

CHAPTER VIII.

PAGANISTIC FALSE VIEWS OF GOD.

POLYTHEISM. TRITHEISM OR TRINITARIANISM. THE FATHER ALONE THE SUPREME GOD. THE SON NOT COEQUAL NOT COETERNAL, NOT CONSUBSTANTIAL WITH THE FATHER. THE HOLY SPIRIT.

HITHERTO in our study of false views of God we have examined five of them: atheism, materialism, agnosticism, pantheism and deism. The next false view of God that presents itself for our study is polytheism, a part of which is creedal, as distinct from Biblical trinitarianism. Etymologically the word *polytheism* is derived from two Greek words, *polys* and *theismos*. *Polys* means *much*, and in some connections *many*; and *theismos* means *the doctrine of God*. The compound word *polytheism*, therefore, means *the doctrine of many gods* and is used to express the doctrine of a plurality of gods. In polytheism there is always a plurality of gods. And in practically all forms of polytheism there are three supreme gods that supposedly constitute one supreme god. Thus these three gods in one in India are Brahma, Vishna and Shiva, who are called the *Trimurti* (Indian for *trinity*). In Babylonia and Assyria they were Anos, Illinos and Aos. In Phoenicia they were Ulomus, Ulosuros and Eliun. In Egypt they were Kneph, Phthas and Osiris. In Greece they were Zeus, Poseidon and Aidoneus. In Rome they were Jupiter, Neptune and Pluto. Among Celtic nations they were called, Kriosan, Biosena and Siva. Among Germanic nations they were called, Thor, Wodan and Fricco. Passing over other heathen trinities without express mention, we remark that the ancient Mexicans worshiped the sun under three images, which they called, Father, Son and Brother

Sun. They called one of their great idols *Tangalanga*—One in Three and Three in One. Their three gods that emanated from the original god they called *Trinamaaka*—*Trinity*. Thus the very terminology, as well as thought, of heathenism on their god-head was by the apostasy early in the Gospel Age introduced among Christians to designate the false trinity of the creeds. And to make the counterfeit taken from heathenism complete, Satan palmed off Mary in the place of the highest of the goddesses of the heathen, who stood next below their trinities, and the canonized saints in the places of the lower gods and goddesses of heathenism. Thus Catholicism introduced heathen conceptions of the gods and goddesses under Christian names. Therefore it may rightly be classed among the polytheistic religions. While most Protestant sects have taken over the creedal trinity, as distinct from the Bible trinity, from Catholicism, they fortunately did not take over its Mariolatry and hagiolatry—worship of Mary and saints—avoiding Rome's main polytheism.

The contrasts between the expressions, atheism—the doctrine of no God, and monotheism—the doctrine of but one God, on the one hand, and of *polytheism*, on the other hand, help us better to grasp the meaning of polytheism. There are but three purely monotheistic religions: Judaism, non-creedal Christianity and Mohammedanism. All other forms of religions are more or less polytheistic. Thus it is rather singular that monotheism is more or less limited to Abraham's fleshly and spiritual descendants. Polytheism is also synonymous with paganism, a name that is associated with the Latin word *paganus*, an inhabitant of a country or village district, and that arose from the fact that country and village people rejected Christianity in the interests of their gods, long after the town and city people of the Roman Empire accepted it, and were therefore wont to be called *pagini*, in allusion to

their heathenism. Thus Augustine early in the fifth century said, "The worshipers of gods false and many we call pagans (*paganos*).". Similarly did the word *heathen* come to its present meaning; for it is derived from the word *heath*, which formerly meant a dweller in lonely or remote uncultivated districts. It probably arose from the translation of the Latin word *pagani* into the Germanic languages. Additionally, the Latin word *gentes* and the Greek word *ethne*, as the equivalents of the Hebrew word *goyim*, which means *nations*, in contrast with Israel as God's people, have given us the expressions, *gentilism* and *ethnic* religions, as synonyms of *polytheism*. Furthermore, not etymologically, but factually, polytheism and idolatry are practically synonymous, for they are almost universally associated; for almost every polytheistic religion has, as a part and parcel of it, idols which its votaries reverence and worship.

