



Equipped Fellowship: The Existence and Attributes of God

1 Peter 3:15

But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and always be ready to give a defense to everyone who asks you a reason for the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear

Part 1 October 2009

1. Our Existence

- a. Naturalistic Explanation
- b. Theistic Explanation
 - 1. Cosmological: Cosmos
 - 2. Teleological: Design
 - 3. Moral: Moral Law
 - 4. Ontological: Absolute Perfect

1. Is the God of the Universe the God of the Bible**a. POLYTHEISM—WHAT IF THERE ARE MANY GODS?**

1. Polytheism says that there are many finite gods
2. WHAT DO POLYTHEISTS BELIEVE ABOUT GOD?
3. WHAT DO POLYTHEISTS BELIEVE ABOUT THE WORLD?
4. WHAT DO POLYTHEISTS BELIEVE ABOUT EVIL?
5. WHAT DO POLYTHEISTS BELIEVE ABOUT VALUES?
6. HOW SHOULD WE RESPOND TO POLYTHEISM?

b. Monotheistic God?

1. WHAT KIND OF GOD EXISTS?
2. GOD IS INTELLIGENT
3. GOD IS MORAL
4. GOD IS NECESSARY
5. God Cannot Change
6. GOD IS UNIQUE
7. GOD IS LORD OVER CREATION
8. GOD IS YAHWEH

2. Trinity Defined:**a. Trinity.**

1. A Philosophical Defense of the Trinity.
2. The Logic of the Trinity.
3. A Model of the Trinity.
4. Some Illustrations of the Trinity.
5. A Mathematical Illustration.
6. A Geometric Illustration.
7. Another aspect of the Godhead is that Christ is one person (shown as one corner of the triangle), yet he has two natures, a divine nature and a human nature.
8. A Moral Illustration.
9. An Anthropological Illustration.
10. A better illustration based in human nature is the relation between the human mind, to its ideas, and the expression of these ideas in words.

b. Historical and Current variations/heresies

1. A note on intentional and unintentional error
2. Arianism
3. Modalism.
4. Oneness Pentecostalism
5. Latter Day Saint Movement The Godhead

c. Examples from Nature

1. Bad Examples

d. Incomprehensibility: Not an unknown concept in the Bible

1. Eternal Life: Living somewhere forever

2. Soul of Man

3. Omnipresence of God

4. Omnipotence of God

5. Greg Koukl

6. Multi Dimensionality of God

7. Triune God

8. One God

e. *Compound Unity:*

f. Trinity Together

1. Mk 1:9-11

2. John 14:16

g. Father as God

h. Son as God

i. Spirit as God

Part 3

2. Attributes

- a. Wisdom
- b. Infinitude
- c. Sovereignty
- d. Holiness
- e. Omniscience
- f. Faithfulness
- g. Love
- h. Omnipotence
- i. Self-existence
- j. Justice
- k. Immutability
- l. Mercy
- m. Eternal
- n. Gracious:”
- o. Omnipresence

Genesis 1:1

1 In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.

Psalms 8:3

When I consider Your heavens, the work of Your fingers, The moon and the stars, which You have ordained,

Jeremiah 32:22

As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, nor the sand of the sea measured, so will I multiply the descendants of David My servant and the Levites who minister to Me.' "

Amos 5:8

He made the Pleiades and Orion; He turns the shadow of death into morning And makes the day dark as night; He calls for the waters of the sea And pours them out on the face of the earth; The Lord is His name.

Psalms 33:6

By the word of the Lord the heavens were made, And all the host of them by the breath of His mouth.

1. Our Existence: Our existence demands an explanation: Only two possibilities.

a. Naturalistic Explanation: Nobody X Nothing = Everything

1. Evolution

1. Big Bang *From Wikipedia*

The **Big Bang** is the cosmological model of the initial conditions and subsequent development of the Universe that is supported by the most comprehensive and accurate explanations from current scientific evidence and observation.^{[1][2]} As used by cosmologists, the term *Big Bang* generally refers to the idea that the Universe has expanded from a primordial hot and dense initial condition at some finite time in the past (currently estimated to have been approximately 13.7 billion years ago^[3]), and continues to expand to this day. Georges Lemaître proposed what became known as the Big Bang theory of the origin of the Universe, although he called it his "hypothesis of the primeval atom". The framework for the model relies on Albert Einstein's general relativity and on simplifying assumptions (such as homogeneity and isotropy of space). The governing equations had been formulated by Alexander Friedmann. After Edwin Hubble discovered in 1929 that the distances to far away galaxies were generally proportional to their redshifts, as suggested by Lemaître in 1927, this observation was taken to indicate that all very distant galaxies and clusters have an apparent velocity directly away from our vantage point: the farther away, the higher the apparent velocity.^[4] If the distance between galaxy clusters is increasing today, everything must have been closer together in the past. This idea has been considered in detail back in time to extreme densities and temperatures,^{[5][6][7]} and large particle accelerators have been built to experiment on and test such conditions, resulting in significant confirmation of the theory, but these accelerators have limited capabilities to probe into such high energy regimes. Without any evidence associated with the earliest instant of the expansion, the Big Bang theory *cannot* and *does not* provide any explanation for such an initial condition; rather, it *describes* and *explains* the general evolution of the Universe since that instant. The observed abundances of the light elements throughout the cosmos closely match the calculated predictions for the formation of these elements from nuclear processes in the rapidly expanding and cooling first minutes of the Universe, as logically and quantitatively detailed according to Big Bang nucleosynthesis. Fred Hoyle is credited with coining the term *Big Bang* during a 1949 radio broadcast. It is popularly reported that Hoyle intended this to be

pejorative, but Hoyle explicitly denied this and said it was just a striking image meant to emphasize the difference between the two theories for radio listeners.^{[8][9][10]} Hoyle later helped considerably in the effort to understand stellar nucleosynthesis, the nuclear pathway for building certain heavier elements from lighter ones. After the discovery of the cosmic microwave background radiation in 1964, and especially when its spectrum (i.e., the amount of radiation measured at each wavelength) sketched out a blackbody curve, most scientists were fairly convinced by the evidence that some Big Bang scenario must have occurred.

- a. **Singularity:** All mass of the universe was present A **gravitational singularity** or **spacetime singularity** is a location where the quantities that are used to measure the gravitational field become infinite in a way that does not depend on the coordinate system. These quantities are the scalar invariant curvatures of spacetime, some of which are a measure of the density of matter. For the purposes of proving the Penrose-Hawking singularity theorems, a spacetime with a singularity is defined to be one that contains geodesics that cannot be extended in a smooth manner. The end of such a geodesic is considered to be the singularity. This is a different definition, useful for proving theorems. The two most important types of spacetime singularities are **curvature singularities** and **conical singularities**. Singularities can also be divided according to whether they are covered by an event horizon or not (naked singularities). According to general relativity, the initial state of the universe, at the beginning of the Big Bang, was a singularity. Another type of singularity predicted by general relativity is inside a black hole: any star collapsing beyond a certain point would form a black hole, inside which a singularity (covered by an event horizon) would be formed, as all the matter would flow into a certain point (or a circular line, if the black hole is rotating). These singularities are also known as curvature singularities.
- b. **Brian Greene** String Theorist from Columbia University The Fabric of the Cosmos Page 272 The Standard Big Bang model doesn't explain the bang. According to Eistien, the universe could either be expanding or contracting.

2. Steady State Theory/Infinite Universe: **From Wikipedia**

In cosmology, the **Steady State theory** (also known as the **Infinite Universe theory** or **continuous creation**) is a model developed in 1948 by Fred Hoyle, Thomas Gold, Hermann Bondi and others as an alternative to the Big Bang theory (known, usually, as the standard cosmological model). In steady state views, new matter is continuously created as the universe expands, so that the perfect cosmological principle is adhered to. Although the model had a large number of supporters among cosmologists in the 1950s and 1960s, the number of supporters decreased markedly in the late 1960s with the discovery of the cosmic microwave background radiation, and today only a very small number of supporters remain. The key importance of the steady-state model is that as a competitor to the Big Bang, it was an impetus in generating some of the most important research in astrophysics, much of which ultimately ended up supporting the Big Bang theory.

