

The Influence of Trinitarian Doctrine on Translations of the Bible

by John David Clark, Sr.

How faithful to the original text is the translation of the Bible which you use?

Contents

1. A Short Introduction to the Tables
2. Introduction to the Tables
3. The Tables: Words Having *Pneuma* as Antecedent
4. Part One
5. Part Two
6. Footnotes to the Tables
7. The Rankings of the Translations
8. Special Verses
9. They Didn't Have To Do It
10. "Middleton's Rule"
11. What Trinitarians Teach
12. The Truth of the Matter
13. Appendix

A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO THE TABLES

(for those who want to, go directly to the Tables)

Anyone can easily see a difference between these two words: *it* *he*

Likewise, we all can see a difference between these words: *which* *who*

We can see a difference between those words simply because there *is* a difference; the letters used to spell each word differ. In this study, that is how simple the issue is. In the Greek language, the difference between *it* and *he* or between *which* and *who* is as easily recognized as it is in English, for those Greek words, too, are spelled differently. For example, consider the Greek words for *it* (ἐ) and for *he* (ἐς). Even a small child in ancient Greece recognized the difference between those simple Greek words.

I began this study with a question: "**Did the writers of the New Testament refer to God's Spirit as a person (*he, him, who*) or as a thing (*it, which, that*)?" To find the answer to the question, I had only to locate the verses in the New Testament in which the apostles referred to the holy Spirit and then read each verse in the Greek. It was a very simple process, one that a first-year student of the Greek language could easily perform.**

Once I had determined which Greek words the apostles used when they referred to the Spirit of God, then the focus of the study became, "How faithful to the apostles' words are Christian versions of the Bible?" To answer that question, I needed only to read the appropriate verses in various translations and see how the apostles' words were translated.

Lastly, I organized the information into Tables so that the reader could see:

1. which Greek words the apostles used when referring to the Spirit
2. what the correct translation of those words should be
3. how those words were translated in various versions of the Bible.

What I discovered in most of the versions of the Bible produced by trinitarians which I studied is irrefutable proof of intentional mistranslation of words which refer to the Spirit of God. This statement is not intended as an antagonistic denunciation of those translators. It is simply a statement of fact, and it is a fact that no scholar on earth can refute. In the versions of the holy scriptures which they produce, I learned that Christian trinitarians *routinely and purposely* mistranslate Greek pronouns, so as to promote the doctrine of the holy Trinity.

The evidence for my conclusions is organized and presented in the Tables on pages 9 - 22. You may turn to those Tables now, if you want to go directly to the heart of the study. At some point, however, you will want to consider the other relevant information contained in the Main Introduction which immediately follows this Short Introduction.

MAIN INTRODUCTION TO THE TABLES

Gender

Many languages refer to things, as well as to people and animals, as "him" or "her". For example, *bread* and *house* in biblical Greek are treated as masculine words, and so, the personal pronoun *he* is always used when such words are the antecedent¹. *Love*, *sword*, and *city*, on the other hand, are treated as feminine and always referred to as *she*. And words considered neuter, such as *name* and *water*, are always referred to as *it*. Gender designation may change from language to language (the biblical Greek word for *spirit* is neuter, but the modern German word for *spirit* is masculine), but within a language itself gender designation is consistent (the biblical Greek word for *spirit* is always neuter in biblical Greek). How it developed, and which people first began designating nouns as masculine, feminine, or neuter is an interesting question, but is probably unknowable. Nevertheless, the designation of words as masculine, feminine, or neuter became an integral part of many ancient languages and remains so in many modern languages.

Determiners

A *determiner* is a word that signals that a noun (such as *spirit*) is coming in the sentence. In English, articles such as *the* and other determiners do not change form, regardless of what they point out (*the* man, *the* woman, *the* tree). But in many languages, including biblical Greek, determiners do change form in order to match the gender of the noun they describe. An excellent example of this is found in Ephesians 4:5. In this verse, we find but six words: three determiners which modify three nouns. In English, it reads:

One Lord, one faith, one baptism

In English, the determiner *one* is spelled the same way, whether describing *Lord*, *faith*, or *baptism*. But in Greek, we find in this single verse three completely different words which mean *one* in English. The reason that Paul used three different determiners is because of the genders of the three nouns in this verse: *Lord* is masculine, *faith* is feminine, and *baptism* is neuter.

Spirit" is also used 6 times (1Cor. 12:9,11,13⁽²⁾; 2Cor. 6:17; Eph. 4:4), and again, the neuter form of *one* is used in every case. *Eternal*, also in neuter form, is used once as an adjective for the Spirit (Heb. 9:14). *My* (3 times) and *his* (4 times) are the only other modifiers for the Spirit to be found in the New Testament writings, except for prepositional phrases such as "the Spirit of your Father", "the Spirit of God", or "the Spirit of grace", etc.

I must stress the fact that there is not a single Greek word in either a masculine or feminine form used in reference to the holy Spirit in the New Testament. Every adjective, article, pronoun, or verb directly related to *pneuma* in the Bible is purely neuter in form (except in those cases wherein the neuter and masculine forms are identical, as explained in the footnote below).

Pneuma is Neuter, Regardless of Whose Pneuma It Is. The rules of grammar which apply to words referring to the holy Spirit also apply to words which refer to other spirits, because *pneuma* (spirit) is a neuter word in the Greek language regardless of whose *pneuma* it may be. In the Tables, I have omitted references to any spirit other than the Spirit of God. The focus is solely on the issue of whether or not, from a grammatical perspective, the New Testament scriptures in any way support Christianity's doctrine of the Trinity. References, then, are to the holy Spirit of God only, not to unclean spirits or to the spirits of men.

What the Facts Will Show

When the information is carefully weighed, the conclusion which forces itself upon us is that the men who wrote the New Testament books were not intentionally making any theological point in their choice of words used in connection with the Spirit; they were merely following the rules of Greek grammar (though the theological point they inadvertently made is powerful, as you will see). If there is any theological point concerning the Spirit which can be made from the Greek grammar of the Bible, it can be made only from these facts: (1) *pneuma* is a neuter noun, and (2) if the apostles believed that the Spirit is a person, they were freed, by the rules of Greek grammar, to refer to the holy Spirit with a masculine pronoun, but they never once chose to do so. This is a revealing fact, one that will be treated more fully later. These two indisputable facts of Greek grammar argue, if anything, *against* the Spirit being a person, and by course lead us to a biblically sound conclusion: that the Spirit of God is not a person and, therefore, no such thing as a trinity of divine persons exists. However, some translations purposely leave the reader with a contrary impression--mistranslating certain Greek words in order to lend credence to the doctrine of the Trinity. Every reference to the Spirit as *he*, *him*, or *whom* found in the translations used in this study is unscriptural, as you will see for yourself; and the transparent inspiration for those mistranslations was not to make the Greek more understandable, but to make the doctrine of the Trinity more believable.

The evidence presented here will prove that some translators wrote things as being part of the Holy Bible which the authors of the scriptures did not write, substituting the original words with their own *for the sole purpose of indoctrination*--and then publishing their work as a faithful translation of the original words and meaning. What is especially disturbing, though, is that none of the translators who altered the text admitting doing so. In their Introductions, not one of them mentioned the subtle changes they had made. This omission is inexcusable in itself; but not only did these trinitarian translators corrupt the text but they also purposely left the impression that they had not done so! Consider the following remarks of some of the translators themselves, taken directly from the Introductions to their various translations:

From Translation #1:

"The ever-present danger of stripping divine truth of its dignity and original intent was prominently before the minds of the producers at all times." (pg. v. of introduction)

Comment: Despite sensing the importance of fidelity to the "original intent" of the New Testament writers, these translators intentionally mistranslated the simple words found in the original text on **26** occasions, substituting words they deemed to be more in keeping with the Christian doctrine of the Trinity.

From Translation #14 (on the question of "whether the translator should 'inject his opinion' into his translation"):

This translator "cautiously answers" with a "yes", "on the ground that it inevitably happens anyway." But this does not mean that the translator "should exploit his role, illegitimately swaying his readers toward a partisan position." (xxii-xxiii of intro.) Comment: There is no doubt that this translator was sincere in his desire not to "exploit" his position as translator/interpreter. Yet, his translation contained **21** corruptions of the Greek in the narrow perimeters of this study, thus "illegitimately swaying his readers toward" the trinitarian faith. From Translation #9 (concerning what his response would be, if someone should say that his work is an interpretation rather than a translation):

"If the word interpretation is used in a bad sense, that is, if it means . . . that there has been a manipulation of the words of the New Testament Scripture to fit some private point of view . . . I would . . . strongly repudiate the charge!" (viii)

Comment: Nevertheless, this translator is guilty of doing just that. His version *interpreted* as masculine (as opposed to *translated*) **13** Greek neuter words which referred to the Spirit, thus "manipulating the words of the New Testament Scripture to fit" this translator's "private point of view" concerning the Trinity. He cannot repudiate that charge.

From Translation #15, concerning one common mistake in judgment made by various other translators:

This translator seeks to avoid the error of "adding words, phrases, and sentences to aid in clarifying the meaning of the text." Comment: His clearly stated intention to avoid the error of "adding words" to the text notwithstanding, this translator rejected the words of the original writers, in **14** places adding to the text words of his own preference which would "clarify the meaning" of the text from a trinitarian point of view.

From Translation #4: The most astonishing contradiction of one's own stated principle was found in the practice of these translators. Sharply criticizing modern translations for frequently altering the original text, Translation #4 claimed to be guided by the "principle of complete equivalence", saying,

"In faithfulness to God and to our readers, it was deemed appropriate that all participating scholars sign a statement affirming their belief in the verbal and plenary [absolute] inspiration of the Scripture, and in the inerrancy of the original autographs." (iii)

Comment: This sounds very impressive. But one must wonder, if these translators sincerely believed that the original Greek text was absolutely inspired of God and without any error at all, how then could they have dared to alter *every* Greek word related to the Spirit which they found in the New Testament (**thirty** times in this survey)! Of the twenty translations surveyed, this translation was (1) most adamant that the original Greek text was verbally inspired by God and without any error whatever, and (2) most guilty of trinitarian corruptions of the Greek in translation! Without a single exception, when these translators were confronted with a neuter pronoun which referred to the Spirit, they replaced it in translation with the masculine "He", "Him", or "Whom". What justification could there be for their refusal to translate faithfully the words found in the original text, *when they themselves signed a confession of faith that those words were verbally inspired by God?* It seems to me that translators who truly believe that God Himself verbally inspired the words written in the Bible would certainly believe that those words were perfect and entirely beyond being improved upon; and, therefore, they could not consider it appropriate to replace God's words with "clarifying" words of their own. Indeed, they would necessarily consider such a practice as ungodly, if not downright blasphemous. Thus, with their own affirmation of faith "in the verbal and plenary inspiration" of the original Greek words, these translators have condemned themselves and their own work.

A Matter of Principle

The aspiration of the translators whose works appear in this study was, no doubt, to render translations without error and without corruption. That is a noble principle by which to work. However, trinitarian translators failed miserably, in the main, to be guided by that principle when confronted with biblical Greek which contradicted their trinitarian faith. This is a gross violation of the readers' trust. If a translator feels so strongly about his faith that he rejects the original biblical text in order to promote it, he should at least have the integrity to alert the reader to the changes he made, so that the reader is not left with a wrong impression concerning the original words. This should be done out of respect for both the readers and the godly authors of the original text. Even if a translator sees himself as serving God and the best interests of the church in altering the text, and even if he is in fact doing so, that alteration must always be admitted to.