There are marked differences between monotheism and polytheism, apart from their basic difference of one God as against many gods. In monotheism absoluteness and supremacy are united in the thought of but one God, while these conceptions are absent from polytheism. This is due to the very nature of the two views. Since it unites in one being supreme perfection of attributes, monotheism in its very nature implies absoluteness and supremacy in the Divine attributes, while polytheism in its very nature must deny these, since it distributes the Divine qualities among many gods. Furthermore polytheism lacks these two qualities in what it attributes to the sum total of its gods, *i.e.*, if we should unite in one God all the attributes that polytheism applies to all its gods, the result would not be a God who would be absolute and supreme; nor have their highest gods these two attributes, *e.g.*, while Jupiter was considered very intelligent, powerful, and more or less benevolent, he was nevertheless limited in his powers, sometimes by the other gods,

and always by what the Romans and Greeks called *fate*. Then, too, the gods of the polytheists are far from being holy persons. The mythologies of the Greeks and Romans literally reek with stories of the unchastities, incests, rapes, thefts, quarrels, envies, jealousies, plunderings, murders, falsehoods, covetings and slanders of the gods. This is also true of the gods of India, Egypt, Babylon, *etc.* The distinctly lower plane on which the polytheistic gods stand as to attributes of being and of character than that occupied by the one God of the Bible is, therefore, manifest on all hands and in every detail. This fact puts the conception of the God of the Bible into a position that is unique and sublime and puts Him into a class by Himself, to the confounding of the gods of polytheism. The Christian finds nothing in his God that needs apology, while polytheism stands in such need of apology for the attributes of being and character of its gods as makes its defenders hang their heads in shame when they are brought face to face with Christian apologists in debate.

Originally the human family was monotheistic, believed in and worshiped but one God. Throughout the antediluvian period there is no trace of polytheism. Mythologies originating after the flood purport to tell of the activities of polytheistic gods in creation and after creation; but these myths are partly the inventions of a later age and partly the perversions of the activities of the sons of God, the angels who had charge of the race during the first dispensation, and who became the fathers of giant sons—the demi-gods of polytheism—by human mothers (Gen. 6:2-4). To the claim of infidels, evolutionists and higher critics, who assert that mankind was first polytheistic and gradually evolved into the monotheistic faith, we answer that the bulk of mankind is still polytheistic, that but one nation, partly by tradition and partly by revelation, years after the flood was monotheistic, that

from this race others, not by evolution, but by adoption, received monotheism, and that the Bible shows that polytheism was a departure after the flood from the primeval revelation and subsequent reflection (Rom. 1:19-28). The Scripture just cited shows that subsequent to the flood polytheism had its start. Other Scriptural hints suggest it as first starting in Babylon, later developing in Egypt among Ham's descendants.

The originators of polytheism were Nimrod and his wife, Semiramis, who was his mother as well as his wife. A short account of Nimrod is given us in Gen. 10:8-12. The word *Nimrod* means *subduer by the leopard*. As a hunter he made use of a leopard as his assistant, as archeological remains of Babylon and Egypt indicate, his wife joining him in the chase. Evidently the rapid increase of wild animal and reptile life made their reduction much desired by the people; and Nimrod's prowess as a hunter gave him such great prestige as to make him become the first king, and that ruling over Babylonia and Assyria, as the above Scripture shows. His being the first king of Ninevah (Gen. 10:11) enables us by secular history to identify him with its first king Ninus, after whom Ninevah received its name, *Ninevah*, meaning *habitation of Ninus*. He was the son and afterward the husband of the Semiramis of secular history, the first queen of Ninevah, as his wife. His descent from the wicked Ham and Cush and his marrying his own mother imply for him a wicked character; and his wife was equally wicked. They attracted people away from a religion of trust in God to one of trust in Nimrod as their deliverer and king in worldliness, luxury, pleasure and debauchery. Thus Nimrod gave to Babylon's religion a bent away from God to himself and to his wife, more or less of Divine honors coming to them thereby. According to secular history and archeology they invented certain initiatory rites, called *mysteries*, by which they palmed off on certain select

Persons their false religion, in which myths of the gods (the angels who took human wives before the flood) and demi-gods (the giants born from these unions) were told, and by which they exalted themselves to Divine beings and honors.