- a. Infinite Regress
- b. **Oscillating Model** Kyle Demming from www.skepticalchristian.com
 - i. a.) **There is no evidence that the universe does oscillate.** Lacking any evidence for the theory, it is at most an *ad hoc* suggestion that has a possibility of being true. As such, there is no real reason for an individual to prefer the oscillating model over any other model of the universe's origins.
 - ii. b.) **There is no known mechanism for a supposed "bounce back" after a theoretical "big crunch."** As the late Professor Tinley of Yale articulated: *"even though the mathematics say that the universe oscillates, there is no known physics to reverse the collapse and bounce back to a new expansion. The physics seems to say that those models start from the Big Bang, expand, collapse, then end."*¹ (Note: I realize that the absence of a proposed mechanism does not necessarily mean that there is no potential mechanism. Perhaps, in the future, scientists will think of a possible source for such an astounding physical event. However, the fact that the oscillating model cannot even produce a mechanism is further evidence that the theory ought to be rejected.)
 - iii. c.) **Recent measurements by scientists have shown that the universe is expanding at "escape velocity".** This means that the universe is moving too quickly to ever collapse back into a "big crunch", thus making the oscillating model impossible. According to scientists Sandage and Tammann, *"Hence, we are forced to decide that . . . it seems inevitable that the Universe will expand forever";* they conclude, therefore, *"the Universe has happened only once."*²
 - iv. d.) **Thermodynamic properties of the universe dictate that, even if the universe did oscillate, an eternal universe could not occur. This is because, the farther back in time one goes, the shorter the time span of oscillations, or rotations. Thus, the**

universe could not be eternal. A scientific team under Duane Dicus came to the following conclusion: “*The effect of entropy production will be to enlarge the cosmic scale, from cycle to cycle. . . . Thus, looking back in time, each cycle generated less entropy, had a smaller cycle time, and had a smaller cycle expansion factor than the cycle that followed it.*”³ Based on this data, Novikov and Zeldovich stated: “*The multicycle model has an infinite future, but only a finite past.*”⁴ Thermodynamics- the most overriding laws governing the universe, prevent oscillating models from working.⁵

- v. **e.) According to the best estimates the universe still has only about half the mass needed for re-contraction. This includes the combined total of both luminous matter and non-luminous matter (found in galactic halos), as well as any possible contribution of neutrinos to total mass.**⁶ (Note: Some may claim that dark matter accounts for this difference, but, as it stands, dark matter is largely theoretical and mysterious. Until the scientific standing of dark matter is on solid ground, I believe that this particular scientific evidence against the oscillating universe stands. Moreover, even if the universe has a significant amount of dark matter, it is unlikely that this matter will be able to account for the large difference between the mass needed for re-contraction and the mass we observe.)

B Theistic Explanation/Intelligent Design

2. Cosmological: Argument from first cause Richard Taylor: *Restating the Cosmological Argument.*

1. The universe as a whole does not explain its own existence.
 - a. No observable part explains its own existence.
 - b. Nor does the whole explain its existence (its nonexistence is conceivable).
 - c. Answering the questions *Where? How long? What? or How large? does not answer why the world exists* when it need not exist (e.g., a large ball found in the forest needs an explanation as to *why* it exists; expanding the ball to the size of the whole universe does not eliminate the need for an explanation).
2. Whatever does not explain its own existence calls for an explanation beyond itself.
 - a. It is logically possible that the principle of sufficient reason is not true. It is not analytically true; it can be denied without contradiction.
 - b. But it is implausible and unreasonable to deny its truth as applied to the world. The nonexistence of the world is conceivable, whether it includes only one grain of sand or all the stars, and we assume the principle of sufficient reason in all our thought.
3. An infinite regress of reasons is impossible, for it fails to give a sufficient reason; it just indefinitely avoids giving the reason that is demanded by existence. **Therefore, there must be a first self-sufficient, (independent) cause of the whole universe.**
4. **From John MacArthur:** Cosmology is the argument of cause and effect. The world and universe exist, and we conclude that someone made it. That makes more sense than believing that everything came out of nothing—that no one time nothing equals all things—which is essentially what the theory of evolution says. As we carefully examine the world, we learn more about the One who made it.
 - a. Examining the effects
 - i. The cause of limitless space must be infinite.
 - ii. The cause of endless time must be eternal.
 - iii. The cause of perpetual motion must be powerful.
 - iv. The cause of complexity must be omniscient.
 - v. The cause of consciousness must be personal.
 - vi. The cause of feeling must be emotional.
 - vii. The cause of will must be volitional.
 - viii. The cause of ethical values must be moral.

- ix. The cause of religious values must be spiritual.
- x. The cause of beauty must be aesthetic.
- xi. The cause of righteousness must be holy.
- xii. The cause of justice must be just.
- xiii. The cause of love must be loving.
- xiv. The cause of life must be living.

5. Teleological: Argument from Design: The Teleological Argument - also known as "the argument from design"

'teleological' comes from the Greek word '*telos*' – meaning "perfection," "result," or "end." When we look at something that has been finished or perfected, we conclude it's resulting design must have had a designer.

The cosmological argument is based on the fact of the universe's *existence*: (All things that exist must have a cause. Therefore, the 'first cause' [the cause of everything including itself] is God.)

By contrast, the teleological argument is based on the *character* of the world and the universe. According to the argument, our world is a place of such extraordinary interlocking complexity that the only rational explanation is the presence of an intelligent designer. A basic form of the argument can be set out as follows:

1. the complexity of life on earth and the harmonious organization of living organisms exhibits evidence of intelligent design
2. a design necessitates the presence of a designer

A. Like most arguments, the teleological argument has a number of variations:

1. William Paley's argument from design

1. William Paley (1743-1805), in his book *Natural Theology*, made the argument that the complexity & efficiency of natural objects (eg. the eye, the brain, etc.) are evidence that they must have been purposefully designed. How else could they have come to be as they are – perfectly adapted for the purpose they serve? Paley uses a watch & its maker to draw an **analogy**. Just by looking at a watch and all its intricate parts working together in unison, we can tell that it was designed by a watchmaker. So, just by examining the complexity of the eye and how it suits its purpose so well (to see), it must have been designed by some sort of 'Divine Watchmaker' (God). Supporters of this form of design argument point to evidence of features of the natural world – micro-organisms to entire galaxies – as confirmation of God's existence. Because such things are far more intricate & complicated than a watch, the 'Divine Watchmaker' must correspondingly be more intelligent than the human watchmaker. This 'Divine Watchmaker' is what we refer to as God.

2. The 'fine-tuning' argument

1. This is a contemporary version of the design argument. Proponents of the argument point to an increasing body of scientific research which indicates the statistical likelihood of life developing anywhere in the universe is incredibly small. Life on earth has only managed to develop because of the favourable (& statistically incredibly unlikely) alignment of a wide variety of factors. Such factors include:
 - the values of the laws of physics
 - the values of the laws of chemistry
 - the position & angle of the earth relative to the sun
 - ✓ The temperature of the sun is estimated at over 20 million degrees Celcius. The earth is located exactly the correct distance from the sun to receive the proper amount of heat and radiation to sustain life.
 - ✓ If the earth were moved just 10% closer to the sun, far too much heat and radiation would be absorbed.
 - ✓ If the earth were moved just 10% farther from the sun, too little heat would be available
 - the earth's circular (& not elliptical) orbit around the sun
 - ✓ As the earth moves in its orbit around the sun, it departs from a straight line by only one-ninth of an inch every eighteen miles.
 - ✓ If it departed by one-eighth of an inch, we would come so near the sun we would be incinerated.
 - ✓ If it departed by one-tenth of an inch, we would move so far from the sun that we would freeze to death.
 - ✓
 - the earth's meteorological patterns
 - the ability of stars to produce base elements that support life

If any of these things operated differently (even by a small degree), life as we know it on earth would not have developed. Therefore, the immense statistical improbability of these factors aligning suggests the presence of an intelligent designer – God must have controlled the physical conditions in our universe, and fine-tuned them to allow life.

