Why We Should Believe in the Trinity

How the Doctrine of the Trinity Developed

The doctrine of the Trinity separates orthodox Christian teaching from heresy. This essential teaching of Christianity states that we believe in one God who exists in three separate and distinct persons—God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. Each member is equal in nature and substance. (For a biblical defense of the Trinity, see Jehovah’s Witnesses and the Trinity.)

A common question raised by heretical groups is, When and how did this doctrine develop? According to the Watchtower tract Should You Believe in the Trinity? this doctrine was not held by the church fathers. Rather, it was imposed on the church by the pagan emperors who had “converted” to Christianity at the Council of Nicea in 325 A.D. and the Council of Constantinople in 381 A.D. The bishops in attendance were overawed by the emperor and signed the creed against their inclination. Let’s take a careful look at what really happened at these two key church councils.

The Council of Nicea was the first church council ever called. Until this time, the church was under severe persecution from the Roman Empire. Early in the fourth century, the emperor Constantine showed an interest in Christianity and was tutored by Hosius of Cordova who held to the doctrine of the Trinity. With peace in the empire, Christianity spread all across the world. However, in Alexandria a presbyter named Arius gathered a significant following around his teaching that Jesus was a created being and not God. As his teachings spread, the controversy grew and Constantine realized it needed to be addressed. He thus called for the first universal church
council at Nicea to debate the matter.

Although the doctrine of the Trinity itself was not discussed, the doctrine of the deity of Christ was confirmed. In attendance were approximately 300 bishops, many of whom were divided over the issue. Arius with his supporters, Theonas, Secundus, and Eusebius of Nicomedia, held the view that Jesus was an inferior creature to God the Father. The orthodox camp was led by Bishops Hosius, Alexander of Alexandria, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Athanasius who argued that Jesus is God.

After hours of debate, the council concluded the following in their creed:

“We believe . . . in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten from the Father, only-begotten, that is from the substance of the Father, God from God, light from light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, of one substance (homoousios) with the Father. . . .”

While the deity of Christ—a crucial aspect of the doctrine of the Trinity—was affirmed, Arius nevertheless continued to teach his doctrine of Christ’s inferiority, and Arianism came back into favor for a short time. Fifty years later, in 381 A.D., the Council of Constantinople was called by Emperor Theodosius. Here the Nicene Creed was reaffirmed and further clarified. It is at this council that the Holy Spirit was declared equal in divinity with the Father and the Son.

The councils of Nicea and Constantinople did not establish a new creed. The councils clarified and formalized the belief in the deity of Christ and the Holy Spirit, views already held by the apostles and church fathers. However, Jehovah’s Witnesses contest this point. Let’s see if the church fathers who lived before the Council of Nicea, the ante-Nicene fathers, held to the deity of Christ.
What Did the Church Fathers Say About the Trinity?

According to the Jehovah’s Witnesses, the deity of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity were never a part of the theology of the church fathers. In the article Should You Believe in the Trinity? several church fathers are cited as denying the orthodox view of Jesus. They include Justin Martyr who died in 165 A.D., Irenaeus 200 A.D., Clement of Alexandria 215 A.D., Tertullian 230 A.D., Hippolytus 235 A.D., and Origen who died in 250 A.D. The Watchtower list quotes from each theologian, claiming that they believed the inferiority of the Son to the Father. But the article contains no footnotes citing the source of these quotations.

Did these significant figures in church history really deny the divine nature of Christ? Let us take a careful (and referenced) look at what the ante-Nicene fathers stated in their original writings.

Justin Martyr: “...the Father of the universe has a Son; who being the logos and First-begotten is also God” (First Apology 63:15).

Irenaeus: (referencing Jesus) “…in order that to Christ Jesus, our Lord, and God, and Savior, and King, according to the will of the invisible Father, ...” (Against Heresies I, x, 1).

Clement of Alexandria: “Both as God and as man, the Lord renders us every kind of help and service. As God He forgives sin, as man He educates us to avoid sin completely” (Christ the Educator, chapter 3.1). In addition, “Our educator, O children, resembles His Father, God, whose son He is. He is
without sin, without blame, without passion of soul, God immaculate in form of man accomplishing His Father’s will” (Christ the Educator Chapter 2:4).

_Tertullian:_ “…the only God has also a Son, his Word who has proceeded from himself, by whom all things were made and without whom nothing has been made: that this was sent by the Father into the virgin and was born of her both man and God. Son of Man, Son of God, …” (_Against Praxeas_, 2).