While the Scriptures are silent on the subject, the ancient historians and archeological remains set forth the thought that Nimrod, under the name of Osiris, and Semiramis, under the name of Isis, went to Egypt and became the sovereigns of that country. But they became so wicked there that Egypt's 72 supreme judges, at the instigation of Melchizedek, the shepherd king then in control of Egypt, sentenced him to death; which was inflicted upon him. They caused his body to be cut into pieces and these to be sent to various cities of Egypt as a warning example of the fate of evil-doers. Grief stricken Isis and her son, Horus, gathered these parts of his body together for mummifying and then circulated the report that her husband and his father came to life again and ascended to heaven as a god. She worked out a ritual whose climax was the suffering and death of this god. About this ritual the Egyptian religion with its multiplicity of gods was developed. The death of Isis and of her and Osiris' son, Horus, became the occasion of their being deified. Other notables of Egypt who were initiated into these mysteries were on death also set forth as deified. Attaching itself to Gen. 3:15, the myth grew that Isis was the mother of the promised seed, that her son and husband, Osiris, was that seed, and that by his defending humanity from the depredations of wild animals he proved himself to be their promised deliverer. The myth was further developed into setting forth that Osiris while killing a great and destructive serpent was himself killed. With variations of names, places and circumstances these general myths were spread everywhere throughout the heathen world and became the framework of almost

all polytheistic religions. In this way polytheism originated and developed and spread among mankind.

What lay back of this? St. Paul, David and Moses give us the clue that enables us to see the whole situation clearly. They say that the gods of polytheism are devils, demons (1 Cor. 10:20; Ps. 106:37; Lev. 17:7; Deut. 32:17). Jesus and St. Paul further tell us that Satan is the prince or god of this world (John 16:11; Eph. 2:2) and that in his rulership over the earth he has other fallen angels as his associates (Eph. 6:11, 12). In a word, then, as ostensibly deified dead humans, Satan and two of his associates got themselves worshiped as the alleged supreme triune god. Another demon got himself worshiped under the name of a supreme goddess, and other demons got themselves worshiped under the names of other gods and goddesses. In other words, polytheism is demonism, the religion of devils as the gods and goddesses of the heathen. It was set up by Satan for a twofold purpose: to turn the minds and hearts of mankind away from the one true God and righteousness, and to turn and enslave their hearts and minds to him as their god and to unrighteousness; and he succeeded in these two purposes with the bulk of humans. From this viewpoint we can see why the Bible is so full of denunciations of heathen religions; and why they have had such a debasing physical, mental, moral and religious effect on mankind.

In these religions Satan has counterfeited as far as possible what he could gather from the few promises of the Messiah given up to the time of their development. In these counterfeits the true God was put in the place of the devil and the devil was put in God's place, and the actually wicked were palmed off as the good, while the righteous, who opposed the wicked were palmed off as the wicked. Up to the time of Nimrod's (Osiris') death only two promises had been made touching the Divinely-arranged deliverance: that