Now, I invite you to consider the evidence which the following pages contain, and to decide for yourself which translations accurately reflect the original text.

Symbols Used In The Tables:

... ..	shows that the words are next to one another in the translation being used.
... . It	Capitalization after a period shows that the word begins a sentence in the translation used.
[]	indicates that a word has been added that is not found in the original Greek text.
()	indicates words which belong in the translation but are not part of the word(s) under examination.
- omitted -	indicates that the translator omitted the original Greek word in his translation.
-	indicates that the translator omits a word which some others add but which is not found in the original text.

Part One

Matthew Through Romans

WORDS HAVING PNEUMA (SPIRIT) AS ANTECEDENT					
VERSE	GREEK	ENGLISH	Gender	Translation #1	Translation #2
MT.					
10:20	... τὸ	...which	N	...who	...that
"	λαλοῦν...	speaks...	N	speaks...	will speak...
JN.					
1:32	ἔμεινεν	it remained	E ¹	He remained	it remained
6:63	... τὸ	...that	N	...who	...what
"	ἐφ' ὃ ποιοῦν...	gives life...	N	gives life...	gives life...
7:39	οἱ	which	N	whom	which

14:17 ² "	σι ο αὐτὸ αὐτὸ μὲν ἔστι	which (receive) (sees, knows) it - (you know) it (he or it) dwells ² (he or it) shall be ²	N N - N E E	whom (receive) (behold) Him (know) [Him] (know) Him He abides (with) will be (in)	(obtain) [it] (see) it (recognize) [it] (recognize) it it stays (with) is (within)
14:26 ²	σι ο	which	N	whom	which
15:26 ²	σι ο	which	N	who	that
16:13 ²	-	-	-	-	-
ACTS					
5:32	οἱ	which	N	whom	which
8:16 "	ἔτι ἐπιπετυχῶς	...(As yet) it had (not) fallen upon...	E N	...He had (not yet) fallen upon...	...it had (not yet) come upon...
ROM.					
5:5 "	... τοῦ δοθέντος...	...which is given...	E N	...who was given...	...that has been given...
8:11 "	... τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος...	...that dwells in...	E N	...who indwells...	...that has taken possession...
8:15	ᾧ	by which	E	by which ³	- omitted -
8:16 "	αὐτὸ συμμαρτυρεῖ	...itself bears witness...	N E	...Himself bears witness...	...itself testifies...
8:26 "	αὐτὸ ὑπερευτυχάζει	...itself makes intercession...	N E	...Himself intercedes for...	...itself pleads for...

WORDS HAVING PNEUMA (SPIRIT) AS ANTECEDENT - continued

VERSE	Gende r	Translation #3-6	Translation #4	Translation #5	Translation #6
MT.					
10:20 "	N N	...which speaketh...	...who speaks...	- omitted - speaking	- omitted - speaking
JN.					
1:32	E ¹	it abode	He remained	it remained	it remained
6:63 "	N N	...that quickeneth...	...who gives life...	...that gives life...	...that gives life...
7:39	N	which	whom	which	which
14:17 ² " " "	N N - N	whom (receive) (seeth) him (knoweth) [him]	whom (receive) (sees) Him (knows) [Him] (know) Him	whom (receive) (sees) him (knows) [him]	whom (receive) (sees) him (knows) [him] (know) him

"	E	(ye know) him	He dwells (with)	(you know)	he abides (with)
"	E	he dwelleth	will be (in)	him	he will be (in)
		(with)		he dwells	
		shall be (in)		(with)	
				will be (in)	
14:26 ²	N	whom	whom	whom	whom
15:26 ²	N	which	who	who	who
16:13 ²	-	-	-	-	-
ACTS					
5:32	N	whom	whom	whom	whom
8:16	E	...(as yet) he	...(as yet) He	...it	...(as yet) [the
"	N	was	had fallen...	had (not yet)	Spirit]
		fallen upon...		fallen on...	had (not)
					come upon...
ROM.					
5:5	E	...which	...who	...which	...that
"	N	is given...	was given...	has been	has been given...
				given...	
8:11	E	...that	...who	...which	...that
"	N	dwelleth in...	dwells in...	dwells in...	dwells in...
8:15	E	whereby	by whom	- omitted -	- omitted -
8:16	N	...itself	...Himself	...himself	...that very Spirit
"	E	bearth	bears witness...	bearing	bearing
		witness...		witness...	witness...
8:26	N	...itself	...Himself	...himself	...that very Spirit
"	E	maketh	makes	intercedes...	intercedes...
		intercession...	intercession...		
VERSE	G	Translation	Translation	Translation	Translation
		#7	#8	#9	#10
MT.					
10:20	N	- omitted -	- omitted -	- omitted -	- omitted -
"	N	speaking	speaking	speaking	speaking
JN.					
1:32	E ¹	remain	stay	rest	resting
6:63	N	- omitted -	...what	...which	- omitted -
"	N	gives life	gives life...	gives life...	gives eternal life
7:39	N	whom	which	which	who
14:17 ²	N	(accept) him	(receive) him	whom	(receive) [him]
"	N	(sees) him	(see) him	(accept)	(looking for) him
"	-	(knows) [him]	(know) [him]	[that Spirit]	(recognize) [him]
"	N	(know) him	(know) him	-	- omitted -
"	E	he lives (with)	he remains (with)	(recognize)	lives (with)
"	E	will be (in)	is (in)	him	shall be (in)
				he is (with)	
				is (in)	
14:26 ²	N	whom	whom	whom	- omitted -
15:26 ²	N	who	who	who	. He
16:13 ²	-	-	-	-	-
ACTS					
5:32	N	whom	who	- omitted -	who

8:16 "	E N	[the Holy Spirit] ...had (not) come upon...	[the Holy Spirit] ...had (not yet) come down on...	...(as yet) he had (not) fallen upon...	...(as yet) he had (not) come upon...
ROM.					
5:5 "	E N	...whom [God] has given...	...who [is God's gift]...	- omitted - given	- omitted - [God] has given
8:11 "	E N	...who lives in...	- omitted - - omitted -	[he] lives in	- omitted - living within
8:15	E	by him	by [the Spirit's power]	- omitted -	- omitted -
8:16 "	N E	...himself testifies...	himself to declare	...himself endorses...	- omitted - speaks -
8:26 "	N E	...himself intercedes...	...himself pleads for...	- omitted - praying for	- omitted - prays for
VERSE	G	Translation #11	Translation #12	Translation #13	Translation #14
MT.					
10:20 "	N N	...that speaks...	- omitted - speaking	- omitted - will be speaking	- omitted - speaking
JN.					
1:32	E ¹	it remained	remain	rest	remaining
6:63 "	N N	...that (is) life-giving...	...that gives life...	...that gives life...	...who gives life...
7:39	N	which	that	which	whom
14:17 ² " " " " "	N N - N E E	which (receive) (beholds) it (knows) [it] (you know) it it remains (with) is (in)	which (accept) (sees, knows) it - (know) it it remains (with) will be (in)	whom (accept) (sees, knows) him it - (know) him he is with he is (in)	(receive) him (sees, knows) him - him he is staying (with) will be (united with)
14:26 ²	N	which	that	whom	whom
15:26 ²	N	which	that (proceeds)	who (issues from)	who
16:13 ²	-	-	-	-	-
ACTS					
5:32	N	which	that	whom	whom
8:16 "	E N	...it had (not yet) fallen upon...	...it had (not yet) fallen upon...	...(as yet) he had (not) come down on...	...he had [not] come upon...
ROM.					
5:5 "	E N	...which was given...	...that has been given...	...which has been given...	...who has been given...
8:11 "	E N	...that resides in...	...that dwells in...	- omitted - living in	- omitted - living in

8:15	E	by which	through which	- omitted -	who
8:16 "	N E	...itself bears witness...	...itself bears witness...	himself to bear witness	...himself bears witness...
8:26 "	N E	...itself pleads for...	...itself intercedes...	...[personally] makes petition...	...himself pleads on our behalf...
VERSE	G	Translation #15	Translation #16	Translation #17	Translation #18
MT.					
10:20 "	N N	...that is speaking...	- omitted - speaking	...who speaks...	...that is speaking...
JN.					
1:32	E ¹	it remained	stay	resting	rest
6:63 "	N N	...what gives life...	- omitted - makes alive	...what gives life... What gives life...
7:39	N	that	whom	whom	which
14:17 ² " " " " "	N N - N E E	whom (accept) (see) Him (recognize) [Him] - omitted - He is going to remain will be (within)	whom (receive) (see, know) Him - (know) Him He lives (with) will be (in)	(receive) him (see) him (know) [him] (know) him he is ever with is ⁸ (within)	(receive) him (sees, knows) him - him he remains will be (within)
14:26 ²	N	whom	whom	whom	whom
15:26 ²	N	that	who	who	which
16:13 ²	-	-	-	-	-
ACTS					
5:32	N	that	whom	whom	which
8:16 "	E N	...(as yet) He had (not) come upon... He had (not) come on...	...he had (not yet) fallen upon...	...(As yet) it had (not) fallen upon...
ROM.					
5:5 "	E N	...that has been given...	...who has been given...	...who has been given...	...which has been given...
8:11 "	E N	...that has [His] home within (you)...	- omitted - living in	- omitted - indwelling	- omitted - indwelling
8:15	E	by which	who (moves us)	in which ³	- omitted -
8:16 "	N E	...Himself bears witness...	- omitted - assures	...himself bears witness...	...this Spirit testifying...
8:26 "	N E	...Himself pleads for...	...Himself pleads for...	...himself intercedes...	- omitted - pleads for
VERSE	G	Translation #19	Translation #20	(for future use) #21	(for future use) #22
MT.					