_Hippolytus:_ “And the blessed John in the testimony of his gospel, gives us an account of this economy and acknowledges this word as God, when he says, ‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God.’ If then the Word was with God and was also God, what follows? Would one say that he speaks of two Gods? I shall not indeed speak of two Gods, but of one; of two persons however, and of a third economy, the grace of the Holy Ghost” (_Against the Heresy of One Noetus_. 14).

_Origen:_ (with regard to John 1:1) “…the arrangement of the sentences might be thought to indicate an order; we have first, ‘in the beginning was the Word,’ then ‘And the Word was with God,’ and thirdly, ‘and the Word was God,’ so that it might be seen that the Word being with God makes Him God” (_Commentary on John_, Book 2, Chapter 1).

Not only in these instances, but also throughout their writings the ante-Nicene fathers strongly defend the deity of Christ.
What Did the Apostle John Say?

To summarize our argument thus far, we discovered that the doctrine of the Trinity was formally adopted as the official teaching of Christianity after the Council of Nicea in 325 A.D. I argued against opponents who state that the doctrine was imposed on the church by Constantine in a political move. Rather, the Nicene Creed was a formal statement of a doctrine already articulated by the church fathers even before Nicea. Now, let us take a look and see what the apostle John teaches.

John opens his Gospel with, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” In the beginning was the Word shows that the Word was eternally with the Father and not a created being. The second phrase, and the Word was with God, shows that the Word is a distinct person from the Father. Thirdly, and the Word was God reveals that although separate and distinct, the Word in nature and substance is fully God.

Throughout his Gospel, John demonstrates that Jesus possesses the attributes which qualify Him to be God. Jesus displays power over nature, over disease, and even death. He has a grasp of the Law of God which He, though not formally trained, teaches with such authority as had never been seen before (7:14-16). Testimony from John the Baptist (1:29; 3:26-36) shows His authority to be God. Jesus also accepted the worship of men (9:38).

Jesus also makes several statements revealing His divinity. In John 5:22-23 Jesus says, “Moreover, the Father judges no one, but has entrusted all judgment to the Son, that all may honor the Son just as they honor the Father. He who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father who sent Him.” Here, Jesus commands followers to honor Him as they honor the Father. To do this, one must acknowledge Jesus as being equal in nature to God.
John 8:58 states, “‘I tell you the truth,’ Jesus answered, ‘before Abraham was born, I am.’” The term *I am* is the term God used when He spoke to Moses in Exodus 3:14. Here is a clear statement of Christ declaring His divinity.

In John 10:30 Jesus says, “I and the Father are one.” Jesus did not mean “I am one in purpose with God.” He was claiming to be God. The verses that follow His declaration make that clear: “Again the Jews picked up stones to stone Him, but Jesus said to them, ‘I have shown you many great miracles from the Father. For which of these do you stone me?’ ‘We are not stoning you for any of these,’ replied the Jews, ‘but for blasphemy, because you, a mere man, claim to be God” (vv. 31-33). The Jews clearly understood His statement and Jesus does not deny their accusation.

The culmination of John’s testimony of Jesus’ deity is in 20:28, which is the conclusion he desires all his readers to come to. “Thomas said to him, ‘My Lord and my God!’” John argues throughout his entire Gospel for the purpose that all who read it might come to believe that Jesus is God incarnate.

**John 1:1**

In spite of the overwhelming testimony throughout the entire Gospel of John, there are some who argue about the translation of John 1:1. The *New World Translation* of the Jehovah’s Witnesses reads, “In the beginning was the word and the word was with God and the word was a god,” which makes Jesus to be an inferior being to God. In refutation of this translation, I will explain the Greek rules behind the proper translation and argue that the Greek word *God* (*theos*) in John 1:1c must be translated in the definite or qualitative sense—written *God* with a capital G—rather than indefinitely—a *god*—as the NWT has done. This discussion will get a little technical, but the importance of the subject deserves careful attention.

Let me first define some key terms of Greek grammar. An
anarthrous noun is a noun without the definite article, the. A noun in the nominative case in Greek often signifies that this is the subject of the sentence. A predicate nominative noun is a noun in the same case and is equivalent to the subject. The Greek construction of John1:1c looks like this, theos e^n ho logos, and is literally translated “God was the Word.”

The subject of this phrase is the Word (ho logos). We know this because it is in the Greek nominative case and it possesses the definite article ho. God (theos) is in the nominative case and does not have an article. It precedes the equative verb “was” (e^n), and therefore is the predicate nominative.