of the seed of the woman and of the serpent, their warfare, the former bruising the serpent's head and the serpent bruising his heel (Gen. 3:15), and that of the chief blessing coming to those represented by Shem and the secondary blessing coming upon those represented by Japheth and the curse coming upon those represented by Ham (Gen. 9:25-27). As God gave later promises as to the true Deliverer and His delivering work, Satan worked these up into his counterfeits. Now, reverting to Nimrod (Osiris) and Semiramis (Isis) with these thoughts in mind, we can see how the counterfeit was worked up around them. She was counterfeited as the mother of the seed of the woman mentioned in Gen. 3:15, while he was palmed off as her seed. Melchizedek, as the chief of the shepherd kings opposing Osiris, was the alleged seed of the serpent. The opposition that he righteously offered to the wicked course of Osiris was represented as the inimical course of the seed of the serpent toward the seed of the woman. The bruising of the serpent's head was represented as the death wrought by the counterfeit seed of the woman upon an alleged serpent, really God, and the death of Osiris was allegedly the bruising of the heel of the woman's seed, while the deifying of Osiris after his death is the alleged glorification of the seed of the woman. The blessing on those represented by Shem was counterfeited by the alleged bliss of those elect few who were initiated into the heathen "mysteries." The blessing on those represented by Japheth was counterfeited by the alleged bliss of the supporters of such initiated elect. And the curse of those represented by Ham is counterfeited in the evils suffered by the alleged seed of the serpent. Additions, as said above, were by Satan made to the counterfeits as additions to the Divine revelations on the coming Deliverer were given by God through the patriarchs, the lawgiver, the prophets, Christ and the Apostles. These additions to

the counterfeits reached their climax in the papacy, which is Satan's masterpiece in counterfeiting every feature of the true seed, and His work and reign.

In the myths of polytheism the hunting capacity of its delivering god (Nimrod) is manifest in the leopard skin in which he and his priests were represented as clothed, in the weapons that he bore and in his alleged fight with the serpent. These appear in the "mysteries" of the Egyptian Osiris, the Roman Bacchus, the Grecian Adonis and the Syrian Tamuz (Ezek. 8:14). Melchizedek is represented in the wild boar that killed this counterfeit deliverer, who is one and the same person under these various national names. The grief of Semiramis is set forth under that of Isis over Osiris, Venus over Bacchus, Astarte over Adonis and Asteroth over Tamuz. Her being a huntress is represented by her appearing with the quiver full of arrows and the bow, as the Egyptian Isis, the Grecian Artemis, the Syrian Ashera and the Roman Diana. No matter what the varying names were that the different nations gave these characters, they were the same two individuals. Despite varying local colors bestowed upon them, they were the selfsame deified humans. And under the names of these and other alleged deified humans Satan and his demon associates secured the worship and service of the heathen for themselves. Thus there was a oneness in the heathen religions, whatever non-essential variations were found in them. These non-essential variations were the local drapery with which Satan sought to commend his religion to the heathens' affections; but on all essential points he succeeded in giving them everywhere and in all nations one religion. It was for this reason that heathen religions almost never persecuted one another. It was for this reason that under different names they all recognized their gods as the same beings. And it was for this reason that, *e.g.*, the Romans always adopted

the religions of the nations that they conquered, except that of the Jews.

It is important that we remember that polytheism originated in Babylon and from there emigrated to other countries, notably to Egypt. If this fact is kept in mind, we will understand how in type (Jer. 51:7) and antitype (Rev. 17:5; 18:2, 3) Babylon made the nations drunk with false doctrine. It is because false religion, polytheism, had its origin in, and largest influence in and through Babylon that God used Babylon as a type of Romanism, the mystic Babylon of prophecy. Not only so, but into mystic Babylon Satan brought over as much of the ritual of polytheism as possible, giving these rites Christian names, but retaining their heathen externals and internals as far as possible. We have already shown how it teaches creedal trinitarianism, which Romanism foisted on Churchianity from polytheism. The Christmas rites and date in Romanism are much akin to those associated with the birthday and date of polytheism's celebration of the birth of Nimrod. The madonna and son worship are counterparts of the worship of the heathen goddess mother and son. The Romish Lenten service partakes of much of the character of the polytheists' mourning period for the death of their deliverer god. The Romanist non-biblical emphasis on Mary mourning over Jesus' death is the counterpart of Semiramis' mourning over Nimrod's death. The fleshly resurrection of Jesus is Rome's counterpart to polytheism's deification of Osiris, *etc.* The heart-of-Jesus worship is the counterpart of polytheism's worship of the heart of Osiris, *etc.* The mass is the counterpart of polytheism's enactment of the death of its delivering god. So, too, are auricular confession, satisfaction, asceticism, monasticism, the priesthood and its celibacy, the hierarchy and the pope as its head, *etc.*, *etc.*, *etc.*, counterparts to polytheism's pertinent features. These facts prove that Satan introduced