Some examples of the design of the human body from the document “Existence of God-Design_REV.pdf”

6. Moral: Argument from the Moral Law C. S. Lewis

1. There must be a universal moral law, or else:
 - a. Moral disagreements would make no sense, as we all assume they do.
 - b. All moral criticisms would be meaningless (e.g., “The Nazis were wrong.”).
 - c. It is unnecessary to keep promises or treaties, as we all assume that it is.

- d. We would not make excuses for breaking the moral law, as we all do.
- 2. But a universal moral law **requires a universal Moral Law Giver**, since the Source of it:
 - a. Gives moral commands (as lawgivers do).
 - b. Is interested in our behavior (as moral persons are).
- 3. Further, this universal **Moral Law Giver must be absolutely good**
 - a. Otherwise all moral effort would be futile in the long run, since we could be sacrificing our lives for what is not ultimately right.
 - b. The source of all good must be absolutely good, since the standard of all good must be completely good.
- 4. **Therefore**, there must be an absolutely good Moral Law Giver.
- 5. **The Moral Law Is Not Herd Instinct.** Lewis anticipates and persuasively answers major objections to the moral argument. Essentially, his replies are:
 - a. What we call the moral law cannot be the result of herd instinct or else the **stronger impulse would always win**, but it does not. We would always act *from* instinct rather than selflessly to help someone, as we sometimes do. If the moral law were just herd instinct, then instincts would always be right, but they are not. Even love and patriotism are sometimes wrong.
- 6. **The Moral Law Is Not Social Convention.** Neither can the moral law be mere social convention, because not everything learned *through* society is *based* on social convention. For example, math and logic are not. The same basic moral laws can be found in virtually every society, past and present. Further, judgments about social progress would not be possible if society were the basis of the judgments.
- 7. **The Moral Law Differs from Laws of Nature.** The moral law is not to be identified with the laws of nature. Nature's laws **are descriptive (is), not prescriptive (ought) as are moral laws**. Factually convenient situations (the way it *is*) can be morally wrong. Someone who tries to trip me and fails is wrong, but someone who accidentally trips me is not.
- 8. **The Moral Law Is Not Human Fancy.** Neither can the moral law be mere human fancy, because **we cannot get rid of it even when we would like to do so**. We did not create it; it is impressed on us from without. If it were fancy, then all value judgments would be meaningless, including such statements as "Hate is wrong." and "Racism is wrong." But if the moral law is not a description or a merely human prescription, then it must be a moral prescription from a Moral Prescriber beyond us. As Lewis notes, this Moral Law Giver is more like Mind than Nature. He can no more be part of Nature than an architect is identical to the building he designs.
- 9. **Injustice Does Not Disprove a Moral Law Giver.** The main objection to an absolutely perfect Moral Law Giver is the argument from evil or injustice in the world. No serious person can fail to recognize that all the murders, rapes, hatred, and cruelty in the world leave it far short of perfect. But if the world is imperfect, how can there be an absolutely perfect God? Lewis' answer is simple: **The only way the world could possibly be imperfect is if there is an absolutely perfect standard by which it can be judged to be imperfect** (see MORALITY, ABSOLUTE NATURE OF). For injustice makes sense only if there is a standard of justice by which something is known to be unjust. And absolute injustice is possible only if there is an absolute standard of justice. Lewis recalls the thoughts he had as an atheist: **Just how had I got this idea of just and unjust?** A man does not call a line crooked unless he has **some idea of a straight line**. What was I comparing this universe with when I called it unjust. . . . Of course I could have given up my idea of justice by saying it was nothing but a private idea of my own. But if I did that, then my argument against God collapsed too—for the argument depended on saying that the world was really unjust, **not simply that it did not happen to please my private fancies**. Thus in the very act of trying to prove that God did not exist—in other words, that the whole of reality was senseless—I found I was forced to assume that one part of reality—namely my idea of justice—was full of sense. [*Mere Christianity*, 45, 46] **Rather than disproving a morally perfect Being, the evil in the world presupposes a perfect standard. One could raise the question as to whether this Ultimate Law Giver is all powerful but not whether he is all perfect. For if anyone insists there is real imperfection in the world, then there must be a perfect standard by which this is known.**

3. Is the God of the Universe the God of the Bible

a. POLYTHEISM—WHAT IF THERE ARE MANY GODS? (When Skeptics Ask, A Handbook on Christian Evidences) Norman Geisler and Ronald Brooks

1. Polytheism says that there are many finite gods who reign over separate realms of the universe. The gods of ancient Greece, Rome, and Norway are good examples of these. Each god had a certain domain and was worshiped as supreme in that respect only. For instance, in Greece, Poseidon was the god of the sea and one would pray to him for safe travel. But for victory in war prayers must be offered to Ares. Polytheism is not confined to antiquity. David L. Miller, a professor of religion at Syracuse University, has said that the West is no longer looking for a single uniting principle and, “The death of God has given rise to the birth of the gods.”¹⁴ He cites the growing interest in the ancient polytheistic traditions, which is sometimes called the new paganism. One such group, in Breckenridge, Texas, has patterned their worship after the Norse gods in the 1959 Kirk Douglas movie *The Vikings*. The largest and fastest-growing polytheistic religion in America today is Mormonism. Though their P.R. would lead us to believe that they are just another Christian denomination, their doctrine says something different: God himself once was as we are now, and is an exalted man, and sits enthroned in yonder heavens! ... Here then is eternal life—to know the only wise and true God; and you have got to learn how to be gods yourselves ... the same as all gods have done before you.¹⁵

2. WHAT DO POLYTHEISTS BELIEVE ABOUT GOD?

1. Polytheists reject the idea of a single God ruling over all things. Instead, they focus on the multiplicity and chaos of the world to show that there are many gods with sometimes discordant plans. Some polytheists say that the gods arose from nature, while others claim that the gods were once men. The Mormons posit an infinite regress of gods begetting gods, so that all gods were “spirit children of an Eternal Father” and “the offspring of an Eternal Mother,”¹⁶ yet there was no first cause for their existence. All gods have a beginning, but they have no end. In the case of the ancient deities, their behavior does not always live up to their exalted status, as they are typically seen quarreling, seeking revenge, and deceiving both gods and men.

3. WHAT DO POLYTHEISTS BELIEVE ABOUT THE WORLD?

1. According to polytheists, the universe is either eternal or made out of eternal matter. The Mormon *Book of Abraham* says, “And then the Lord said: Let us go down. And they went down at the beginning, and they, that is the gods, organized and formed the heavens and the earth” (4:1). The material used to form the earth is called by Joseph Smith, Jr., *element*, which is chaotic matter that “had no beginning, and can have no end.”¹⁷ Nature is usually seen to have its own life principle, which explains why it is possible for it to give birth to the gods (e.g., Aphrodite arising from the sea-foam). But this vivifying principle also explains the chaos of nature as different forces war with one another.

4. WHAT DO POLYTHEISTS BELIEVE ABOUT EVIL?

1. For polytheists, evil is a necessary part of nature. The Greeks saw evil in the first power struggle between the gods which resulted in Creation, so that the world was a mixture of good and evil from the beginning. Mormonism says that evil is necessary for the progress and existence of all things, for without opposition there is no challenge to overcome in moral choices.