10:20 "	N N	- omitted - is speaking	- omitted - supply words		
JN.					
1:32	E ¹	it remains	...making himself at home...		
6:63 "	N N	...that which is vivifying...	- omitted - . . . make life . . .		
7:39	N	which	whom		
14:17 ² " " " " "	N N - N E E	which (get) (is beholding) it (is knowing) [it] (know) it it (is remaining) will be (in)	take him in to see him - omitted - know him he has been staying will be (in)		
14:26 ²	N	which	whom		
15:26 ²	N	which	- omitted -		
16:13 ²	-	-	-		
ACTS					
5:32	N	which	- whom -		
8:16 "	E N	...(not as yet) was it fallen on...	- omitted -		
ROM.					
5:5 "	E N	...which is being given...	- omitted - - omitted -		
8:11 "	E N	- omitted - making its home	- omitted - living in (you)		
8:15	E	in which	- omitted -		
8:16 "	N E	...itself is testifying...	- omitted - confirms		
8:26 "	N E	...itself is pleading for...	. He . . . making prayer		

Part Two

1 Corinthians through Revelation

WORDS HAVING PNEUMA (SPIRIT) AS ANTECEDENT					
VERSE	GREEK	ENGLISH	G ender	Translation #1	Translation #2
1COR.					
2:12	το	which (comes from)	N	who (is from)	that (comes from)
6:19 "	οσιν	- which (you have)	- E	[who is] (in) whom (you have)	[that is] (within) which (you have)
12:11 "	διαποσθ βουλεται	distributing it wills	N E	distributing He wills	apportions [the Spirit] chooses

EPH.					
1:14	ὅ	which	N	who	which
4:30	ᾧ	with which	E	by whom	with which
6:17 ⁴	ὅ	which	N	which	which
2TIM.					
1:14	ὅ	...which dwells in...	E	...who dwells in...	...that lives in...
"			N		
TITUS					
3:6	ὃ	which	E	whom	which
1PET.					
1:11	τὸ	which	N	- omitted -	- omitted -
"	προμαρτυρούμενον	...it was bearing witness beforehand...	N	He predicted	in predicting
1JN.					
3:24	ὃ	which	E	which	which
5:6	.. τὸ μαρτυροῦν	...that bears witness...	N	...who bears witness... ⁵	- omitted - testifies
"			N		

WORDS HAVING PNEUMA (SPIRIT) AS ANTECEDENT - continued

VERSE	G ender	Translation #3	Translation #4	Translation #5	Translation #6
1COR.					
2:12	N	which	who	which	that
6:19	-	[which is] (in)	[who is] (in)	-	-
"	E	which (ye have)	whom (you have)	which (you have)	which (you have)
12:11	N	dividing	distributing	[who]	[who] allots
"	E	he will	He wills	apportions he wills	[the Spirit] chooses
EPH.					
1:14	N	which	who	which	this
4:30	E	whereby	by whom	in whom	with which
6:17 ⁴	N	which	which	which	which
2TIM.					
1:14	E	...which dwelleth...	...who dwells...	...who dwells...	- omitted - living in
"	N				
TITUS					
3:6	E	which	whom	which	[. This Spirit...]
1PET.					
1:11	N	which	who	- omitted -	- omitted -
"	N	...it testified beforehand...	...He testified beforehand...	when predicting	...it testified in advance...
1JN.					
3:24	E	which	whom	which	that

5:6	N N	...that beareth witness...	...who bears witness...	...who bears witness... ⁵	...that testifies...
VERSE	Gender	Translation #7	Translation #8	Translation #9	Translation #10
1COR.					
2:12	N	who	- omitted -	- omitted -	- omitted -
6:19 "	- E	[who is] (in) whom (you have rec'd)	[who lives] (in) who [was given]	[who lives] (in) - omitted -	[he lives] (within) - omitted -
12:11 "	E	he gives he determines	he gives he wishes	who distributes he wills	who gives deciding
EPH.					
1:14	N	who	- omitted -	- omitted -	- omitted -
4:30	E	with whom	- omitted -	. [He]	[he]
6:17 ⁴	N	which	which	- omitted -	which
2TIM.					
1:14 "	E N	...who lives in...	...who lives in...	...who lives within...	...who lives in...
TITUS					
3:6	E	whom	- omitted -	which	whom
1PET.					
1:11 "	N N	- omitted - he predicted	- omitted - in predicting	- omitted - he foretold	- omitted - he told
1JN.					
3:24	E	- omitted -	that	- omitted -	- omitted -
5:6	N N	...who testifies...	...himself testifies...	- omitted - bears witness ⁵	- omitted - says
VERSE	Gender	Translation #11	Translation #12	Translation #13	Translation #14
1COR.					
2:12	N	which	that	- omitted -	- omitted -
6:19 "	- E	- which (you have)	- whom (you have)	[who is] (in) whom (you rec'd)	[who lives] (inside) whom (you rec'd)
12:11 "	N E	making distribution it wills	distributing he wishes	distributing at will	distributing he chooses
EPH.					
1:14	N	which	which	who	who
4:30	E	with which	with which	who	[he has stamped]
6:17 ⁴	N	that is,...	which	that is,...	that is,...
2TIM.					
1:14 "	E N	...which is dwelling in...	...that dwells within...	...who dwells in...	...who lives in...
TITUS					
3:6	E	. This [spirit]... ⁷	whom	which	whom

1PET.						
1:11 "	N N	- omitted - was indicating	- omitted - it testified in advance	- omitted - was revealing	- omitted - in predicting	
1JN.						
3:24	E	which	that	that	whom	
5:6	N N	...that which is bearing witness...	...that testifies...	...that bears witness...	- omitted - bears witness	
VERSE	G ender	Translation #15	Translation #16	Translation #17	Translation #18	
1COR.						
2:12	N	that (comes from)	who (comes from)	which (comes from)	that (comes from)	
6:19 "	- E	[that is] (in whom (you have)	[who is] (in whom [God gives you]	[who is] (within) whom (you have)	- - omitted -	
12:11 "	N E	apportions He chooses	gives He wishes	distributes he wills	apportioning he pleases	
EPH.						
1:14	N	who	who	who	which	
4:30	E	by whom	by whom	in whom	by whom	
6:17 ⁴	N	which	which	which	that is,...	
2TIM.						
1:14 "	E N	...who has His home in...	- omitted - living in	...who makes [his] home...	...that dwells within...	
TITUS						
3:6	E	which	- omitted -	which	which	
1PET.						
1:11 "	N N	- omitted - in foretelling	- omitted - ...He exactly predicted...	...which [He] ever testified beforehand...	- omitted - foretold	
1JN.						
3:24	E	that	whom	which	- omitted -	
5:6	N N	- omitted - testifies	- omitted - ⁹ telling the truth	...he who bears testimony...	- omitted - the witness	
VERSE	G ender	Translation #19	Translation #20	(for future use) #21	(for future use) #22	
1COR.						
2:12	N	which (is from)	- omitted -			
6:19 "	- E	- which (you have)	- - omitted -			
12:11 "	N E	apportioning He is intending	handed out . He decides . . .			
EPH.						

1:14	N	which	- omitted -		
4:30	E	by which	for himself		
6:17	N	which	- omitted -		
2TIM.					
1:14 "	E N	...which is making its home...	... who works in ...		
TITUS					
3:6	E	which	- omitted -		
1PET.					
1:11 "	N N	- omitted - testifying beforehand	- omitted - - omitted -		
1JN.					
3:24	E	which	- omitted -		
5:6	N N	..it is which is testifying...	- omitted - is confirming		

Footnotes

¹ The **E** means simply that the form of the Greek word may be used with **Either** masculine or neuter antecedents. It does not mean that the translator is free to choose between *he* or *it*. The faithful translator will find the antecedent to which the word is linked, and on that basis make a judgment on the proper translation. In all these examples, the antecedent is *pneuma*, a neuter word. Therefore, the only correct translation for pronouns or verbs designated with "**E**" is *it*, *which*, or *that*. The words *he*, *him*, *who*, or *whom* should not appear anywhere in the Tables.

² See the following section titled, "**Special Verses**".

³ In this verse, *spirit* is treated by this translator as other than the holy Spirit.

⁴ Normally, *which* would refer to *pneuma*, which preceded it. However, only a few of the translators use it so, for arguably sound grammatical reasons. See the following section titled, "**Special Verses**".

⁵ In this version of the Bible, the scripture is 1Jn. 5:7, not 5:6.

⁶ Pronouns in general are confused in Translation #3, as its handling of Mt. 24:32 and Mk. 13:28 exemplifies. The same feminine word for *fig tree* is used in both verses, but while it is referred to as *her* in one verse it is called *his* in another. How these translators could have justified using *his* and *her* interchangeably in translation is an interesting puzzle. But they mistranslate pronouns in every direction, not only using *which* for *who* (Mt. 5:12, 16; etc.), but often *who* or *whom* for *which* (Jn. 14:26; Acts 5:32). This indicates that when this version of the Bible was written, the distinction between pronouns was apparently not seen with the same degree of importance as it is now; therefore, the changes in pronouns in reference to the Spirit cannot justifiably be called "trinitarian corruptions". Trinitarian doctrine, however, was certainly behind this version's horrible corruption of Phip. 2:6. Paul's meaning was completely reversed by these translators in order to promote trinitarianism.

⁷ Brackets are theirs.

⁸ "Is" in this instance is understood.

⁹ This note on 1Jn. 5:7b-8a from translator #16: "Our oldest manuscripts do not have vv.7b-8a: "in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one. And there are three testifying on earth." Early in the 16th century an editor translated these words from Latin manuscripts and inserted them in his Greek New Testament. Erasmus took them from this Greek New Testament and inserted them in the third edition (1522) of his Greek New Testament. Luther used the text prepared by Erasmus. But even though the inserted words taught the trinity, Luther ruled them out and never had them in his translation. In 1550 Bugenhagen objected to these words "on account of the truth." In 1574 [after Martin Luther's death] Feyerabend, a printer, added them to Luther's text, and in 1596 they appeared in the Wittenberg Bible. They were not in Tyndale's or Coverdale's Bible or in the Great Bible."

Rank (Best to Worst in Accuracy of Translation)	Numbers Used For Translations In The Tables	No. of Trinitarian Corruptions ¹
Best	Translation # 2	0
Best	Translation # 11	0
	Translation # 19	1

	Translation # 12	3
	Translation # 18	7
	Translation # 3	9²
	Translation # 6	10
	Translation # 20	12
	Translation # 13	13
	Translation # 10	13
	Translation # 9	14

Translation # 15	14	
Translation # 5	15	
Translation # 8	17	
Translation # 16	20	
Translation # 14	22	
Translation # 17	23	
Translation # 7	25	
Translation # 1	27	
Worst	Translation # 4	30

¹ The last two verb forms in Jn. 14:17 not included. See "**Special Verses**".

² See Footnote #6 following the Tables.

IMPORTANT! Please note that this ranking applies only to this very narrow issue. This study is neither an endorsement nor a rejection of a particular version of the Bible as a whole. For example, Translation #11, ranked **Best** here, is published by a sect which does not believe in the Trinity. For that reason, these translators had no problem translating faithfully the Greek words related to the Spirit. However, this sect *is* guilty of manipulating many other scriptures in order to lend credence to its non-trinitarian faith! The above rankings, then, have to do only with Greek words related to this narrow subject matter, and may or may not reflect on the particular translation as a whole.

Special Verses

John 14:16-17, 26; 15:26; 16:7-14

These verses appear to contain references to *pneuma* (spirit) as "he", "him", and "whom". Actually, these personal pronouns refer not to *pneuma*, but to *paraclatos* (comforter). *Paraclatos* is a masculine noun, not neuter; therefore, masculine pronouns are used when referring to *paraclatos*. Again, theology was not John's motivation in his choice of pronouns; he was simply following rules of Greek grammar. Here is the correct translation of each of these verses:

John 14:16-17

And I shall ask the Father, and He will give to you another comforter, that *he might be*¹ with you for ever, the Spirit of truth *which*² the world is unable to receive, because it neither sees nor knows *it*³. But you know *it*³, because *it abides*⁴ with you and *it shall be*⁴ in you.

¹ The verb form used here could be translated "it might be", but since the subject of this verb is the masculine word, *paraclatos*, not *pneuma*, the only grammatically correct translation is "he might be".

² "Which", is correct because the antecedent is the neuter word *pneuma* not the masculine *paraclatos*.

³ We have no choice between in these cases; John used *it*.

⁴ This is a very interesting conclusion, for the translator must decide whether John was returning to *paraclatos* as his subject, or whether he was continuing his references to *pneuma*. If *paraclatos*, then these two verb forms are to be translated "he abides" and "he shall be". If the translator thinks that *pneuma* was still John's subject, then "it abides" and "it will be" is correct.

John 14:26

But the comforter, the holy Spirit *which*⁵ the Father shall send in my name, that (masculine) one *shall teach*⁶ you everything and (*he shall*) *remind*⁶ you of everything that I have spoken to you.