into Romanism various features that he introduced into polytheism. But he did more than that; he in that system counterfeited everything with reference to the true Christ, in doctrine, organization and work. It is because of Rome's essential heathenism, which originated in, and spread out from Babylon, that God designates Romanism, mystic Babylon.

From the above we are able to see very clearly the essentially wicked character of polytheism. Instead of its being, as evolutionists claim, a stage of man's progress from bestiality toward a religious life, which is one of the differences between man and brute, it is a stage of his degradation from a belief in, and service of the one God to a belief in, and a service of the devil and his underling demons. Its author is Satan; and, accordingly, its theories are devilish deceptions and also counterfeits of glimmerings of the slowly advancing Divine revelation. Instead of its uplifting man it has degraded him and turned him away from the true God and a godly life. It has always stood for Satan's original lies (Gen. 3:4, 5), the unreality of death, the consciousness of the dead, the change of humans into spirits at death and the bliss or torture of the dead. Then, too, it has always stood for the other great Satanic error: three gods constituting one god—the trinity of polytheism and creedism. When looked upon according to the above description of it, we have a right focus upon it; we can see its nature, purpose and results from the right standpoint and can properly measure its real size. Accordingly we are able to sympathize with the Scriptural delineation of it. The prophets' descriptions of it become sober estimates of it; and their zeal as servants of God and as patriots in seeking to prevent its entrance into Israel, and in seeking to expel it when it found lodgment there, become transparent as fully appropriate and justified. Of course Satan's determined and persistent efforts to foist it upon Israel were intended

not only to advance his religion, but also to extirpate monotheism; for Israel was then the only monotheistic people, whose mission, among other things, was to keep alive the knowledge of the one true God. Accordingly Israel was the battle ground of monotheism and polytheism; and we thank God that monotheism survived the centuries-long attacks that Satan through polytheism made upon it.

But the battle did not end with the Jewish Age. When Christianity, as another monotheistic religion, came on the stage of human affairs, Satan made the subtlest attack on monotheism ever launched. For through the apostasy, which had its start in St. Paul's day (2 Thes. 2:7), Satan made the attack of attacks upon it and for centuries foisted a real polytheism upon Christians, which in Romanism is a rather complete counterpart of the polytheism of the ancient heathen. While the reformation purged away much of this baptized polytheism, it for the most part left the chief feature of it intact; and even to this day this feature—creedal trinitarianism—has not been completely set aside, as we trust it will ere long. As Christians learn to think more logically and Scripturally they will free themselves from this intrusion, this poisonous graft upon Christianity. "In that day the Lord will be one and His name one" (Zech. 14:9).

While the gods of polytheism are really Satan and the fallen angels, as alleged deified humans mainly, the more strongly to enlist human attention, which frequently falters at the contemplation and worship of invisible spirits, Satan has associated such gods with visible objects of nature, like the sun, the moon and the stars (Deut. 4:19; 2 Kings 17:16; 21:3, 5; Jer. 7:18; 8:2; Acts 7:42), the earth and separate objects in and about it, like trees, mountains, streams, stones, skies, the atmosphere, *etc.* In such cases the gods have been considered the spirits of such objects, which they allegedly inhabit and leave at will. The energies acting