¹⁴ David L. Miller, *The New Polytheism: The Rebirth of Gods and Goddesses* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), p. 4.

¹⁵ Joseph Smith, Jr., *The History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1976), 6:305–306.

¹⁶ Bruce R. McConkie, *Mormon Doctrine—A Compendium of the Gospel*, rev. ed. (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1966), p. 516.

¹⁷ Joseph Smith, Jr., *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, ed. by Joseph Fielding Smith, 4th ed. (Salt Lake City: The Deseret News Press, 1938), p. 345.

5. . WHAT DO POLYTHEISTS BELIEVE ABOUT VALUES?

1. Some polytheists say that the moral laws are given by the gods, and that the gods punish whoever breaks their laws. Others say that the whole idea of absolute laws comes from monotheism and is foreign to this many-oriented system. These, like David Miller, prefer a relativistic ethic. Values cannot be absolute, he says, because, “truth and falsity, life and death, beauty and ugliness, good and evil are forever and inextricably mixed together.”¹⁸ In either case, the main motivation for doing good is self-interest.

6. HOW SHOULD WE RESPOND TO POLYTHEISM?

1. The multiplicity of the world and its forces, which polytheism stresses, are very real; some wonderful imagery and expressions of man’s struggles with these forces have been developed. Polytheism runs aground on its own principles, however. If the gods are not eternal, but come from nature, then they are not the ultimate. Why worship something that is not of ultimate value? It would be better to worship nature itself which gave the gods birth; however, that would be pantheism (Hinduism is really a polytheistic religion which admits an ultimate unity beyond the gods). There is also a problem with the notion of an eternal universe. The evidence for a beginning of the universe is given in chapter 2 and chapter 10. Finally, the anthropomorphic nature of the polytheistic gods is questionable. Some resemblance between God and man is to be expected, but should we impose human imperfections on God too? This would seem to lower His worthiness and deem Him unfit to be worshiped. This aspect makes the gods seem very much to be made in the image of man.

b. Monotheistic God? (When Skeptics Ask, A Handbook on Christian Evidences) Norman Geisler and Ronald Brooks

1. WHAT KIND OF GOD EXISTS?

1. If we want to show that God exists and that He is the God of the Bible, then we need to show that all of the things in the arguments mentioned are true. Each one contributes something to our knowledge of God and, taken together, they form a picture that can only fit the one true God.

2. GOD IS POWERFUL

1. The argument from Creation proves not only that God exists, but that He has power. Only a God with incredible power could create and sustain the whole universe. His energy would have to be greater than all the energy that was ever available in the whole Creation, for He not only caused all things, He holds them together and keeps them in existence and still sustains His own existence. That is more power than we can imagine.

3. GOD IS INTELLIGENT

1. Even Carl Sagan admits that the design of the universe is far beyond anything that man could devise. The argument from design shows us that whatever caused the universe not only had great power, but also great intelligence. God knows things—things that we cannot understand. This opens the possibility for God to know all sorts of other things, but more on that later. For now it is enough to say that God at least knows everything there is to know about the way we think, because He designed our brains.

4. GOD IS MORAL

1. The existence of a moral law in the mind of a moral Lawgiver shows us that God is a moral Being. He is neither beyond morality (like some kings think they are) nor beneath morality (like a rock). He is by nature moral. This means that part of what He knows is the difference between right and wrong. But we can take this one step further: He is not only moral; He is good. We know that part of what He created was people, and persons are good, in and of themselves. The fact that persons always expect to be treated better than things shows that. Even someone denying that people have value at least expects you to value his opinion as a person. But whatever creates good things must be good itself (a cause can’t give what it hasn’t got). So God is not only moral, He is good.

¹⁸Miller, op. cit., p. 29.

5. GOD IS NECESSARY

1. The argument from the idea of a necessary being may not prove that God exists, but it sure does tell us a lot about God once we know that He does exist (by the argument from Creation). We said already that necessary existence means that He cannot not exist—so He had no beginning and no end. But it also means that He cannot “come to be” in any other way. He must be *as He is* necessarily. He can’t become something new. That removes all change from His being—He is unchanging. And without change, time is not possible, because time is just a way to measure change—so He is eternal (*e* = no, *tern* = time; no-time). In fact, since a necessary being cannot not be, He can have no limits. A limitation means “to not be” in some sense, and that is impossible—so He is infinite. Also, He can’t be limited to categories like “here and there,” because unlimited being must be in all places at all times—therefore, He is omnipresent. All of these are attributes that follow just from knowing that He is necessary.

6. God Cannot Change

1. Change can only be essential, like changing from a dog to a horse, or accidental, like changing from a brunette to a blond. Essential changes change what a thing is; accidental ones only change little details. God can’t change His essence because that would mean not existing (remember: His essence is to exist). He can’t change any details because everything He’s got is wrapped up in His existence. Therefore, God is changeless. But His necessity also tells us something about His other attributes. Because of His necessity, He can only have whatever He has in a necessary way. That means, as we have seen, without beginning, without change, and without limitation. So while the argument from Creation tells us that He has power, the argument from the idea of a perfect being shows that it is perfect, unlimited power. The argument from design tells us that He is intelligent, but His necessity informs us that His knowledge is uncreated, unchanging, and infinite. The moral order suggests that He is good, but the perfection of His being means that He must be all good in a perfect and unlimited way. Anything that God is He must be in accordance with His nature; so His power, knowledge, and goodness are as perfect as His being.

7. GOD IS UNIQUE

1. We have said that God is all-powerful, all-knowing, all-good, infinite, uncreated, unchanging, eternal, and omnipresent. But how many beings like that can there be? He is a class of one by definition. If there were two unlimited beings, how could you tell them apart? They have no limits to define where one stops and the other begins—but neither one can “stop” or “begin” anyway. There can only be one infinite Being and no other.

8. GOD IS LORD OVER CREATION

1. The argument from Creation does more than prove that God exists; it also proves that He is the Creator. There is no way to distinguish two infinite creatures, but God is distinct from the finite world that He has made. The whole point of the argument from Creation is that the universe cannot explain its own existence—that it is not God. The same point can be made if we consider an individual. I exist; but I have no way to account for my existence in myself. It is painfully clear that my being is not necessary—I could cease to exist at any moment and the world would go right on without me. Only by recognizing an infinite Being, a necessary cause for my being—One who gives me being—can I make sense of my existence. And as the all-powerful, all-knowing Creator, He has control over the creation. Not only does God exist, but His creation also exists distinct from Him.

9. GOD IS YAHWEH

1. Is this the God of the Bible? At the burning bush, God told Moses His name and said, “I AM WHO I AM” (Ex. 3:14). This signifies that the central characteristic of the God of the Bible is existence. His very nature is existence. Popeye can say, “I am what I am.” But only God can say, “I AM WHO I AM.” He is the “I AM.” The Bible also calls God eternal (Col. 1:17; Heb. 1:2), unchanging (Mal. 3:6; Heb. 6:18), infinite (1 Kings 8:27; Isa. 66:1), all-good (Ps. 86:5; Luke 18:19), and all-powerful (Heb. 1:3; Matt. 19:26). Since these beings are the same in all these respects, and there can’t be two infinite beings, then this God that the arguments point us to is the God of the Bible.

