 We know that God does not listen to sinners, but if any one is a worshiper of God and does his will, God listens to him. RSV

John 9:33 εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἠδύνατο ποιεῖν οὐδέν.  
John 9:33 If this man were not from God, he could do nothing." RSV

John 10:33 ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, Περὶ καλοῦ ἔργου οὐ λιθάζομέν σε ἀλλὰ περὶ βλασφημίας, καὶ ὅτι σὺ ἄνθρωπος ὢν ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν θεόν.  
John 10:33 The Jews answered him, "It is not for a good work that we stone you but for blasphemy; because you, being a man, make yourself God." RSV

John 10:34 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς, Οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν ὅτι Ἐγὼ εἶπα, Θεοὶ ἐστε;  
John 10:34 Jesus answered them, "Is it not written in your law, I said, you are gods? RSV

John 10:35 εἰ ἐκείνους εἶπεν θεοὺς πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή.  
John 10:35 If he called them gods to whom the word of God came (and scripture cannot be broken), RSV

John 10:35 εἰ ἐκείνους εἶπεν θεοὺς πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή.  
John 10:35 If he called them gods to whom the word of God came (and scripture cannot be broken), RSV

John 10:36 ὃν ὁ πατὴρ ἡγίασεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι Βλασφημεῖς, ὅτι εἶπον, Υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι;

John 10:36 do you say of him whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world, You are blaspheming,' because I said, I am the Son of God?' RSV

John 11:4 ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Αὕτη ἡ ἀσθένεια οὐκ ἔστιν πρὸς θάνατον ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ δι' αὐτῆς.

John 11:4 But when Jesus heard it he said, "This illness is not unto death; it is for the glory of God, so that the Son of God may be glorified by means of it." RSV

John 11:4 ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Αὕτη ἡ ἀσθένεια οὐκ ἔστιν πρὸς θάνατον ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ δι' αὐτῆς.

John 11:4 But when Jesus heard it he said, "This illness is not unto death; it is for the glory of God, so that the Son of God may be glorified by means of it." RSV

John 11:22 [ἀλλὰ] καὶ νῦν οἶδα ὅτι ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν θεὸν δώσει σοὶ ὁ θεός.

John 11:22 And even now I know that whatever you ask from God, God will give you." RSV

John 11:22 [ἀλλὰ] καὶ νῦν οἶδα ὅτι ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν θεὸν δώσει σοὶ ὁ θεός.

John 11:22 And even now I know that whatever you ask from God, God will give you." RSV

John 11:27 λέγει αὐτῷ, Ναὶ κύριε, ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος.

John 11:27 She said to him, "Yes, Lord; I believe that you are the Christ, the Son of God, he who is coming into the world." RSV

John 11:40 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Οὐκ εἶπόν σοι ὅτι ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς ὄψῃ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ;

John 11:40 Jesus said to her, "Did I not tell you that if you would believe you would see the glory of God?" RSV

John 11:52 καὶ οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους μόνον ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ διεσκορπισμένα συναγάγῃ εἰς ἓν.

John 11:52 and not for the nation only, but to gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad. RSV

John 12:43 ἠγάπησαν γὰρ τὴν δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἢπερ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

John 12:43 for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God. RSV

John 13:3 εἰδὼς ὅτι πάντα ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθεν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ὑπάγει,

John 13:3 Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he had come from God and was going to God, RSV

John 13:3 εἰδὼς ὅτι πάντα ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθεν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ὑπάγει,

John 13:3 Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he had come from God and was going to God, RSV

John 13:31 Ὅτε οὖν ἐξῆλθεν, λέγει Ἰησοῦς, Νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ.

John 13:31 When he had gone out, Jesus said, "Now is the Son of man glorified, and in him God is glorified; RSV

John 13:32 [εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ,] καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει αὐτόν.

John 13:32 if God is glorified in him, God will also glorify him in himself, and glorify him at once. RSV

John 13:32 [εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ,] καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει αὐτόν.

John 13:32 if God is glorified in him, God will also glorify him in himself, and glorify him at once.  
RSV

John 14:1 Μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία· πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε.  
John 14:1 "Let not your hearts be troubled; believe in God, believe also in me. RSV

John 16:2 ἀποσυναγώγους ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς· ἀλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα ἵνα πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνων ὑμᾶς δόξῃ λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ.

John 16:2 They will put you out of the synagogues; indeed, the hour is coming when whoever kills you will think he is offering service to God. RSV

John 16:27 αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ πατήρ φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐμὲ περιλήκατε καὶ πεπιστεύκατε ὅτι ἐγὼ παρὰ [τοῦ] θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον.

John 16:27 for the Father himself loves you, because you have loved me and have believed that I came from the Father. RSV

John 16:30 νῦν οἶδαμεν ὅτι οἶδας πάντα καὶ οὐ χρείαν ἔχεις ἵνα τίς σε ἐρωτᾷ· ἐν τούτῳ πιστεύομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες.

John 16:30 Now we know that you know all things, and need none to question you; by this we believe that you came from God." RSV

John 17:3 αὕτη δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ ἵνα γινώσκωσιν σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.