in these objects have been supposed to be the manifestations of the resident god's activities. Thus the sun has been worshiped as Baal, *etc.*, Satan, because he was supposed to dwell in it, as a spirit indwelling a body. The moon has been worshiped as Asteroth, *etc.*, the goddess of love, who supposedly has indwelt it, as a spirit is supposed to indwell a body. Other demons, mainly as alleged deified humans, have been worshiped as various planets and stars. The earth has been supposed to be the mother and the heaven the father of the gods. These have been polytheism's chief gods and goddesses. This personifying and then worshiping of objects of nature, especially those great objects of nature set forth as created by God in Gen. 1, *e.g.*, the heavens, earth, chaos, the land, the sea, the firmament (atmospheric expanse), the sun, the moon, the stars, were the original form of polytheism, as invented first by Nimrod and his wife. This can be seen from the Babylonian and Assyrian creation tablets discovered by George Smith, *etc.*, during the last century. A little later Nimrod and Semiramis added to this much of polytheism the worship of the sons of God and their offspring giant sons—as gods and demigods. Still later, after Nimrod's death, the form of polytheism described previously as invented by Semiramis arose. To the three above-mentioned forms of polytheism the worship of heroes and ancestors was added after Semiramis' death. By the first three of the foregoing forms of polytheism Satan and his fallen angels especially secured for themselves the worship of the heathen. Then, there have been still other secondary gods and goddesses invented as the personifications of inferior objects of nature, like the nymphs of woods, fountains, mountains, seas, *etc.*, through which other demons have been worshiped. Still others as attendants on the gods, as fauns, have likewise been worshiped. Even abstract qualities have been personified as certain demons and then have been worshiped

as gods, like law, justice, fear, memory, death, honor, virtue, peace, victory, *etc.* Even rulers as alleged descendants of the gods have been worshiped as divine in polytheism. Thus under a variety of objects of nature, persons and thought Satan and the fallen angels, mainly as alleged deified humans, secured the worship of humans. It is especially through the deifying of objects of nature that Satan has spread superstition and the spirit of fear.

Mythology has likewise been brought into the service of Satan to palm off the worship of himself and his underlings. After the flood myths were woven about the angels that sinned in marrying women (Gen. 6:2-4) and their giant offspring produced by these unions. These sinning angels were made to appear blameless; and then great creative and providential acts were ascribed to them in these myths, resulting in their securing the worship of themselves by humans. They furthermore palmed off the unfallen angels in these myths as wicked and malicious spirits. The giant sons of the fallen angels that they represented in the myths, they suggested to the minds of men as great heroes and benefactors, and thus raised them up to the dignity of demigods. These myths gradually grew among men at demoniac suggestion and are practically alike in almost all polytheistic religions, despite the variations due to local coloring. Thus they are found in the archeological remains of Babylon, Egypt, Phoenicia, Assyria, Syria, Philistia, Moab, Ammon, *etc.*, as well as in the literary remains of China, Japan, India, Persia, Greece, Rome and the Germanic and Slavic nations. These were through the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, possible of amalgamation with the accounts of alleged deified humans by the very nature of polytheism, which is capable of accepting all sorts of gods, whatever their alleged origin.

Idolatry, though not exactly synonymous with polytheism (as the religion of ancient Persia, in which

there were no idols, shows), usually is a by-product of polytheism. It is based upon the incapacity of the average uncultured human to worship an invisible spirit without a visible representation of him, wherein he is supposed to dwell. These idols have been of the greatest variety, some of them being simple fetishes, amulets and charms, largely of almost no value and of almost endless variety. Some of them have been sticks and stocks and stones, especially in the earlier polytheistic religions and in later African religions. Some of them have been the ugly figures of hideous gods and goddesses supposedly adorning the temples of India, China, Japan, *etc.* Some of them have been images of men's bodies with heads, *etc.*, of various animals, birds, reptiles, *etc.*, as in Egypt. Some of them have been the marvelous creations of Greek and Roman painters and sculptors. Some of them have been the images and paintings in Roman and Greek churches. The thought of the idolaters has been generally that these images and pictures were not the gods themselves, but such representations of them as they indwelt. Hence they are, even in our times in Roman and Greek churches, represented sometimes as winking, smiling, shedding tears, bleeding, speaking, *etc.* They are thus worshiped as related to, and connected with their indwelling gods. To such fetishes, amulets, charms and idols belong the relics of the saints, whose bones, *etc.*, are usually claimed to sweat blood, to work miracles of healing and to prevent and ameliorate calamities. Thus in such idols, *etc.*, Satan and the fallen angels succeeded in securing man's worship.