4. Trinity Defined:

a. **Trinity.** *Trinity* simply means “triunity.” God is not a simple unity; there is plurality in his unity. The Trinity is one of the great mysteries (see MYSTERY) of the Christian Faith. Unlike an antinomy (see Kant) or paradox, which is a logical contradiction (see LOGIC), the Trinity goes beyond reason but not against reason. It is known only by divine revelation, so the Trinity is not the subject of natural theology but of revelation¹ **The Basis for the Trinity.** While the word *Trinity* does not occur there, the concept is clearly taught in the Bible. The logic of the doctrine of the Trinity is simple. Two biblical truths are evident in Scripture, the logical conclusion of which is the Trinity:² 1. There is one God. There are three distinct persons who are God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

b. Plausibility of Compound Unity /Philosophical Coherence

1. **A Philosophical Defense of the Trinity.** The doctrine of the Trinity cannot be proven by human reason; it is only known because it is revealed by special revelation (in the Bible). However, just because it is beyond reason does not mean that it goes against reason (see MYSTERY). It is not irrational or contradictory, as many critics believe.
2. **The Logic of the Trinity.** The philosophical law of non-contradiction informs us that something cannot be both true and false at the same time and in the same sense. This is the fundamental law of all rational thought. And the doctrine of the Trinity does not violate it. This can be shown by stating first of all what the Trinity is not. The Trinity is not the belief that God is three persons and only one person at the same time and in the same sense. That would be a contradiction. Rather, it is the belief that there are three persons in one *nature*. This may be a mystery, but it is not a contradiction. That is, it may go beyond reason’s ability to comprehend completely, but it does not go against reason’s ability to apprehend consistently. Further, the Trinity is not the belief that there are three natures in one nature or three essences in one essence. That would be a contradiction. Rather, Christians affirm that there are three *persons* in one essence. This is not contradictory because it makes a distinction between person and essence. Or, to put it in terms of the law of non-contradiction, while God is one and many at the same time, he is not one and many in the *same sense*. He is one in the sense of his essence but many in the sense of his persons. So there is no violation of the law of non-contradiction in the doctrine of the Trinity.
3. **A Model of the Trinity.** By saying God has one essence and three persons it is meant that he has one “What” and three “Who’s.” The three Who’s (persons) each share the same What (essence). So God is a unity of essence with a plurality of persons. Each person is different, yet they share a common nature. God is one in his substance. The unity is in his essence (what God is), and the plurality is in God’s persons (how he relates within himself). This plurality of relationships is both internal and external. Within the Trinity each member relates to the others in certain ways. These are somewhat analogous to human relationships. The Bible’s descriptions of *Yahweh* as Father and Jesus as Son say something of how the Son relates to the Father. Also, the Father sends the Spirit as a Messenger, and the Spirit is a Witness of the Son (John 14:26). These descriptions help us understand the functions within the unity of the Godhead. Each is fully God, and each has his own work and interrelational theme with the other two. But it is vital to remember that the three share the same essence, so that they unify as one Being..

c. Examples from Nature

1. **Bad illustration # 1:** The Trinity is like an egg. An egg is a unit, yet it exists in three distinct parts: the shell, the white, and the yolk. Sorry! This illustration fails to do justice to the Biblical doctrine of the Trinity because according to the Bible, each member of the Trinity shares fully and equally in all that being God entails. The Father is eternal, so is the Son, and so is the Holy Spirit (See John 1:1-3, Hebrews 9:14, et. al.) The same is true of omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, immutability, sovereignty, and all the Divine attributes: Father and Son and Holy Spirit each possess them all. The egg surely gives us an example of unity. However, the shell, the white and the yolk have different attributes. The shell is hard, but the other two parts are not. The yolk is yellow, but the other two parts are not, and so forth. The members of the Trinity are not "parts" of the indivisible unity of God.

¹Geisler, Norman L.: *Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*. Grand Rapids, Mich. : Baker Books, 1999 (Baker Reference Library), S. 730

²Geisler, Norman L.: *Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics*. Grand Rapids, Mich. : Baker Books, 1999 (Baker Reference Library), S. 730

2. **Bad illustration # 2:** The Trinity is like one man who has three distinct roles: a father to his boy, a son to his own father, a sibling to his brother. He is one man, but wears "three hats". Sorry! This illustration also fails to adequately portray the Divine mystery of three Persons, one God. The distinction of the Persons of the Trinity is quite real. The Father is not the Son, and neither the Father nor the Son is the Holy Spirit. The unity of the Divine being cannot be divided, yet the three Persons are truly distinct.
3. **Bad illustration # 3:** Identical triplets. Sorry! This illustration makes a valiant effort, but still fails. The Persons of the Trinity are indeed distinct, as has just been affirmed. However, they are one being...one God, not three gods.
4. **Bad Illustration #4** An example would be a molecule of water. H₂O appears in three states, solid, liquid, and gas. These states are determined by the ambient temperature that the molecule resides in and the amount of time that it is exposed to those temperatures. One could posit that the H₂O molecule is like the trinity in that it is one molecule that appears in 3 forms. Unfortunately, this model breaks down on at least two levels. One: The particular molecule is made up of only two elements. Two: The particular molecule in question cannot exist in all three states simultaneously. The three states represent modes that by the existing state excludes the other two states from concurrently existing. This particular view is called "modalism".
5. **Bad Illustration # 5** The Trinity is *not* like a chain with three links. For these are three separate and separable parts. But God is neither separated nor separable.
6. **Bad Illustration #6** Neither is God like the same actor playing three different parts in a play. For God is simultaneously three persons, not one person playing three successive roles.
7. **Good Illustration #1 A Mathematical Illustration.** One aspect of the problem can be expressed in mathematical terms. Critics make a point of computing the mathematical impossibility of believing there is a Father, Son and Holy Spirit in the Godhead, without holding that there are three gods. Does not $1 + 1 + 1 = 3$? It certainly does if you *add* them, but Christians insist that the triunity of God is more like $1 \times 1 \times 1 = 1$. God is triune, not triplex. His one essence has multiple centers of personhood. Thus, there is no more mathematical problem in conceiving the Trinity than there is in understanding 1 cubed (1³).
8. **Good Illustration #1 A Geometric Illustration.** Perhaps the most widely used illustration of the Trinity is the triangle. One triangle has three corners, which are inseparable from, and simultaneous to, one another. In this sense it is a good illustration of the Trinity. Of course, the triangle is finite and God is infinite, so it is not an imperfect illustration.
9. **Good Illustration #3 A Moral Illustration.** Augustine suggested an illustration of how God is both three and one at the same time. The Bible informs us that "God is love" (1 John 4:16). Love involves a lover, a beloved, and a spirit of love between lover and loved. The Father might be likened to the Lover; the Son to the One loved, and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of love. Yet love does not exist unless these three are united as one. This illustration has the advantage of being personal, since it involves love, a characteristic that flows only from persons.
10. **Good Illustration #4 An Anthropological Illustration.** Since humankind is made in the image of God (Gen. 1:27), it would seem reasonable that men and women bear some snapshot of the Trinity within their being. One that causes more problems than it solves is to visualize the human being as a "trichotomy" of body, soul, and spirit. Whether the trichotomist position is accurate, this is not a helpful illustration. Body and soul are not an indivisible unity. They can be (and are) separated at death (cf. 2 Cor. 5:8; Phil 1:23; Rev. 6:9). The nature and persons of the Trinity cannot be separated.
11. **Good Illustration #5 A better illustration based in human nature is the relation between the human *mind*, to its *ideas*, and the expression of these ideas in *words*.** There is obviously a unity among all three of these without there being an identity. In this sense, they illustrate the Trinity.