The Jehovah’s Witnesses argue that since God (theos) does not have the article before it, it must be translated indefinitely. So we get their translation, “a god.” However, there are other possibilities available for translation.

According to a Greek grammar rule called Colwell’s rule, the construction in John 1:1c—anarthrous predicate nominative (theos)equative verb (e^n)articular noun (ho logos) does not automatically mean that the predicate nominative must be indefinite. Colwell’s rule, in summary, states that an anarthrous predicate nominative preceeding an equative verb can be translated as either (1) definite, (2) qualitative, or (3) indefinite. Thus, (1) as a definite noun the Word equals God, (2) as a qualitative the Word has the attributes and qualities of God, or (3) as an indefinite noun the Word is a god. Context determines which one it will be.

In the vast majority of cases in the New Testament, especially in the Gospel of John, this construction is translated as a qualitative or definite noun. Greek Scholar Dan Wallace writes, “an anarthrous pre verbal PN [predicate nominative] is normally qualitative, sometimes definite and only rarely indefinite. . . . We believe there may be some in the NT, but
this is nevertheless the most poorly attested semantic force for such a construction.”[1]

Furthermore, the translators of the New World Translation are not even consistent with their own rule of translation. Throughout John we find instances of an anarthrous God (theos) not translated as “a god,” but as “God.” John 1:6 and 1:18 are clear examples of this. Therefore, to argue that God (theos) in John 1:1c must be translated as indefinite solely because it has no article is clearly incorrect.

In an effort to insure that our decision agrees with the overall context of John’s Gospel, we must see if the Gospel of John argues that Christ is inferior to God. As I showed previously, this is certainly not the case.

We must conclude that grammar and context argue against an indefinite translation that makes the Word an inferior being to God. The noun God (theos) should be translated “God,” as a definite or qualitative, thus upholding the fact that Jesus is 100 percent God and 100 percent man.

Alleged Objections from the Gospel of John

To close this discussion, I will address several problem verses in the Gospel of John that are used in attempts to deny the deity of Christ.

In some translations like the King James Version and New American Standard, John 1:14 reads that Jesus is “the only begotten from the Father.” Some cults understand the Greek word translated only begotten to mean “to procreate as the Father.”[2] In other words, God created Jesus. However, this definition would be inconsistent with John 1:1a, 17:5, and 17:24 which declare the eternal nature of the Word.

The term, translated in some versions as “only begotten,” may
sound to English ears like a metaphysical relationship. However, in Greek it means no more than unique or only. Elsewhere in the New Testament it is used of the Widow of Nain’s “only” son and Jairus’ “only” daughter (Luke 7:12, 9:38 and 8:42). Its use in Hebrews 11:17 with reference to Isaac is particularly insightful. Isaac, we know, was not Abraham’s only son. According to Genesis 16 and 25:1, Abraham fathered several other sons. Isaac is the “only begotten” in that he was unique; he was the only son given to Abraham by God’s promise. Therefore, when only begotten is used of Jesus, He is the only begotten in the sense that He is unique. No other is or can be the Son of God. The unique relationship the Son has with His Father is one of the great themes in the Gospel of John.

The next controversial verse is John 14:28. Jesus states, “...I am going to the Father for the Father is greater than I.” Here the Jehovah’s Witnesses understand the term greater to mean “superior in nature.” Thus they assert that Jesus is stating His inferiority to God. Once again, however, this would argue against John’s consistent theme of the deity of Christ. Greater here refers to position, not to nature. For example, we would agree with the statement that the President of the United States is greater than you or I. As the chief executive of the country he is greater due to his position. However, we would disagree with a statement that says the President is by nature better than you or I. In other words, is he a superior being to the rest of the citizens of the United States? No, we are all human and equal in nature. Greater refers to position, not to nature.

There is an established economy in the Trinity. The Father is the head who sends the Son. The Son sends the Spirit. All three are equal in nature, but different in position. This is called “functional subordination.” We see the same principle in 1 Corinthians 11:3, “...and the head of every woman is man, and the head of Christ is God.” The husband is greater than
his wife, her head by position. However, he is not a superior being to his wife. The same applies to Jesus. The Father is greater by position, not by nature.

It is essential that we defend the doctrine of the Trinity, the foundation of Christian theology. Many of the great church fathers courageously defended this truth. Let us follow in their footsteps.
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