In practically all polytheistic religions there is a special order of officials, usually called priests, who are the representatives of Satan and his fallen angels to their devotees, and who are also the representatives of their devotees before such idol-indwelling gods. Their position is closely akin to that of mediators between the gods and their worshipers. It is through these

priests that these gods have palmed off various embellishments of the religion that Satan originally made known through Nimrod and Semiramis. They usually have given the responses of the gods to the questions put to the gods. They have kept the knowledge of their religious mythology, rites, beliefs, arts, sciences, literature and liturgy in custody, and have taught the people what they desired them to know, as well as have revealed the "mysteries" to the elect initiates. As a rule, they have offered the people's sacrifice, and have claimed to make peace and keep peace between the gods and them. They have degenerated into wizards, fortune tellers and necromancers, instilling the spirit of fear into the people. This has given them a vast amount of influence over the people and often has invested them with dictatorial powers in matters of state and family, as well as in religion. Their office, place, power, *etc.*, is well illustrated in that of the priests of Rome. These polytheistic priests, like those of Rome, have been of various grades, ascending from the common priests through a well regulated and organized hierarchy of various ranks to a chief priest. In this respect the Roman priesthood has been graded by Satan after the polytheistic pattern. At the side and as assistants of such polytheistic priests, orders of monks and nuns of a lower grade than the priests have stood in practically all polytheistic religions, more or less devoted to celibacy, but not to chastity. Hordes of these monks have yielded themselves up, as parts of their religious rites, to the most debasing vices, and the nuns have been required to act as prostitutes in connection with the temple rites of the goddess of love, *as a part of the religious worship*. Even to this day there are thousands of temples in India that have attached to them these nuns, as adjuncts of the obscene rites of those temple services; for a part of the worship of the goddess of love from times immemorial has been the unchaste use of these nuns by the male

worshippers at those temples. Not only so, but where female worshippers did not bring along male companions to consort with them as a part of the worship of that goddess, the monks attached to such temples served this debasing purpose. And when Satan made monks and nuns a part of the Greek and Roman Church organizations, he had similar, but by far more attenuated purposes in mind, above which, we are glad to know, not a few monks and nuns have lived.

In practically all polytheistic religions Satan has caused temples to be an adjunct of them. These were not so much to accommodate worshippers as either to house the gods as invisible spirits or to house their images and to be convenient sacrificing places. The most important feature of such temples was their altars, where sacrifices were offered to appease or to please the gods. Usually the roofs above the altars were open so that the smoke and incense might ascend toward the sky. The worship of polytheism was both private, in the homes, and public, in the temples. In the former case the head of the house usually officiated; and in the latter case the priests always officiated. Sacrifices were a usual part of the public worship, which was as a rule carried out according to an elaborate ritual. These sacrifices were either unbloody, *i.e.*, growths from the ground, or bloody; *i.e.*, animal. These sacrifices were sometimes propitiatory, to make atonement between the gods and the sacrificers; sometimes they were non-propitiatory, as matters of thanks, worship and praise. In most polytheistic religions human sacrifices were made, as burning the children on the red hot hands and arms of Moloch, hurling the children into the Ganges River, burning living widows with the husbands' bodies in the funeral rites of India, and sacrificing people to appease the gods.