⁵ *Pneuma* is the antecedent; therefore, *which* is the correct pronoun. John correctly avoids using the personal pronoun *whom*.

⁶ Even though there is no difference in the neuter and masculine verb forms used here, *paraclatos* is the subject of these verbs. *He*, then, is the only proper translation. To strengthen the point, John injects "that [masculine] one" into the sentence after the words, "in my name".

John 15:26

When the comforter *whom*⁷ I will send unto you has come, even the Spirit of truth *which*⁸ proceeds from the Father, *he shall bear witness*⁹ of me.

⁷ "Whom" refers to the masculine word "comforter" (*paraclatos*).

⁸ "Which" refers to the neuter word "spirit" (*pneuma*).

⁹ The verb form here is another example of a verb which can be used with either a neuter or a masculine subject. If the translator chooses *paraclatos* as the subject, which seems to be the reasonable choice here, "he shall testify" is the only proper translation.

John 16:7-14

John 16:13 at first appears to contain a masculine pronoun referring to the Spirit. In conversation with the church concerning my discovery, however, it was pointed out to me by Lyn Hammonds, an observant reader, that *pneuma* was not the subject here. The subject throughout this section is *paraclatos*, beginning with verse seven.

The powerful influence of a deeply held trinitarian faith upon even a great scholar's mind is evident in Professor A.T. Robertson's treatment of John 16:13. He dismisses the possibility of "that (masculine) one" referring to *paraclatos* in verse seven because of the five verses which come between the subject and the pronoun. This, despite John's use of "that (masculine) one" in verse 8 and the continuing reference to the work of the *paraclatos* in the other four verses leading to verse 13. To say, as Mr. Robertson does (p. 709), that "in this passage John is insisting on the personality of the Holy Spirit" is an unwarranted assessment of the grammar and imposes upon John a trinitarian faith about which he knows and says nothing, though opportunities abounded for him to do so. No one except a trinitarian would possibly hear in John's grammar a voice "insisting" on the doctrine of the Trinity. The complete absence of the idea of a "holy Trinity" in the New Testament writings and the strain upon the imagination which trinitarians ask us to endure in viewing their biblical "evidence" (this verse being a prime example) should speak forcefully to all students of the scriptures about this issue.

One should especially note that the use of the masculine noun, *paraclatos*, cannot be taken as evidence that the Spirit is a (masculine) personality, for other such descriptive titles for the Spirit are feminine words, such as *dove*, *promise*, and *gift*. In fact, the word most closely related to *paraclatos* is *paraclasis* (consolation), and it is feminine. One finds more feminine words than masculine words used in allusions to the Spirit, when a survey is made. But who, other than those who are on a crusade for equalization of the sexes, is willing to suggest that the Spirit should be referred to as *she*? Actually, it would not be surprising to see trinitarians proclaim at some point that the Spirit *is* a feminine personality, perhaps even to declare that the real identity of the holy Spirit is Mary, the mother of Jesus. Time will tell.

Outside of these verses in John, the only other usage of *paraclatos* is in reference to Jesus himself, found in 1John 2:1.

Ephesians 6:17

A comment on Ephesians 6:17 is needful because of a popular misinterpretation which has prevailed in some fundamentalist and charismatic circles, contrary to the meaning which is made clear by an attention to the Greek. Here, we read:

And take . . . the sword of the Spirit, *which* is the word of God.

At issue here is, what is the antecedent of *which*? In alluding to this verse, some over-zealous believers refer to their Bibles, raising them high and exclaiming, "Here is my sword", as if the *which* in this verse refers to *sword*; but if *which* in this verse referred to *sword*, *which* would be in a feminine form because *sword* is a feminine word. However, the *which* here is in neuter form, and that requires us to look for a neuter word as the antecedent: *Spirit*. Paul is saying here that the Spirit, not the sword (and certainly not the Bible) is the word of God.

Most translations translate the parenthetical clause "which is the word of God" in this manner: "that is [to say], the word of God." This is a legitimate translation. I personally read *which* to be referring to *Spirit* in this sentence, and unless one has a theological difficulty with the Spirit being the Word of God, this would probably be the first meaning which would come to mind in the normal course of translation. Nevertheless, this is an occasion in which the translator has a choice as to what the original

writer intended. An interesting rendering of this verse is from Translation #2: ". . . the sword of the Spirit, which is the voice of God." After all, does not God communicate to us through His Spirit? Translator #2 may have been encouraged in this rendering the Greek by the fact that *word* here is the Greek *rama* ("that which is said", "expression"), not *logos* (word, or the personified Word). Regardless of which translation is preferred, however, the use of *sword* as the antecedent of *which* in this verse is impossible.

They Didn't Have To Do It!

The point that will now be made is of immense importance, for it makes a very strong case for the statement that the New Testament writers did not consider the Spirit of God to be a person and that they intentionally used *it*, *which*, and *that* when referring to it. And if that is true, there can be no justification for any translator to change the apostles' relative pronouns into personal pronouns, as trinitarian translators frequently have done.

It may surprise the reader to learn that there are examples of the New Testament writers breaking the general rule and referring to neuter antecedents with masculine or feminine pronouns. For example, the Greek word *Gentile(s)* is itself neuter, but a masculine pronoun is used in reference to Gentiles (Acts 15:17; 26:17). I assume that Luke, in referring to *Gentiles* with a masculine pronoun, felt that it would be disrespectful to refer to people as if they were things, even if they were Gentiles. Additionally, John shows that it was customary to refer to mixed groups of people with the masculine gender, when in his second letter he greets the "elect lady" (feminine) and her "children" (neuter), but then uses the masculine form of *whom* in reference to them all (v.1). The same intentional change of gender is seen in Matthew 28:19, Mark 6:45-46, and Acts 8:5. In John's Gospel, too, we find a masculine pronoun used in reference to the neuter word *child*, indicating that John felt it was inappropriate to refer to a person, even a very small one, as an *it* (Jn. 6:9). In Mark, the writer refers to yet another neuter word for *child* with the pronoun *her*, for in this case the child was female. Paul also demonstrates this liberty concerning gender when he spoke of the runaway slave, Onesimus (Philemon 10): **"I appeal to you concerning my child [neuter], whom [masculine] I have begotten in my bonds."**

Another instructive example of mixed gender usage concerns the word *amen*. In both 1Corinthians 14:16 and 2Corinthians 1:20, Paul refers to "the [neuter] Amen". But in John's Revelation, when Jesus calls himself "the Amen", it is with a masculine *the*, not neuter. And finally, at one point John in his Revelation refers to the Beast (a neuter word) with a masculine pronoun (Rev. 13:14), indicating that the coming Beast will be a person. So, throughout the New Testament writings, the evidence shows exactly what Robertson (p. 683) says; to wit, that "the personal pronouns are sometimes used freely according to the sense" rather than according to strict grammatical rules.

Robertson repeats this extremely important observation later (p. 713), noting that in biblical Greek, changes in the gender of pronouns are at times "made according to the real gender rather than the grammatical" gender. In other words, if the writer used a neuter word, but with a person in mind, *he was at liberty to use a masculine or feminine pronoun instead of the neuter pronoun*.

The inescapable conclusion to these facts is that if the New Testament writers believed that the Spirit of God is a person, they would surely have shown as much respect to Him as they showed to slaves, women, and children. They were completely free to use personal pronouns (or verb forms: Mk. 9:20) whenever referring to a person, and the evidence shows that they took full advantage of that liberty. The question, then, which veritably screams at the trinitarian for an answer is, "If the apostles believed that the Spirit is a person, and were free to refer to it as *he*, then why did none of them ever refer to the Spirit with a personal pronoun (or determiner, adjective, or verb form)?" If they referred to all other persons with personal pronouns, regardless of the neuter words involved, then why not the Spirit of God, if indeed they believed the Spirit to be a person? It is obvious that the apostles did not believe that the Spirit of God is a person; and for trinitarians to translate the New Testament in such a way as to make it appear as if the apostles did think so is indefensible and irresponsible in the extreme.

The compulsion to refer to the Spirit in personal terms (which compulsion the New Testament authors never once felt) was a motivating factor for most of the translators whose work is represented in the Tables of this study. Believing that the Spirit is a person, they obviously felt constrained to substitute the apostles' words with their own. As a result, instead of simply bending a rule of grammar in order to make the original meaning clear (which is sometimes a necessary evil in translation), they violated a cardinal principle of integrity in scholarship by rejecting the words of holy men of God in order to propagate their own private beliefs. For them to have done this is not simply a matter of inappropriate methodology; it is evil.

Middleton's Rule

Mr. Robertson (p. 795) alludes to a "Middleton's Rule", which suggests that whenever the Greek article *the* is used with *pneuma*, "personality is being taught". With all due respect to this gifted linguist, I have to ask, taught by whom? In the New Testament, there are about one hundred uses of *Spirit* without the article *the*, as opposed to about one hundred fifty with it. Are we to infer from those numbers that about 40% of the time (when the article is absent) the New Testament writers were teaching that the Spirit was *not* a person? And were the apostles thus reduced to merely making subtle hints about a doctrine of such immense significance?

Paul wrote that the hope of the gospel prompted him to use "great plainness of speech" (2Cor. 3:12). Not only Paul, but every other teacher sent from God taught the truth openly, not in riddles impossible for all but astute linguists to decipher. In the introduction to his translation, translator #9 (himself a trinitarian) makes several shrewd observations in regard to the imagined "secret messages" which some translators claim to discern in the Greek of the New Testament. **"I doubt very much,"** he writes, **"whether the New Testament writers were as subtle or as self-conscious as some commentators would make them appear."** He continues, ". . . it appears to me quite beside the point to . . . deduce hidden meanings [from the New Testament writers' words] of which certainly he was unaware." This is true. Accordingly, we should admit that there simply does not exist in any use of *pneuma* or in any use of the words related to it, an effort by New Testament writers to persuade the reader, subliminally or otherwise, that the Spirit of God is a person. The evidence simply doesn't exist. And every time a trinitarian finger is pointed to a

verse or to a word which might, by a great stretch of imagination, be interpreted as endorsing the doctrine of a "holy Trinity", it only serves to show how devoted to his faith a trinitarian can become. (More on Middleton's Rule in the Appendix.)

What Trinitarians Teach

"Trinity (n.). The union of three persons or hypostases (the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit) in one Godhead, so that all the three are one God as to substance, but three persons or hypostases as to individuality." So I read from the lecture notes (see Appendix) that were provided to me by a trinitarian seminary professor who had recently taught on the subject. I had approached this Professor of the New Testament with a question about the Greek grammar related to this study. To my joy, in addition to some guidance in that regard, I also received his lecture notes on the trinitarian faith, and I read them carefully.

First of all, as a sincere student, I was eager to find out what an *hypostasis* is, and who it was who first taught that Jesus is one of them. I found a partial answer farther along in the professor's notes: **"Hypostasis (n.). The unique essence or substance of the Godhead, and as such, of the three persons of the trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, equivalent to [the Greek word] *ousia* (Lat. *substantia*)." I have studied Latin, and I have studied Greek. It's the professor's English that I don't understand. I may not be an expert in logic, but it seems to me that when I ask to have the Trinity explained to me, and someone tells me that it is a union of three hypostases, and then I ask what is an hypostasis and I am told that it is the trinitarian nature of God, I get the picture of a dog chasing his own tail, equivalent to the Greek word *oura* (Lat. *cauda*). That kind of circular reasoning and pseudo-intellectual blather is similar to the scientific method of some evolutionists, who date fossils in part by the rock strata in which they are found, then date rock strata in part by the types of fossils that are found in them - and then call you ignorant if you don't agree with their conclusions.**

Further complicating the issue is the word *Godhead*.¹ What does it mean, and who invented that weird word? (Don't tell me it is the union of the three hypostases of the Trinity, please.) Webster's Dictionary, following the standard trinitarian formula, defines *Godhead* as "*the essential being of God*". But in order to comprehend those words I must respectfully ask, what is the difference between God's *plain* being and His *essential* being? It seems to me that if God (or anyone else) is going to be, He is going to essentially be. Seriously, what's the point of being, if a person doesn't go ahead and *essentially* be? And how would someone go about *unessentially* being?