d. Historical and Current variations/heresies

1. A note on intentional and unintentional error
2. **Arianism** is the theological teaching of Arius (ca. AD 250–336), a Church priest, concerning the relationship of the entities of the Trinity ('God the Father', 'God the Son' and 'God the Holy Spirit'). The doctrines of Arius, denying that Jesus was of the same substance as God and holding instead that he was only the highest of created beings, viewed as heretical by most Christian churches. Arius was deemed a heretic at the First Council of Nicea of 325, later exonerated in 335 at the First Synod of Tyre^[1], and then pronounced a heretic again after his death at the First Council of Constantinople of 381^[2]. The Roman Emperors Constantius II (337-361) and Valens (364-378) were *Arians* or Semi-Arians. Arianism is defined as those teachings attributed to Arius which are in contrast to the current mainstream Trinitarian Christological dogma, as currently maintained by the Catholic Church, the Eastern Orthodox Churches and most Protestant Churches. The term "Arianism" is also used to refer to other nontrinitarian theological systems of the 4th century, which regarded the Christ, Son of God, the Logos, as a created being (as in Arianism proper and Anomoeanism) or as neither uncreated nor created in the sense other beings are created (as in "Semi-Arianism").
3. **Modalism. (Wikipedia)** Modalism is an unorthodox or heretical view of God that denies the orthodox Trinitarian view that there are three distinct, co-eternal persons in the godhead (see TRINITY). Modalists claim that God simply manifests himself in different modes or forms at different times. Unfortunately, some illustrations used by trinitarians tend toward a modalistic concept of God. For example, modalists claim that God is like water, which can be manifested in one of three different modes at different times: liquid, gas, or solid. Better illustrations are more appropriate to trinitarianism. They show that God is simultaneously a plurality within a unity, since he is three distinct persons in one eternal nature. God is like one triangle (his nature), which has three corners (his persons). In this illustration the three and one are simultaneous, not successive. Without three sides there is no triangle. Further, each corner differs from the others, yet all share in the nature of a triangle. Or God is like $13 (1 \times 1 \times 1 = 1)$. Here too there are three and one at the same time. It is not one manifest at three different times in three differing ways. In modalism there is one person in the godhead. In this sense, modalism is more like the traditional monotheism of Islam, rather than trinitarian theism. In the Trinity, three distinct persons unite in one eternal nature. Both trinitarianism and modalism are in contrast to tritheism, which affirms that there are three gods ($1 + 1 + 1 = 3$). This is a form of polytheism. Like trinitarianism it has three different persons, but unlike trinitarianism, it believes three separate beings are each a god, with an individual nature. Orthodox Trinitarians hold that God has only one nature, but that three distinct persons, co-eternal and co-equal, share this same nature (see bibliography under TRINITY).
4. **Oneness Pentecostalism (Wikipedia)**(also known as **Jesus Name** or **Apostolic Pentecostalism**) refers to a grouping of denominations and believers within Pentecostal Christianity, all of whom subscribe to the theological doctrine of Oneness. This movement claims an estimated 24 million adherents today.^[1] Major Oneness Pentecostal churches include: the United Pentecostal Church International, the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ of the Apostolic Faith, the Bible Way Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Apostolic Assembly of the Faith in Christ Jesus, the Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Apostolic Church of Pentecost of Canada. Other Oneness Pentecostal denominations are listed at Oneness Pentecostal denominations. This movement first emerged around 1914, as the result of doctrinal disputes within the nascent Pentecostal movement.^[1] Oneness Pentecostalism derives its distinctive name from its teaching on the Godhead, which is popularly referred to as the *Oneness doctrine*.^[2] This doctrine states that there is one God, a *singular* spirit who manifests himself in many different ways, including as Father, Son and Holy Spirit.^[3] This stands in sharp contrast to the doctrine of three distinct and eternal "persons" posited by Trinitarian theology. Oneness believers baptize in the name of Jesus Christ, commonly referred to as Jesus-name baptism, rather than using the Trinitarian formula. In most other ways the beliefs and worship of Oneness Pentecostals are similar to those of other Pentecostals. However, they tend to emphasize strict "holiness standards" in dress, grooming and other areas of personal conduct that are not necessarily shared by other Pentecostal groups, at least not to the degree that is generally found in Oneness churches. Furthermore, Oneness soteriology differs significantly from that of most other

Pentecostal and Evangelical factions. Whereas most of them require only faith in Jesus for salvation, Oneness Pentecostalism defines faith as repentance, baptism (in Jesus' name) and receipt of the Holy Spirit. This reflects their interpretation of the Bible, and has caused friction between Oneness Pentecostalism and other churches. The Oneness emphasis on "standards" has equally led to charges of spiritual legalism by members of other faiths, though Oneness believers ardently deny this allegation. They insist that these guidelines were mandated by the Apostles themselves in Scripture, and are thus incumbent upon all believers.

5. **Latter Day Saint movement the Godhead , (Wikipedia)** is the focus of worship and devotion within the faith. It consists of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.^[1] Depending on era and denomination, the Latter Day Saint movement accommodates a variety of doctrines concerning the interrelationship and metaphysical nature of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. These teachings derive mainly from the movement's founder Joseph Smith, Jr., and they evolved over his lifetime. The term *Godhead* derives from the Authorized King James Version of the Bible, where the term is used to translate Greek words meaning divinity or deity. The term first appeared in its Latter Day Saint sense in 1835, in the once-canonized *Lectures on Faith*,^[2] and has since entered the jargon of Mormonism (the branch of the Latter Day Saint movement that recognizes Brigham Young as a prophet) as a substitute for the term *Trinity* that does not connote Trinitarian theology. The prevailing Godhead doctrine within Mormonism is nontrinitarian, based on Smith's sermons on the subject in the last few years before his 1844 assassination which described the Father, Son, and Spirit as three distinct beings. However, denominations of the broader Latter Day Saint movement such as the Community of Christ view Trinitarianism as compatible with the Book of Mormon and other early Latter Day Saint scripture. In addition Mormon fundamentalists derive part of their Godhead theology from statements by Brigham Young, which they recognize as the Adam God doctrine. It is also common within Mormonism for adherents to believe in a Heavenly Mother and other deities, although they are not classed within the Godhead and not often viewed as a focus of worship.

e. Incomprehensibility: Not an unknown concept in the Bible

1. God's Sovereignty/Mans Free Will
 2. Eternal Life: Living somewhere forever
 3. Soul of Man
 4. Omnipresence of God
 5. Omnipotence of God
 6. Greg Kokul: Why is it that you can't accept the truthfulness of something if you can't image it in your mind? Tell me what love looks like. Tell me what God looks like. You can't image God in your mind. In fact, you are prohibited from trying to do so. The First Commandment, by the way. You can't image God. You can't image love. You can't image justice. But we have good reason to believe they are real things and we know that. So it is not a liability because we can't image the Trinity in our mind. What we need to find out is if it is taught. And the teaching of the Trinity is there is one God and there are three Persons. And Jesus Christ is the second Person, fully human and fully divine.
 - 7.
2. Multi Dimensionality of God
1. **If superstring theory** turns out to be correct, the idea of a world consisting of 10 or more dimensions is one that we'll need to become comfortable with. But will there ever be an explanation or a visual representation of higher dimensions that will truly satisfy the human mind? The answer to this question may forever be no. Not unless some four-dimensional life-form pulls us from our three-dimensional Space land and gives us a view of the world from its perspective. Imagining Other Dimensions by Rick Groleau NOVA
 2. See, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Large_Hadron_Collider regarding ongoing investigations into string theory and extra dimensions.

3. **Parents and Children:** Mom and Dad know and understand more than the kids do. Sometimes the simple answer no has very good and complicated reasons “why”. The two year old simply isn’t capable of thorough and profound understanding.