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

John 19:7 ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, Ἡμεῖς νόμον ἔχομεν καὶ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸν θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἐποίησεν.

John 19:7 The Jews answered him, "We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he has made himself the Son of God." RSV

John 20:17 λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰησοῦς, Μὴ μου ἄπτου, οὐπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου καὶ εἰπὲ αὐτοῖς, Ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ θεόν μου καὶ θεὸν ὑμῶν.

John 20:17 Jesus said to her, "Do not hold me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father; but go to my brethren and say to them, I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God." RSV

John 20:17 λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰησοῦς, Μὴ μου ἄπτου, οὐπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου καὶ εἰπὲ αὐτοῖς, Ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ θεόν μου καὶ θεὸν ὑμῶν.

John 20:17 Jesus said to her, "Do not hold me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father; but go to my brethren and say to them, I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God." RSV

John 20:28 ἀπεκρίθη Θωμᾶς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου.  
John 20:28 Thomas answered him, "My Lord and my God!" RSV

John 20:31 ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύ[σ]ητε ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.

John 20:31 but these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name. RSV

John 21:19 τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ δοξάσει τὸν θεόν. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν λέγει αὐτῷ, Ἀκολούθει μοι.

John 21:19 (This he said to show by what death he was to glorify God.) And after this he said to him, "Follow me." RSV

**Appendix 5**  
*The "I am" Statements in John*

John 8:24 εἶπον οὖν ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν· ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν.

John 8:24 I told you that you would die in your sins, for you will die in your sins unless you believe that I am he."  
RSV

John 8:28 εἶπεν οὖν [αὐτοῖς] ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ὅταν ὑψώσητε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τότε γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ ποιῶ οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἐδίδαξέν με ὁ πατήρ ταῦτα λαλῶ.

John 8:28 So Jesus said, "When you have lifted up the Son of man, then you will know that I am he, and that I do nothing on my own authority but speak thus as the Father taught me. RSV

John 8:58 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμί.

John 8:58 Jesus said to them, "Truly, truly, I say to you, before Abraham was, I am." RSV

John 9:9 ἄλλοι ἔλεγον ὅτι Οὗτός ἐστιν, ἄλλοι ἔλεγον, Οὐχί, ἀλλὰ ὅμοιος αὐτῷ ἐστιν. ἐκεῖνος ἔλεγεν ὅτι Ἐγὼ εἰμι.

John 9:9 Some said, "It is he"; others said, "No, but he is like him." He said, "I am the man."<sup>39</sup> RSV

John 10:7 Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων.

John 10:7 So Jesus again said to them, "Truly, truly, I say to you, I am the door of the sheep. RSV

John 10:9 ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα· δι' ἐμοῦ ἐάν τις εἰσέλθῃ σωθήσεται καὶ εἰσελεύσεται καὶ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ νομὴν εὐρήσει.

John 10:9 I am the door; if any one enters by me, he will be saved, and will go in and out and find pasture.  
RSV

John 10:11 Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός· ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων·

John 10:11 I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep. RSV

John 10:14 Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς καὶ γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ γινώσκουσί με τὰ ἐμὰ,

John 10:14 I am the good shepherd; I know my own and my own know me, RSV

John 11:25 εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωὴ· ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ κἀν ἀποθάνῃ ζήσεται,

John 11:25 Jesus said to her, "I am the resurrection and the life; he who believes in me, though he die, yet shall he live, RSV

John 13:19 ἀπ' ἄρτι λέγω ὑμῖν πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι, ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅταν γένηται ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.

John 13:19 I tell you this now, before it takes place, that when it does take place you may believe that I am he.  
RSV

John 14:6 λέγει αὐτῷ [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς, Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωὴ· οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ δι' ἐμοῦ.

John 14:6 Jesus said to him, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father, but by me.  
RSV

John 15:1 Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ γεωργός ἐστιν.

---

39 This is the only "I am" statement in the Gospel that is not attributed to Jesus.

John 15:1 "I am the true vine, and my Father is the vinedresser. RSV

John 15:5 ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος, ὑμεῖς τὰ κλήματα. ὁ μένων ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ οὗτος φέρει καρπὸν πολὺν, ὅτι χωρὶς ἐμοῦ οὐ δύνασθε ποιεῖν οὐδέν.

John 15:5 I am the vine, you are the branches. He who abides in me, and I in him, he it is that bears much fruit, for apart from me you can do nothing. RSV

John 18:5 ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ, Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον. λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ἐγώ εἰμι. εἰστίκει δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας ὁ παραδιδούς αὐτὸν μετ' αὐτῶν.

John 18:5 They answered him, "Jesus of Nazareth." Jesus said to them, "I am he." Judas, who betrayed him, was standing with them. RSV

John 18:6 ὡς οὖν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ἐγώ εἰμι, ἀπήλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ ἔπεσαν χαμαί.

John 18:6 When he said to them, "I am he," they drew back and fell to the ground. RSV

John 18:8 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι· εἰ οὖν ἐμὲ ζητεῖτε, ἄφετε τούτους ὑπάγειν·

John 18:8 Jesus answered, "I told you that I am he; so, if you seek me, let these men go." RSV