¹ The Greek words translated as "Godhead" (found in Acts 17:29; Rom. 1:20; Col. 2:9; and 2Pet. 1:3,4) refer to the divine nature of God. That I can understand. I can comprehend the fact that our God is altogether divine (not just His head). Actually, the word translated Godhead in Acts 17:29 and 2Peter 1:3,4 is an adjective, not a noun. Peter uses it to describe God's divine power (v. 3) and His divine nature (v. 4). Acts 17:29 should be translated "the divinity" instead of "Godhead", if the translator wants to give the reader a chance to understand Paul's message. The words Paul used in Romans 1:20 and Colossians 2:9 are both nouns which simply mean "deity", or "divine nature".

This is all folly. Trinitarianism's pretentious, philosophical definitions of God and its long-winded attempts at analyzing His holy nature are indications of ignorance, not knowledge of God. It treats God as if He were a thing, a divine Blob to be dissected and speculated upon. Except for the fact that Christianity claims authority from God Himself to teach it, the doctrine of the Trinity would be dismissed by every sensible person as the babbling of a fool trying to appear wise. It is astonishing that so many otherwise reasonable people have become zealous proponents of this transparently empty, pseudo-philosophy; and it is alternately humorous and frightening to consider with what power Christianity mesmerizes so many with its meaningless babble about such things as "the consubstantiality of the Godhead". . . . Please, don't ask. I don't know.

Reading farther in the professor's paper on the Trinity, I came to the section titled "Inadequate Conceptions of the Godhead". I assume that this ominous sounding title means simply, "Wrong Ideas About God", and on that basis I will cautiously proceed. From the professor's paper, then, here are those conceptions which are condemned as heresy by those who consider themselves to be authorities on the doctrine of the Trinity:

1. **Arianism.** Condemned as an heretic by Christianity about 1700 years ago, Arius held that the Son of God was created by the Father. As Arius is purported to have said, "There was [a time] when he was not." Now, inasmuch as Jesus said that the Father gave him life (Jn.5:26) and that he is "the beginning of the creation of God" (Rev. 3:14), and in light of the fact that Paul calls Jesus "the firstborn of every creature" (Col. 1:15), Arius's idea seems perfectly reasonable. It certainly is understandable. Trinitarians believe that to say that Jesus is a created being is to deny the deity of Christ. But why should the trinitarian think so? Are trinitarians of the opinion that the Father is incapable of creating a divine being?

The **Scriptural** answer to that last question is clear. The Father did in fact create the Son (Rev.3:14, Prov.8:22-30), and then He ordained His Son to create everything else that was created (Jn. 1:3). The Son, then, is both a created being and a divine one. Christ has a God (his Father) over him (Jn. 20:17); yet he himself is God over everything else (Mt. 28:18). There is no theological problem in this. The scriptures show that the Father can make anybody a "god" over a particular place or people. The judges in Israel were called "gods" (Ex. 22:28). Moses himself was made a god over Pharaoh and Egypt (Ex. 7:1). Those to whom the word of God came were called gods by the Father (Ps. 82:6).

This last verse, Psalm 82:6) is especially significant because it is the verse to which Jesus referred in an attempt to explain what he meant by saying that he and the Father were one (Jn. 10:34-35). Jesus was speaking of a oneness in spirit, but his adversaries mistakenly thought that he was claiming to be God the Father. In effect, what Jesus's accusers wrongly thought Jesus was teaching, and what Jesus adamantly denied he was teaching, the doctrine of the Trinity most emphatically does teach. Thus, both Jesus and his adversaries rejected the fundamental idea behind the Trinity (complete equality of the Father and the Son) when it first appeared.

In light of the simple truth of scripture, we conclude that trinitarians tragically erred when they condemned Arius for teaching that Jesus was created by the Father. In the centuries that followed, Christian teachers horribly compounded their error by claiming

divine authority to impose upon men their bizarre trinitarian doctrine, and by persecuting all (even torturing and murdering many) who dared to believe the truth of the matter.

2. **Pneumatomachianism**. If you think that the Spirit of God is not a person, this ominous sounding title applies to you. Pneumatomachianism sounds dangerous, but it is just a big word invented by trinitarians to make you afraid that they'll accuse you of it. You should be advised that at this very moment you are reading the words of a flagrant pneumatomachianist! Aren't you embarrassed? Don't you want to hide this before somebody sees you reading it, so that the rumor won't be spread that you, too, are a pneumatomachianist? Relax. If this impressive word applies to anyone who understands that the holy Spirit is not a person, then Jesus is a pneumatomachianist, too.

3. The other two "heresies" mentioned in the professor's paper are variant expressions of the doctrine of the Trinity itself. The first is condemned for teaching that there are three Persons who exist simultaneously as three Gods. A "denial of the unity of the Godhead", protested the professor's paper. On the other hand, the second heresy is condemned for teaching that there is just one God who manifested Himself in three "modes". "A denial of the tripersonal nature of the Godhead", we are told. Frankly, I can't see a hair's breadth of difference between either of these two doctrines and the "orthodox" trinitarian faith. None of them makes a bit of sense. It resembles a quarrel among identical triplets over which one is ugliest.

According to the professor's paper (to whom I am sincerely grateful for his generosity, and his efforts to explain his faith), the correct trinitarian formula is "**God reveals Himself to us in Scripture as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, each with distinct personal attributes [i.e., tripersonal] but without division of nature, essence, or being [i.e., as one].**" Really, now, what does that say? It says, according to one definition, that both Christ Jesus and the holy Spirit are "consubstantial" with the Father. Come, now. Is Jesus the Father and/or the holy Spirit, or is he not? Is the Father the Spirit and/or Jesus, or is He not? And is the Spirit the Father and/or the Son or is it not? If what trinitarians are saying is true, the only correct response to these questions is "Yes and/or No". If you just say yes, you're a heretic for denying "the tripersonal nature of the Godhead", and if you just say no, you're condemned for denying "the unity of the Godhead". So, to be an orthodox Christian, one must confess that Jesus is and is not the Father, and that the Father is and is not the Spirit, and that the Spirit is and is not both of the other two, who actually are, together with the Spirit, one big Godhead in substance, made up of three hypostases in individuality, and consubstantial with each other.

As my earthly father used to say, "I'll take strawberry".

The Truth of the Matter

Capitalization of *spirit*. Because the word *spirit* is so often capitalized in various translations, the assumption on the part of many readers is that *pneuma* is capitalized in the original Greek text. It is not. Of the 245 times when the New Testament writers used the word *pneuma*, they never capitalized it (except on the two occasions when *pneuma* was the first word in a quotation: Lk. 1:35 and 4:18). The only justification for capitalizing *spirit* is reverence for God, just as we may capitalize other words not capitalized in the Greek, such as Father, Son, and even the word God itself.

What is problematic is that most translators, not content with capitalizing the word *spirit*, overstep the boundary of sound discretion by also capitalizing the simple adjective *holy*. And when the words *holy spirit* are capitalized (as a person's *name* always is) the capitalized words *Holy Spirit* are read by many as a personal name. With this addition to the original text, translators suggest something in their translations which the apostles did not intend. Such a change does not clarify the original; it alters it for pedagogic purposes. This is mistranslation pure and simple, motivated by misdirected piety and intended to advance a sectarian idea; to wit, that the Spirit of God is a person.

The Father and the Son. A person is a being with a body and a spirit. God is a person. He has a body and a spirit. No one denies the biblical testimony as to the existence of God's Spirit; however, many deny the biblical testimony in regards to His body. Nevertheless, God's hands, eyes, back, arms, and other body parts are mentioned in the scriptures. (In the Appendix is a complete list of God's body parts mentioned in the Bible.) God's Son, Jesus, is another person. He dwells in his own body, separate from the Father's body (that's what makes Jesus a different person); but he shares the eternal Spirit of life with his Father. By Jesus's own confession, we learn that he received life from the Father, that he was created by Him (Jn. 5:26; Col. 1:15; Rev. 3:14; Prov. 8; etc.). Thus, being two persons, Jesus and his Father can look at each other, talk to each other, even hug each other, and they probably do. They are two separate persons enjoying a blessed unity of purpose, a communion of spirit of which carnal men are thoroughly ignorant. God is neither a trinity nor a quadripartite of persons, anymore than we are, who were created in His image. There is in heaven a holy Father, a person, and His only begotten Son with Him, also a divine person; no other than these two is worthy of worship.

The Father created the Son and then anointed him with power to create all things, seen and unseen (Jn. 1:3). Christ Jesus is "the first and the last" of all that the Father created (Rev. 3:14; 22:13); but, though he was created with glory beyond description, he feared and obeyed God while he lived on this earth (Heb. 5:7) and he warned his followers to do the same (Lk. 12:4-5). He was completely dependent upon the Father for his doctrine (Jn. 7:16-17) and his power (Jn. 14:10), as well as his very life (Jn. 6:57). The Father is greater than Jesus in every respect (Jn. 10:29; 14:28). It is true that all power in heaven and in earth has been given to Jesus (Mt. 28:18); but it is equally true that if the Father had not given that power to him, he would not possess it. Jesus is at times called God (e.g. Heb. 1:8) because the Father made him God over this creation, just as the Father made Moses a god to Pharaoh (Ex. 7:1).

Because the Father gave life to the Son (Jn. 5:26) and the Son obediently walked in that eternal life, they were, and are, "one" (Jn. 10:30). This oneness, this fellowship with the Father, is offered to us freely in Christ Jesus through the Spirit which he purchased for us. He prayed fervently that we might be given the holy Spirit, pleading with the Father that we might thus become one as he and the Father are one (Jn. 17:20-23). Jesus's oneness with the Father is spiritual, as is our oneness with God. This oneness is a thing, a spiritual condition (thus, the neuter form of *one* in John 10:30). It will be obvious to every reasonable person

that in praying that his followers might be made one as he was one with his Father, Jesus was not praying that we would be made into one person, but rather that we would "speak the same thing [and] be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment", "having the same love" for one another (1Cor. 1:10; Phip. 2:2). That is how the Father and the Son are one, and that is the will of God in Christ Jesus for us.

Satan's Purpose for the Doctrine of the Trinity. I have often wondered what the Enemy's purpose could have been for introducing the doctrine of the Trinity (which is to say, the notion that the Spirit is a third Person of a "Godhead"). To what unrevealed evil the Trinity doctrine is leading those who follow it, I cannot say; but some of the present, ungodly *effects* of that doctrine are painfully obvious. A principal result of the doctrine of the Trinity is that souls are discouraged from pursuing with zeal and confidence the holiness of God. If we believe that Jesus is one-third of an incomprehensible, divine Blob, then we will be inclined to feel that Jesus was sinless because he had an inside track to righteousness, and that he overcame the world by virtue of a connection with the two-thirds of God which he left behind in heaven rather than by the power of the Spirit and obedience to his Father's commandments. On the other hand, if we see Jesus as he was, overcoming the same temptations we face every day by the power of the Spirit of God, we can believe that he was *in real terms* our example. We can have faith "that we should walk, even as he walked" and that we can overcome the world as Jesus did *only* when we believe that he lived here as one of us, not as an alien to our struggle.