4. **Does the Trinity Make Sense: Greg Koukl**

- a. Some people say the Trinity—the idea that there is one God Who subsists in three fully distinct but fully divine persons—doesn’t make sense. This depends entirely on what one means by the concept of making “sense.” If one means that the Trinity is irrational, that it violates some law of reason, then the challenge is simply false. There is no violation of the laws of reason in the Trinity. Anyone who thinks I’m mistaken on this point must identify the specific law being breached in light of the orthodox teaching on the Trinity (as opposed to some misrepresentation; we don’t believe in three gods, for example). One might argue that the Trinity doesn’t make sense in that it doesn’t appeal to any sense perception, that it’s hard to conceptualize the Trinity because it can’t be pictured in the mind. This seems accurate, but it’s hardly relevant. Individual spiritual beings—God, angels, souls—can’t be pictured. Though they may manifest themselves in physical form (we find this in the Bible), this is not what they actually look like. Even so, the concepts are certainly intelligible. The same is true with immaterial things like love, kindness, or vengeance. Each of these may be evidenced in actions that can be seen, but they are not themselves physical, and indeed no accurate physical characterization or “sense” of them can even be imagined. So, it is no liability that no one can picture the Trinity. It is not “sensible” in that way. This tells you nothing about the truth of the doctrine. That question is answered by a different means: Does God’s own self-revelation give us reason to believe that the doctrine of the Trinity, classically understood, is an accurate and true description, as far as it goes, of God’s nature? The answer to that is clearly yes.

3. Triune God

1. *One God.* The central teaching of Judaism called the *Shema* proclaims: “Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God, the LORD is one” (Deut. 6:4). When Jesus was asked the question, “What is the greatest commandment?” he prefaced the answer by quoting the *Shema* (Mark 12:29). In spite of his strong teaching on the deity of Christ (cf. Col. 2:9), the apostle Paul said emphatically, “there is but one God, the Father, from whom all things came and for whom we live” (1 Cor. 8:6a). From beginning to end, the Scriptures speak of one God and label all other gods as false (Exod. 20:3; 1 Cor. 8:5–6). The Bible also recognizes a plurality of persons in God. Although the doctrine of the Trinity is not as explicit in the Old Testament as the New Testament, nonetheless, there are passages where members of the Godhead are distinguished. At times they even speak to one another (see Ps. 110:1).

4. The first step is to establish how many Gods exist: one! Isaiah 43:10; 44:6,8; 45:5,14,18,21,22; 46:9; 47:8; John 17:3; 1 Cor. 8:5-6; Gal. 4:8-9 “I am the LORD, and there is no other; besides Me there is no God,” (Isaiah 45:5). “Thus says the Lord, the King of Israel And his Redeemer, the Lord of hosts: ‘I am the first and I am the last, And there is no God besides Me,” (Isaiah 44:6). (From CARM)

f. **Compound Unity:** *A note on Echad from the Shema: Powerful argument for Triunity of God. Also see Rosenthal’s, “One God or Three”*

1. <http://www.bible.ca/trinity/trinity-oneness-unity-yachid-vs-echad.htm> Article by Steve Rudd

g. **Trinity Together**

1. Mk 1:9-11

2. John 14:16

h. **Father as God : See Chart**

i. **Son as God : See Chart**

j. **Spirit as God : See Chart**

k. **History** <http://www.religionfacts.com/christianity/beliefs/trinity.htm>

1. History of the Doctrine of the Trinity

1. The doctrine of the Trinity took centuries to develop, but the roots of the doctrine can be seen from the first century. The word "Trinity" is not found in the New Testament, nor is the doctrine explicitly taught there. However, foundations of the concept of the Trinity can be seen in the New Testament, especially in the Gospel of John, one of the latest and most theologically developed of the New Testament books. ¹ Hints of Trinitarian beliefs can also be seen in the teachings of extra-biblical writers as early as the end of the first century. ² However, the clearest early expression of the concept came with Tertullian, a Latin theologian who wrote in the early third century. Tertullian coined the words "Trinity" and "person" and explained that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit were "one in essence - not one in Person." ³ About a century later, in 325, the Council of Nicea set out to officially define the relationship of the Son to the Father, in response to the controversial teachings of Arius. Led by bishop Athanasius, the council established the doctrine of the Trinity as orthodoxy and condemned Arius' teaching that Christ was the first creation of God. The creed adopted by the council described Christ as "God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance (*homoousios*) with the Father." ⁴ Nicea did not end the controversy, however. Debate over how the creed (especially the phrase "one substance") ought to be interpreted continued to rage for decades. One group advocated the doctrine that Christ was a "similar substance" (*homoiousios*) as the Father. But for the most part, the issue of the Trinity was settled at Nicea and, by the fifth century, never again became a focus of serious controversy. Most post-Nicene theological discussion of the Trinity consisted of attempts to understand and explain such a unique concept. Gregory of Nyssa, in his treatise, *That There are Not Three Gods*, compared the divinity shared by the three persons of the Trinity to the common "humanness," or human nature that is shared by individual human beings. (Ironically, this initially promising explanation has been seen by some to yield a conclusion quite opposite than the title of his work.) Saint Augustine, one of the greatest thinkers of the early church, described the Trinity as comparable to the three parts of an individual human being: mind, spirit, and will. They are three distinct aspects, yet they are inseparable and together constitute one unified human being.

References

1. E.g., Matthew 28:19; John 1:1; John 10:30.
2. *Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians* (Ante-Nicene Fathers 1.58); *The Martyrdom of Polycarp* 14 (ANF 1.42).
3. ANF 3.621; c. 213 AD.
4. William Placher, *Readings in the History of Christian Theology*, 53.

There is only one God

The Trinity			
	FATHER	SON	HOLY SPIRIT
Called God	Phil. 1:2	John 1:1,14; Col. 2:9	Acts 5:3-4
Creator	Isaiah 64:8	John 1:3; Col. 1:15-17	Job 33:4, 26:13
Resurrects	1 Thess. 1:10	John 2:19, 10:17	Rom. 8:11
Indwells	2 Cor. 6:16	Col. 1:27	John 14:17
Everywhere	1 Kings 8:27	Matt. 28:20	Psalm 139:7-10
All knowing	1 John 3:20	John 16:30; 21:17	1 Cor. 2:10-11
Sanctifies	1 Thess. 5:23	Heb. 2:11	1 Pet. 1:2
Life giver	Gen. 2:7; John 5:21	John 1:3; 5:21	2 Cor. 3:6,8
Fellowship	1 John 1:3	1 Cor. 1:9	2 Cor. 13:14; Phil. 2:1
Eternal	Psalm 90:2	Micah 5:1-2	Rom. 8:11; Heb. 9:14
A Will	Luke 22:42	Luke 22:42	1 Cor. 12:11
Speaks	Matt. 3:17; Luke 9:25	Luke 5:20; 7:48	Acts 8:29; 11:12; 13:2
Love	John 3:16	Eph. 5:25	Rom. 15:30
Searches the heart	Jer. 17:10	Rev. 2:23	1 Cor. 2:10
We belong to	John 17:9	John 17:6	...
Savior	1 Tim. 1:1; 2:3; 4:10	2 Tim. 1:10; Titus 1:4; 3:6	...
We serve	Matt. 4:10	Col. 3:24	...
Believe in	John 14:1	John 14:1	...
Gives joy	...	John 15:11	John 14:7
Judges	John 8:50	John 5:22,30	...

Therefore, the doctrine of the Trinity is arrived at by looking at the whole of scripture, not in a single verse. It is the doctrine that there is only one God, not three, and that the one God exists in three persons: Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. An analogy would be time. Time is past, present, and future. But, there are not three times, only one.

This table is provided by the Christian Apologetics and Research Ministry: <http://www.carm.org/trinity>

Another Chart

God The Father, Son & Holy Spirit (Eccl 4:12)			
Bible Verse	Father	Son	Holy Spirit
Baptism in name of (Mt 28:18)	"Father"	"Son"	"Holy Spirit "
Creation of universe	Acts 17:24	Jn 1:1-3	Gen 1:2
Baptism of Jesus (Mt 3:16-17)	Spoke from heaven	In water	Like dove in air
Another comforter (Jn 14:16)	"Ask Father to"	"I" (Jesus)	"Send another"
Paul's request (Rom 15:30)	"Prayers to God"	"Jesus"	"Love of H.S. "
Paul's farewell (2 Cor 13:14)	"Love of God"	"Grace of Jesus"	"Fellowship of H.S."
Unity passage (Eph 4:4-6)	"One Father"	"One Lord"	"One Spirit "
1 Cor 12:4-6	the same God	the same Lord	the same Spirit
1 Pet 1:2	Foreknowledge of God the Father	sanctifying work of the Spirit	obey Jesus Christ
Isa 48:16	Lord God	has sent Me	and His Spirit
Unity passage (Eph 4:4-6)	"One Father"	"One Lord"	"One Spirit "
Three divine beings: "Let Us"	Genesis 1:26; 3:22; 11:7; Isa 6:8		

Online Sources for this months study.