The doctrine of the Trinity obscures the fact that Jesus suffered and died to make available to men the same power for holy living that he had from God, so that we might live as he lived, know God as he knew Him, and serve God as he served Him. It is in large part because of the influence of the doctrine of the Trinity that there are millions of people who believe that being a saint is possible only for a select few in the church, when in fact it is the calling of every child of God. The doctrine of the Trinity makes Jesus's perfectly upright example seem unattainable for ordinary people. If Jesus was sinless by virtue of a special connection with God which we cannot have, he is not our example at all. But the holy life Jesus lived was the result of yielding to the guidance of the Spirit of his Father, the same Spirit which was sent from heaven to guide us who believe in Christ. He was not sinless because of a membership in an exclusive trinity of divine, united personalities. He was sinless because he was obedient.

Other effects of the doctrine of the Trinity, such as deceitful pride and foolish confidence, are seen in various ways, one of which is the evidence presented in this study. Who but a thoroughly deluded man would be so bold as to intentionally mistranslate, for his own doctrinal purposes, the words of the apostles of Jesus? Who but a thoroughly deluded man could have so little fear of the righteous judgment of God that he would publish a translation of the Greek that he himself knows is unfaithful to the original words, as almost all the translators in this study have done? Jesus said that the time would come when his followers would be murdered by those who think that they are doing a service to God (Jn. 16:2). And if throughout Christianity's sordid history its leaders have felt constrained by their faith to execute people, including innocent saints (and thousands of times have done so over the last two millennia), for the simple "crime" of refusing to receive some of its teachings, why should it be surprising to learn that Christianity's scholars feel free to alter, without comment, some of the words of the Greek text in order to promote their trinitarian doctrine?

A False Standard. Some Christian teachers, if not the majority, insist that adherence to the philosophy of the Trinity is a standard by which one's relationship to Christ must be judged! This, despite the fact that their doctrine of the Trinity is completely incomprehensible and inexplicable. How has such a confused philosophical concept become so important to Christians that they esteem it to be a cornerstone of true faith, and that pity, or even scorn, should be shown toward those who reject it? Christians often refer to the Trinity as a wondrous "mystery"; but, the real mystery concerning the doctrine of the Trinity is how vehemently trinitarians promote and defend it! I have personally faced the ire of otherwise personable and intelligent people who became outraged at the suggestion that this doctrine may not be true!

Wrote Paul, "*If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his*" (Rom. 8:9). The difference, then, between those who belong to God and those who do not is not adherence to a doctrine, as trinitarians often teach, but the possession of an experience: the baptism of the holy Ghost; "*for by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body*" (1Cor. 12:13). And the difference between those who please God and are prepared for Christ's return, and those who do not please God and are unprepared, is obedience to the Spirit's guidance. Paul again wrote, "*As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God*" (Rom. 8:14). There is more to salvation than simply being born again. With this truth all the scriptures agree. "*Wherefore take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God. For we are made partakers of Christ if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end*" (Heb. 3:7-14). "*For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them*" (2Pet. 2:21). And finally, "*Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left unto us of entering into His rest, any of you should seem to come short of it*" (Heb. 4:1). The kingdom of God on earth, the church, has in it both the wise and the foolish. The foolish will not be prepared for the Lord's return and will be cast out of the kingdom, their names "blotted out" of the Book of Life (Mt. 25:1-13; Rev. 3:5). The wise, on the other hand, patiently endure the trials of this life, and with joy "*believe to the saving of the soul*" (Heb. 10:39). Repentance and receiving the holy Ghost, and faithfulness afterwards, are the standards for judgment which God originally gave to the church.

The Doctrine of the Trinity is not of God. What the Trinity is, then, is nothing but a wrong idea about God, a vain philosophy. What the doctrine of the Trinity does is to divide us for nothing. It instigates contention over nothing, reveals nothing, confuses all, and profits nothing for those who believe it. Instead of leaving the church alone to judge and to live by the sure standards provided by the Spirit, Satan has offered, among other things, the Trinity theory as a *substitute standard* by which to judge the orthodoxy of another's walk with God. As a result of our receiving Satan's phony standard, the knowledge of *how* to make righteous judgments according to the Spirit has all but passed from us, and only by the mercies of God will that knowledge

be restored. The saints of God have been robbed of many precious gifts by receiving the unclean doctrines of Christianity, not the least of which is the strange doctrine of the Trinity.

It is a constant wonder to me that the doctrine of the Trinity has been adopted by many of God's own children as a standard by which one may judge another's faith. By what clever means and by what authority has Satan been able to carve such an ungodly doctrine so deeply into the hearts of so many--*not a single one of whom can either understand or explain that doctrine at all!* It seems to me that since neither Jesus nor Paul, nor yet any other servant of God, ever taught that doctrine, it is only reasonable to question the authority by which Christianity's theologians have taught it for seventeen centuries. As the *Lord* asked a deceitful heavenly worshipper long ago, "Whence comest thou?" But who dares to ask the question on earth?

Christianity's doctrine of a "holy Trinity" is simply not true. There is nothing in the scriptures which even suggests that it is, except to those who have already been taught to see it there. The doctrine of the Trinity is a heathen philosophical intrusion into the faith of Jesus, a faith so simple that, as Isaiah prophesied, "even a fool need not err". The children of God should be in the forefront of condemning it as a perversion of the precious gospel of Christ. For Christianity's teachers to demand adherence to the doctrine of the Trinity, and to denounce and persecute all who reject such doctrines, is oppressive nonsense. Jesus never demonstrated that kind of intellectual tyranny over human minds. Insofar as the Greek text of the Bible is concerned, there is no evidence at all to support Christianity's doctrine of the Trinity, as the facts contained in this study indicate; and every bit of divine revelation as well as simple reason rejects it as outlandishly superstitious and vain.

Appendix

More on "Middleton's Rule"

It is true, as "Middleton's Rule" suggests, that the Greek article *the* is frequently used with *spirit* when activity associated with a personality is present. Even so, the issue remains, whose personality? And the answer is simply, God's. It is altogether proper to speak of the Spirit as living, feeling, performing deeds, and knowing, because God does those things. And He does them by the same means we do them: by the Spirit which dwells in Him. God's Spirit is His life, just as our spirit is our life (Jas. 2:26). That the Spirit was sent by God (Jn. 14:26) does not imply that the Spirit is "distinct from the Father" as some scholars suggest, for God explains that what He sent was "of my Spirit" (Acts 2:17,18). In other words, He shared His own life, His eternal Spirit, with us. Here are translations of Acts 2:17 from some of the translations used in our Tables:

Trans. No.	Translation
1	I will pour forth of My Spirit
11	I shall pour out some of my spirit
12	I will pour out a portion of my spirit
19	I shall be pouring out from My spirit

So far as personality being shown when the article is used, the following chart shows activities which are attributed to the holy Spirit both when the article is present and when it is not.

Activity	Pneuma With Article	Pneuma w/o Article
speaking by men	Mk. 12:36	1Cor. 12:3; 2Pet. 1:21
revealing to men	Lk. 2:26	Eph. 3:5
teaching men	Lk. 12:12	1Cor. 2:13
giving life to men	Jn. 6:63	1Pet. 3:18
men filled with it	Acts 4:31	Acts 2:4
God gives it to men	1Jn. 3:24	Lk. 11:13
men receiving it	Gal. 3:2	Jn. 20:22
men sanctified by	1Cor. 6:11	Rom. 15:16
men led by	Mt. 4:1	Rom. 8:14
the church having fellowship in it	2Cor. 13:14	Phip. 2:1
it dwelling in men	Rom. 8:11	Rom. 8:9
men being born of it	Jn. 3:6	Jn. 3:5

- "Middleton's Rule" continued -

Books	Verses in which "Spirit" has no Article		
Matt	1:18 20	1: 11	3: 11

Mar	1:8								
k									
Luke	1:15	1: 35	1: 41	1:67	2: 25	3:16	4: 1	4 :18	10 :21
"	11:1								
3									
John	1:33	7: 39	20 :22						
Acts	1:2	1: 5	2: 4	4:8	6: 3	6:5	7: 55	8 :15	8: 17
"	8:18	8: 19	8: 39	9:17	10 :38	11:1	11 :24	1 3:9	13 :52
"	19:2								
(2)									
Rom	1:4	5: 5	8: 1	8:4	8: 5a	8:9(8: 13	8 :14	8: 15
"	9:1	14 :17	15 :13	15:1	15 :19				
1Cor	2:4	2: 13	7: 40	12:3	14 :2				
(2)									
2Cor	3:3	3: 6	3: 18	6:6					
Gal.	3:3	4: 29	5: 5	5:16	5: 18	5:25			
(2)									
Eph.	2:22	3: 5	5: 18	6:18					
Phip.	2:1	3: 3							
Col.	1:8								
1The	1:5	1: 6							
ss.									
1Ti	3:16								
m.									
2Ti	1:14								
m.									
Titus	3:5								
Heb.	2:4	6: 4	9: 14						
1Pet.	1:2	1: 22	3: 18						
2Pet.	1:21								
Jude	v.19	v. 20							
Rev.	1:10	4: 2	11 :11						

Another remarkable activity of the Spirit which is usually associated with personality is the conception of a child, Jesus, "of holy spirit" (Mt. 1:18,20; Lk. 1:35). The article is missing here. If, as Middleton's Rule says, the writer wants to communicate the personhood of the Spirit when the article is present, what subtle message lies within the article's absence in this divine act of conception? Moreover, when Philip was miraculously caught away by "spirit of [the] Lord", what was Luke cunningly trying to teach us about the Spirit's personhood by omitting the article? My answer is, nothing. There is no secret code, no secret message being sent. It is simply a matter of writing style. No one except a trinitarian would see it any other way.

So, while activity associated with personality may often be present when the article is used with *pneuma*, it must be pointed out that activity associated with personality is also present when the article is not used. "Middleton's Rule", then, proves useless as a defense of the doctrine of the Trinity. He does not show at all that the New Testament writers were "teaching personality" when they used the article. What Middleton's Rule does show is how trinitarians must strain to find anything in the scriptures which might possibly be used in defense of their doctrine. If there is a rule concerning the use of the article with *pneuma*, it resembles the conclusion reached by Mr. Robertson concerning the use of articles with proper names. To wit, ". . . no satisfactory principle can be laid down for the use or non-use of the article." (p. 761). He reaches this conclusion, it should be noted, even though he earlier stated that "in the ancient Greek for the most part the article was not used with proper names" (p. 759). There is no reason why we cannot reach a similar conclusion concerning the article's use with *pneuma*. Though often it is present when personal activity is suggested, "no satisfactory principle can be laid down" merely on the basis of that interesting fact.

I have provided the interested student with a list of all the verses in the New Testament in which the article is absent when the holy Spirit is mentioned (previous page). The student who takes the time to read each of these verses will notice how some of them communicate a different feeling concerning God's Spirit when it is read as the original writer wrote it ("holy spirit" instead of "the Holy Spirit"). Of course, there are instances where the article is needed in English translation in order to accommodate a smooth translation; but, the point is that there is nothing proved by either the absence or presence of the article in relation to the Spirit, "Middleton's Rule" notwithstanding. The holy Spirit should be understood to be God's presence - in spirit rather than in body. This is how the apostles understood it, as their words indicate when they are faithfully translated.

The Spirit of Man. The question should be asked: If the Spirit's knowing and performing deeds indicates that God's Spirit is a person, then what do the activities of man's spirit indicate? Man's spirit can be troubled (Gen. 41:8), revived (Gen. 45:27; Isa. 57:15), stirred up (1Chron. 5:26; 2Chron. 36:22; Ezra 1:1), wounded (Prov. 18: 14), overwhelmed (Ps. 77:3), and refreshed (1Cor. 16:18). Further, the spirit of man is said to be able either to make one willing to do something (Ex. 35:21), or to restrain one from an action (Job 32:18). Man's spirit searches things out (Ps. 77:6; Prov. 20:27; Isa. 26:9!; Ezek. 13:3; Matt. 22:43), sometimes fails (Ps. 143:7), and at other times sustains a man (Prov. 18:14). It can even travel (Eccl. 3:21; 12:7; Lk. 8:55; 1Cor. 5:3-4); it can go places and return (Jud. 15:19)! Man's spirit can stand up (Eccl. 10:4), rejoice (Lk. 1:47), serve God (Rom. 1:9), bear witness (Rom. 8:16), confess (1Jn. 4:2), and know things (1Cor. 2:10-11). It can pray (1Cor. 14:14) and work (Eph. 2:2); and it needs rest (2Cor. 2:13).

None of these activities attributed to man's spirit means that the Bible endorses the view that man's spirit is a person. When a man's spirit needs rest, it is because he needs rest. When a man's spirit is praying, the man is praying. When a man's spirit knows something, he knows something. Your spirit is your life, which inhabits a body, and will continue to live after this earthly body is decayed. Your spirit is you! And God's spirit is God. We were created in God's image, and the fact that the Bible mentions things done both by man's spirit and by the Spirit of God is only to be expected; it implies nothing about a Trinity.

The Power of God: A Secret Fourth Person?

As we have already mentioned, in the scriptures the Spirit is at times said to have spoken, or to have felt something, or to have done a deed. These comments are seen by trinitarians (and only by them) as clear evidence of the Spirit's personhood. But can anyone really think that trinitarians see this in the scriptures simply because of what those verses state, and not rather because they have been taught to see it there?

Let us consider the power of God, by way of illustration. There have been no voices raised to promote a doctrine which states that the power of God is a person; yet, "spirit and power" are frequently used in similar, indeed identical ways. Jesus is said to be sitting beside power in heaven (or should it be "Power"? Mk. 14:62), and we are told that power (Power) will come back with him (Lk. 21:27). It was God's power, along with God's Spirit, that overshadowed the virgin Mary (Lk. 1:35). That being true, is Jesus then the Son of God's Power or the Son of God's Spirit? According to Peter, Jesus was anointed by God with both "holy spirit and power" (Acts 10:38). It was power that raised up Jesus from the dead (Rom. 1:4), and power will also raise us from the grave (1Cor. 6:14). In short, the power of God is said to have done many of the same things which the Spirit of God is said to have done, but does that mean that God's power is a person? Of course not.

Still, were we to capitalize "Power" and (since "power" is a feminine Greek word) refer to it as *she*, and then teach naive souls that it is a fourth Person of a quadripartite God, some people would no doubt point to the verses in which activity associated with personality is attributed to God's power and "see" the evidence of personhood for themselves. Doubtless, some would become indignant and angrily condemn as a cult (dunamamachianism?) all who would not believe that God's Power is a fourth person of the Godhead, equal in all respects to and "consubstantial with" the Father, the Son, and the holy Spirit. And would there, then, be another group of persecuted martyrs, burned at the stake for denying the deity of the Power of God? The blood of many precious saints, blood which stains Christianity's white-washed walls, bears witness that this question is not as far-fetched as it would first appear.

God's Body

BODY PARTS	SCRIPTURES
head & hair	Dan. 7:9
eyes	Prov. 15:3; Dt. 11:12; Ps. 34:15
eyelids	Ps. 11:4
ears (hear)	Ps. 17:6; 34:15; 5:3

nose (smell)	Lev. 26:31; Amos 5:21; Phip. 4:18
nostrils	Ex. 15:8; Job 4:9; Ps. 18:8,15
mouth	Dt. 8:3
tongue	Isa. 30:27
lips	Job 11:5; 23:12; Isa. 30:27
breath	Ps.33:6
voice	Gen. 3:8; Dt. 4:12; Isa. 6:8; 30:30
face countenance	Ex. 33:20; Ps. 13:1 Num. 6:26; Ps. 4:6
arm	Dt. 33:27; Isa. 51:5
hands	Gen. 49:24; Ex. 15:17; Isa. 5:12
finger	Ex. 8:19; 31:18; Lk. 11:20; Ps. 8:3
back	Ex. 33:23
feet	Ex. 24:10; 2Sam. 22:10; Isa. 60:13; Nah. 1:3
a general bodily form "image"	Num. 12:8; Jas. 3:9; Rev. 4:3 Gen. 1:26-27 with 5:3
heart	Gen. 6:6; 8:1; Hos. 11:8
spirit	Gen. 1:2; 1Cor. 2:11
soul	Isa. 1:14; 42:1; Jer. 5:9, 29

Also, God rides, walks, sits, stands, feels, and thinks. Yes, we are made in His image!

NOTE: "Wings of the Almighty" are mentioned several times (Ruth 2:12; Ps. 17:8; 36:7; 57:1; 61:4; 63:7; 91:4), but that is a figure of speech. Wings are mentioned figuratively throughout the Bible (e.g. as belonging to Assyria in Isa. 8:8; Moab in Jer. 48:9; the risen Christ in Mal. 4:2).

Verbs Which Have Pneuma As The Subject					
VERSE	ENGLISH	Gende r	VERS E	ENGLISH	Gende r
MT.			ACTS (cont.)		
3:16 "	descending coming	N E	11:12	told	E
MK.			11:15	fell upon	E
1:10	descending	N	13:2	said	E
1:12	drove out	E	16:7	did (not) permit	E
LK.			19:2	exists	E
1:35	will come	E	19:6	came	E
2:25	was (upon)	E	20:23 "	testifies saying	E N
3:22	descended	E	20:28	has made	E
12:12	will teach	E	21:11	says	E
JN.			28:25	spoke	E
1:32	descending	N	ROM.		
1:33 "	descending remaining	N N	8:9	dwells	E
6:63	it is	E	8:26	helps	E
7:39 "	...was [given]... ¹	E [N]*	1COR.		

ACTS			2:10	searches	E
1:8	has come	N	3:16	dwells	E
1:16	spoke beforehand	E	12:11	works	E
2:4	gave	E	15:45	life-giving	N
8:18	was given	E	2COR.		
8:29	said	E	3:6	makes alive	E
8:39	caught away	E	3:17	-	-
10:19	said	E	GAL.		
10:44	fell upon	E	4:6	crying out	N

¹ Jn. 7:39. "Given" is not found in many ancient manuscripts.

- continued -

Verbs Which Have Pneuma As The Subject							
SE	VER	ENGLISH	Gen der	SE	VER	ENGLISH	Gen der
M.	1TI			REV			
	4:1	says	E	2:7	says		E
	HEB			2:11	says		E
	3:7	says	E	2:17	says		E
	9:8	indicating	N	2:29	says		E
5	10:1	bears witness	E	3:6	says		E
T.	1PE			3:13	says		E
	1:12	sent	N	3:22	says		E
	4:14	rests	E	11:11	entered into		E
	1JN.						
	5:6	is	E	22:17	say (with bride)		E
	"	is (the truth)	E				

The verbs included in this Appendix, together with the words in the main Tables, make up an exhaustive list of the pronouns which have *pneuma* as the antecedent and verbs which have *pneuma* as the subject. To have included all these verses in the earlier Tables would have cluttered the pages with unnecessary information and clouded the issue by offering the reader a multitude of words which in translation would have been treated the same way by almost every translator. The reader should know that any translator who translates the verbs in the above Appendix list as "he (does or says)" or as "who (does or says)", instead of "it (does or says)" has bent the translation to accommodate his desire to personalize the Spirit of God. It is not in the Greek.

THE TRANSLATIONS USED IN THE TABLES

C	Translation
ode	
1	New American Standard (NAS)
2	The New Testament - An American Translation (Goodspeed)
3	The King James Version (KJV)
4	The New King James Version (NKJV)
5	The Revised Standard Version (RSV)
6	The New Revised Standard Version (NRSV)

7	The New International Version (NIV)
8	The Good News Bible - Today's English Version (TEV)
9	The New Testament in Modern English (Phillips)
10	The Living Bible
11	The New World Translation (Jehovah Witness)
12	The New American Bible (Catholic)
13	The New Jerusalem Bible (Catholic)
14	The Jewish New Testament (David H. Stern)
15	The New Testament in the Language of the People (C.B. Williams)
16	The New Testament in the Language of Today (W.F. Beck)
17	The New Testament in Modern English (Helen B. Montgomery)
18	The New Testament: A New Translation (James Moffatt)
19	Concordant Version of The Sacred Scriptures
20	The Message: The New Testament in Contemporary English
21	
22	

The Professor's Trinity Study Guide

The following notes are an exact reproduction of the generous professor's notes, from which he had recently taught the doctrine of the Trinity to a church group. If you are able to understand it, feel free to explain it to me. Please excuse the few misspelled words and awkward style of parts of these pages. I wanted to leave the notes exactly as I found them, and so I chose not to correct the grammar and style problems contained in the original.

The Doctrine of the Trinity¹

I. Definition of Trinity

The word "Trinity" does not appear in Scripture² but was used widely during the Arian controversy (Arius of Alexandria denied the Deity of Christ, and his views were denounced as heretical at the Council of Nicaea in A.D. 325) to describe a Scriptural truth. God is one (Deut. 6:1--"Hear, O Israel: the LORD our God, the LORD is one.") But the one true God exists in three Persons, hence "tri-unity." (Matt. 3:16-17--"When He had been baptized, Jesus came up immediately from the water; and behold, the heavens were opened to Him, and He saw the Spirit of God [Holy Spirit] descending like a dove and alighting upon Him. And suddenly a voice came from heaven, [God the Father] saying, "This is My beloved Son [God the Son] in whom I am well pleased." Just the son of a human is human, and the son of an animal is an animal, the Son of God is God, a point the Pharisees grasped in John 10:30-33 "For a good work we do not stone You, but for blasphemy, and because You, being a Man, make Yourself God." [In the context, Jesus had just said, "I and My Father are one" in 10:30.]

God reveals Himself to us in Scripture as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, each with distinct personal attributes, [i.e., as tripersonal] but without division of nature, essence, or being [i.e., as one].

II. Inadequate conceptions of the Godhead include:

A. Arianism--Although acknowledged as more than man, Christ is wrongly viewed as the first created being: "There was [a time] when he was not." Presently held by Unitarians, Jehovah's Witnesses, and followers of The Way, International (a denial of the deity of Christ).

B. Monarchian modalism--the belief that God is one Person, who appears at various times in three "modes," like one actor appearing in three parts at different times in a play (Noetus of Smyrna, Praxeus, and Sabellius) (a denial of the tripersonal nature of the Godhead).