Stand To Reason

http://www.str.org/site/PageServer?pagename=search_iframe&cx=012394203280333296866%3Anuevz1zgwa&cof=FORID%3A11&q=trinity&sa=Search#972

The Trinity, the Definition of Chalcedon, and Oneness Theology

<http://vintage.aomin.org/CHALC.html>

Many Bible Verses about the Trinity

<http://www.openbible.info/topics/trinity>

A Brief Definition of the Trinity

<http://vintage.aomin.org/trinitydef.html>

THE NATURE OF GOD - THE TRI-UNITY OF GOD

<http://vintage.aomin.org/natureofgod.html>

Bible Charts

<http://www.biblecharts.org>

Bibliography and Suggested Reading Resources

The New Evidence that Demands a Verdict: Josh McDowell; Nelson Publishing: \$14.99

http://www.christianbook.com/new-evidence-demands-verdict/josh-mcdowell/9780785242192/pd/42199?item_code=WW&netp_id=157655&event=ESRCN&view=covers

The Evidence Bible: The Way of the Master Ministries \$17.99

http://www.christianbook.com/evidence-irrefutable-thinking-comfortable-james-softcover/9780882709055/pd/709054?item_code=WW&netp_id=304376&event=ESRCN&view=covers

Holman Christian Standard Bible Apologetics Study Bible, Hardcover \$26.99

http://www.christianbook.com/holman-christian-standard-apologetics-study-hardcover/9781586400248/pd/400248?item_code=WW&netp_id=481441&event=ESRCN&view=covers

The Norman L. Geisler Apologetics Library on CD-ROM \$31.99

- Why I Am a Christian
- Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics
- Roman Catholics and Evangelicals
- When Skeptics Ask
- When Critics Ask
- When Cultists Ask
- Miracles and the Modern Mind
- Come, Let Us Reason
- Worlds Apart: A Handbook on Worldviews
- Introduction to Philosophy
- Christian Apologetics
- Answering Islam, Second Edition
- Complete KJV Bible
- Fully searchable by topic or Bible verse
- Powered by Libronix Library System
- Windows 98 or higher

http://www.christianbook.com/Christian/Books/product?item_no=02943&item_code=WW&netp_id=292369&event=ESRCN&view=covers

Mere Christianity, CS Lewis \$10.99

http://www.christianbook.com/mere-christianity-c-s-lewis/9780060652920/pd/2926X?item_code=WW&netp_id=228847&event=ESRCN&view=covers

The Canon of Scripture, FF Bruce \$22.99

http://www.christianbook.com/Christian/Books/product?item_no=1258&item_code=WW&netp_id=106962&event=ESRCN&view=covers

One God or Three: Stanley Rosenthal Study of the Triune Nature of God

http://books.shop.ebay.com/i.html?_nkw=One+God+or+Three&_sacat=267&_trksid=p3286.m270.l1313&_sop=2&_odkw=rosenthal&_osacat=0

Web Resources

Ravi Zacharias International Ministries: <http://www.rzim.org/>

Ravi Zacharias International Ministries seeks to reach and challenge those who shape the ideas of a culture with the credibility and the beauty of the gospel of Jesus Christ. With a team of individuals based in six countries, RZIM is committed to reaching this generation around the world - in the university, the arts, politics, business, and the church. Through open forums, community outreach, and various media, we seek to remove the barriers to the cross for the skeptic and we prepare Christians to give a reason for the hope within us.

Christian Apologetics and Research Ministry <http://www.carm.org/>

Welcome to CARM. The Christian Apologetics and Research Ministry equips Christians and defends the faith. We do this by analyzing religions such as Islam, Jehovah's Witnesses, Mormonism, Roman Catholicism, Universalism, Wicca, etc., and comparing them to the Bible. We also analyze secular philosophies such as abortion, atheism, evolution, and relativism. In all our analyses we use logic and evidence to undergird the truth of the Bible which is the inspired word of God. If you want to learn, get answers, and be able to defend the faith, CARM is your place.

Christian Research Institute
The Bible Answer Man Web Site

<http://www.equip.org/>

Bethinking.org

<http://www.bethinking.org/>

Conservative UK apologetics web site. Great audio lectures and resources.

Veritas Forum

<http://www.veritas.org/>

Veritas Forums are university events that engage students and faculty in discussions about life's hardest questions and the relevance of Jesus Christ to all of life. Includes many online lectures: Many masters level lectures.

Answers in Genesis

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/>

Creation Ministry of Ken Ham

Bible History Online

<http://www.bible-history.com/>

Focus

The focus at Bible History Online is history and the Bible. The Bible is about God's activities in history. It deals with actual people in an actual geographical area during actual specified historical times who had contact with other actual peoples and empires whom we know of from sources outside the Bible. Knowledge of the historical background of the Bible is essential to any serious student of the Scriptures.

Recent archaeological discoveries as well as comparative historical research and philological studies, along with an analysis and interpretation of the Old Testament text have made possible a fuller and more reliable picture of Biblical history than in previous eras. The Lord has allowed our studies of the Bible to be greatly enhanced with the tremendous technology of the computer and the Internet bringing the pictures of the past as well as the work of devoted teachers and scholars right into our homes.

The Blue Letter Bible

<http://www.blueletterbible.org>

Our mission is to facilitate in-depth study of God's Word through an on-line interactive reference library continuously updated from the teachings and commentaries of selected pastors and teachers who hold to the conservative, historical Christian faith. We desire to operate the Blue Letter Bible as a ministry. This is a zero revenue project. There will be no charge for any services, nor are there any banner ads on the website to generate revenue. Development and programming labor, hardware and webspace have been provided by our sponsor, [Sowing Circle](#), a non-profit Bible-centered ministry committed to serving Jesus Christ. We do not ask for donations, however, many people have expressed the desire to assist in this ministry project. If the Lord is leading you in this direction, click on the following for [more information](#). In addition, many individuals and ministries have donated content to the library (see our [links page](#)). We wish to thank all of them and ask for God's blessing upon their ministry.

Crosswalk .com

<http://www.crosswalk.com>

Our aim is to offer the freshest and most compelling biblically-based content to Christians who take seriously their relationship with Christ. Crosswalk.com is built around four primary content areas – Faith, Family, Fun and Community. Each category is further subdivided into areas of significance to many Christians, including Bible Study, Devotionals, Marriage, Parenting, Music, etc. Within this framework, we work hard to provide timely, relevant, life-enhancing material from qualified, respected Christian sources, including major ministries such as Focus on the Family, Family Life Today, The Bible Answer man and Insight For Living. We would love to hear your ideas about how we can improve Crosswalk.com. Please don't hesitate to contact us.

Bible Gateway

<http://www.biblegateway.com/>

The Bible Gateway is a tool for reading and researching scripture online -- all in the language or translation of your choice! It provides advanced searching capabilities, which allow readers to find and compare particular passages in scripture based on keywords, phrases, or scripture reference.

.The Way of the Master: Ray Comfort

<http://www.livingwaters.com/witnessingtool/browse.shtml>

Witnessing tools and handling objections

<http://www.skepticalchristian.com/refutation>

<http://www.apologeticspress.org/>