C. Pneumatomachianism (Macedonianism)--a denial of the deity of the Holy Spirit as a person equal to the Father and Son. Assigns creaturely, inferior status to the Holy Spirit (Eustatius of Sebaste--student of Arius, A.D. 355 Archbishop of Sebaste; and Macedonius; Jehovah's Witnesses also deny the personal nature of the Holy Spirit, and use the term Holy Spirit to refer to the invisible power of Jehovah) (denial of the tripersonal nature of the Godhead).

D. Tritheism--the belief that the three Persons exist simultaneously as three Gods (Peter Abelard's teacher Boscellinus; condemned at the Council of Soissons A.D. 1092) (a denial of the unity of the Godhead).

¹Trinity (n). The union of three persons or hypostases (the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit) in one Godhead, so that all the three are one God as to substance, but three persons or hypostases as to individuality.

Hypostases (n). The unique essence or substance of the Godhead, and as such, of the three persons of the Trinity, Father Son, and Holy Spirit, equivalent to ousia (Lat. substantia).

²First used by Tertullian (Against Praxeus) A. D. 213. From Greek trios (three) and Latin unitas (one). The word trios was used of the Godhead by Theophilus of Antioch in A. D. 180.

III. God the Father

Attributes (Those distinctive characteristics of the divine nature inseparable from the idea of God. They form the basis for His manifestation to His creatures and comprise the essential character of God [A. H. Strong]; They show forth the character of God by which He's distinguished from created beings, making Him worthy of worship and service [W. T. Conner]):

A. God--Isa. 40:25

1. Holy--Dan. 4:8-9; 5:11; Amos 4:2; Isa. 6; John 17:11; I Pet. 1:16
2. Everlasting--(eternal) Psalm 90; 102:27; Rom. 11:36; I Tim. 6:15-16; Rev. 1:8
3. Unchanging--(immutability) Num. 23:19; Mal. 3:6; James 1:17; Heb. 6:17 (This is to be conceived of as consistency, freedom to act according to His nature, not immobile, captive to fate, whimsical, unable to act.
4. Wise--I Cor. 1:18ff; Rom. 16:27; Eph. 1:9; 3:10; Col. 2:3; James 1:5
5. All-Powerful--throughout Scripture
6. "Jealous"--unwilling to tolerate disobedience, rebellion, idolatry; God's holiness demands undivided allegiance
7. Just--(righteousness) God's wrath is real, and is directed against sin, the thing that destroys His creatures. Psalm 96:10; Deut. 13:18; Psalm 19; 119; 129:4; Exod. 9:27; Jer. 11:20; Ezek. 9:15; Isa. 45:21
8. Glorious--Psalm 19, 72; Hab. 2:14; John 17; II Corinthians 3, 4; Rom. 5:2; Col. 1:27; Eph. 1:17
9. Love--(loving, gracious) Deut. 7:7ff.; Tit. 2:11; Romans 4, 5; II Corinthians 9; I Corinthians 15
10. Longsuffering--(patient) throughout Scripture
11. Faithful--(true) I Thess. 5:24; I Cor. 10:13
12. Merciful--(kind, compassionate) throughout Scripture
13. Unique--(incomparable) Exod. 8:10; 9:14; Isa. 40:18, 25; 43:11; 45:5-6; 45:21; 46:9; Deut. 4:35-39; 6:4
14. Self-Sufficient
15. Perfect
16. Omniscient--all knowing
17. Omnipresent--all present, ubiquitous
18. Omnipotent--all powerful

B. Father to Israel--Exod. 4:22; Isaiah; Jeremiah; Hosea; **Father by adoption to New Testament believers** Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6 (This is not "the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man" cf. John 1:12 "But as many as received Him to them He gave power to become children of God, to those who believe in His name...")

C. Personal

D. Spirit

IV. God the Son

A. God II Cor. 5:19; John 5:18; Tit. 2:13; Luke 5:20, 24; Heb. 1:8; Isa. 40:3/Matt. 3:3; Matt 26:63; John 1:1, 14; 3:16, 18; 10:30, 38; 12:45 Jesus accepts worship--John 9:38-39; Matt. 14:33; 15:25 (cf. Luke 4:8 "You shall worship the LORD your God, and Him only you shall serve." (See above; all of the attributes listed under III. A. are also true of Jesus).

B. Divine and one with the Father³ John 1:1, 14; 10:30

C. Personal and distinct from the Father--Matt. 11:27; John 5:19-24; 14:16;17; Matt. 27:46, and all the prayers of Jesus

D. Eternal--Mic. 5:2

E. Incarnate--John 1:1, 14

V. God the Holy Spirit

A. God--I Cor. 2:10-12; 12:4; Matt. 28:19; Eph. 1:3-14; II Cor. 13:14 (See above; all of the attributes listed under III. A. are also true of the Holy Spirit)

B. Distinct from the Father and Son--John 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7-11, 13-15

C. Personal--can be grieved (Eph. 4:30), quenched (resisted) (I Thess. 5:19), have personal choices in ministry, (Acts 13:2) have personal choices as to the distributions of gifts, (I Cor. 12:11) can urge or compel people to carry out His will, (Matt. 4:1; Luke 4:1) can have personal preferences as to Whom He will glorify (Jesus) (John 16:13-14)

D. Spirit

VI. NT Passages That Mention the Three Persons of the Trinity in the Same

Context

A. Without commenting on the relationship among the three: Matt. 3:16-17;12:28-32; Luke 10:21; I Thess. 1:3-5; 5:18-19; II Thess. 2:13; II Cor. 1:21-22; Rom. 8:2-3, 11; Eph. 3:14-21; 5:18-20; Tit. 3:4-6; Acts 1:4-5; 7:55; I Pet. 1:2; Heb. 9:14; John 3:34; 16:7-11, 13-15; 20:21-22; I John 3:21-24; 4:2, 13-14; Rev. 1:10; 3:5-6, 21-22

B. Implying a relationship among the three: [F=Father, S=Son, Sp=Spirit]

Matt. 28:19 - F S Sp

John 14:26 - Sp F S

Eph. 4:4-6 - Sp S F

Eph. 1:3-14 - F S Sp

I Cor. 12:4-6 - Sp S F

John 15:26 - Sp S F

John 14:16-17 - S F Sp

Eph. 2:18 - S Sp F

II Cor. 13:14 - S F Sp

Note: every possible order of the three is expressed here except F Sp S, but that order is found in Eph. 3:14-21; Tit. 3:4-6; I Pet. 1:2 (see VI. A.)

VII. The Trinity and the Plan of God (adapted from Aubrey Malphurs)

The Father gave up His only begotten Son, the dearest thing He had--because He so loved the world

The Son gave up the rights and privileges of deity to become a servant--even unto the death of the cross. He gave up His very life that He might seek and save the lost

The Holy Spirit gave up His glory that He might glorify Christ (John 16:13-14)

What are we willing to sacrifice that the Great Commission might be fulfilled?

³Some of the following material was drawn from Dr. James Leo Garrett's "Divine Three-in Oneness in the New Testament Writings," Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Ft. Worth, Texas, 8/30/82, unpublished handout, 931-431 Systematic Theology.

Other Books by John David Clark, Sr.

Spiritual Light

In-depth Bible study on these topics: How did the ceremonies of the Law of Moses foretell of the death and resurrection of Christ Jesus? What does baptism have to do with salvation and what form of baptism is the "one baptism" which Paul preached? Must a man obey the commandments of God and do good works in order to be saved in the end? Does everyone who receives the Holy Ghost speak in tongues?

Price: \$2.00

All Things (Rom.8:28)

The worshipping of idols is not idolatry; it is merely a symptom of it. As the red spots of a child with measles are indications of the disease, and not the disease itself, so the worshipping of idols indicates the disease of idolatry is present. Unfortunately, we have assumed that, because idol-worship is no longer among us, we are free of the disease of idolatry. All Things exposes the mind-set of idolatry, the attitude which leads to idolatrous living, and reveals that idolatry is alive and well among men and, tragically, even in the church. Nothing has changed but the symptoms.

The stories of Joseph, Job, and the Lord Jesus are reviewed, showing how they overcame trials which were insurmountable except for their faith in God as He really is. They were not afflicted with the idolatrous notions about God which prevent so many of us from ever knowing true peace with the Creator. Therefore, they could overcome any suffering which earth had to offer.

The history of Israel as it is recorded in the Scriptures is told in detail, from the time of the Judges to the captivity of Judah, demonstrating clearly that God was in thorough control of the circumstances they faced, both the pleasant and the horrifying. The nation was destroyed because the people foolishly held other gods responsible for some of the things that befell them. In our day, this same idolatrous notion shows its ugly head every time someone holds Satan responsible for the circumstances of his life. Jesus is Lord of all. If we can understand that glorious, liberating truth, we can overcome the world!

Price: \$6.00

Marriage and Divorce

Concerning earthly relationships, perhaps in no other way has more harm been done to the church by her own ministers than in matters concerning marriage and divorce. In most cases, remarriage is permitted by God, and the scriptures, rightly divided, clearly say so! The only case in which remarriage is forbidden is when two truly born-again people separate. In every other case remarriage is allowed.

Price: \$2.00

Sermons by John David Clark, Sr.

"Ye Must Be Born Again"

The doctrine of conversion, or the "new birth", is central to the gospel. A person's perspective of righteousness, sin, God, the church - everything concerning life - is shaped by his understanding of what it means to come into a right relationship with God in Christ. What experience is the experience of new birth? When were the disciples born again, and how did they know it? By clear

explanation of the Scriptures, Pastor Clark explains the truth about the new birth. If you have been taught that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was not essential for your salvation, you may want to rethink your position after hearing these 12 sermons on cassette, taken from the Pioneer Broadcast radio program.

"What Must I Do To Be Saved?"

The gimmick "get saved" religion which arose in the 20th Century and took the church by storm is at last brought into question. Hundreds of Scriptures are employed in this series of 12 sermons, conclusively showing that salvation is the hope of the saints, not received by repeating a few Scriptures, nor by claiming it. It is received by obeying the voice of God until the end. Stubborn, disobedient believers will not be saved, but condemned by Christ Jesus in the judgment. Hear these convincing sermons and be set free from the burden of claiming something that has not yet been given!

All Things (Rom.8:28)

Companion to the book by the same title (see previous page), this series of sermons puts into words the same message contained in the book. The lives of the men and women of greatest faith are examined: Abraham, Job, Joseph, the Lord Jesus, Paul, the prophets. The Law No ancient prophet in Israel ever spoke more perfectly of the coming Messiah than did the Law of Moses. The work of Jesus Christ is painted brilliantly in the ceremonies of the Law. The earliest Church preached Christ, with no scriptures but what we call the "Old Testament"! The negative attitude of many toward the Law of Moses is shown to be from Satan, not from God. Jesus loved the Law which his Father gave to Moses. So did Paul and the apostles. We all need to know the real reason that the Church was taught by Paul not to continue to observe the Law's ritualistic ordinances.

The cost of each series of 12 sermons is only \$7.00, postage included.

Send all correspondence to:

Isaiah 58 Broadcast & Tracts
PO Box 2392 Daly City, CA 94017
call: 1-800-9-"AMEN 58"
fax: 1-650-757-5750

To find many of these and other materials on the Internet, Visit our website today at:

<http://www.isaiah58.com>
(E-mail: GSAVELLI@aol.com)