The effects of polytheism on character and society have been bad. Almost always the civilization of polytheistic nations has been on a low scale, and always

they have been cursed by the most degraded manners and ideals prevalent. It has directly depraved religious as well as moral character and has implanted the spirit of fear, superstition and servility toward the gods, thus stifling true faith, hope, love and obedience. It has developed selfishness and crushed duty-love and disinterested love toward one's fellows. It has pandered to the lower tendencies of the naturally depraved heart, leaving each successive generation worse than the preceding one. Instead of inculcating the brotherhood of man, it has formed castes whose contrasted acme is reached in the Brahman and the Pariah (the lowest of the untouchables) of India. The right of life, liberty and pursuit of happiness it has crushed. Everywhere has it made its votaries sensual and degraded, particularly along sex lines. Its papal form has fostered much of the evils just set forth. The worst indictment of polytheism still remains the section of the Bible from the pen of St. Paul in Rom. 1:21-32. Well may we bless God that we are free from it! Well may we worship, praise and adore the God and Father of our Lord Jesus, the one and only true God, all whose ways praise Him and elevate us in character.

The final false view of God that we desire to consider is the trinity, which is a view held in most denominations. Because of the many details involved in this subject, our discussion of it must be terse and pointed, otherwise it would become entirely out of proportion with the rest of our subject. The word *trinity* is a compound of two Latin words, *tres*=three, and *unitas*=unity, the idea being three in unity or three in one. In the compounding of these words they have been made to amalgamate and assimilate into one another. Hence the words *tres* and *unitas* have in Latin been amalgamated by assimilation into the word *trinitas*; and it has been taken over into English with the change of the last syllable, *tas*, into *ty*, as is usually

done with the Latin nouns ending in *tas*, if taken over into English, *e.g.*, *libertas* = liberty, *amitas* = amity, *qualitas* = quality, *etc.* The idea actually expressed by the word trinity is, three gods are one God, though, the proponents of the trinity doctrine would not so express it. Rather they put it as follows: three persons are one God. Yet as they say of each of their three persons that he is God, their doctrine actually implies that three Gods are one God. They further claim that these three persons are the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and these are by them meant by the term trinity. They admit that they can neither understand nor explain it, but claim that it must be believed on pain of eternal torment. The fact that it is ununderstandable and unexplainable, yea, self-contradictory, is, they claim, to be expected on the ground that it is a mystery, which is an expression that they use of the trinity and other teachings to mean an actually ununderstandable, unexplainable and self-contradicting idea, *e.g.*, three are one and one are three. Of course in our arithmetic we learned better, *i.e.*, that three are three times one, not one. But they claim that this is a Bible mystery; hence must be received with blank unquestioning minds. To this we reply that the word mystery as used in the Bible and profane Greek never means self-contradictory, unreasonable, ununderstandable and unexplainable things; but in the Bible it is used to mean a secret not understood by the uninitiated, but understood by the initiated.

The following are all the passages in which the Greek word *mysterion* occurs in the New Testament: Matt. 13:11; Mark 4:11; Luke 8:10; Rom. 11:25; 16:25; 1 Cor. 2:1, 7; 4:1; 13:2; 14:2; 15:51; Eph. 1:9; 3:3, 4, 9; 5:32; 6:19; Col. 1:26, 27; 2:2; 4:3; 2 Thes. 2:7; 1 Tim. 3:9, 16; Rev. 1:20; 10:7; 17:5, 7. Let the reader look up each of these references, and he will find in none of them the thought that Bible mysteries are unreasonable, ununderstandable, unexplainable or self-contradictory things. Every

where he will find our definition true, that Bible mysteries are secrets not understood by the uninitiated, but understood by the initiated. In proof we will comment on a few of the plainer of the cited passages. That Matt. 13:11; Mark 4:11; Luke 8:10 use the word as we have defined it is evident from the contrast that Jesus makes between the disciples' being given to understand the mysteries and the multitude, who heard them, not being given to understand them. The secret that St. Paul tells in Rom. 11:25—that Israel would be in blindness until the full number of the Elect would be completed and then would be recovered from that blindness—is certainly an understandable thing and by no means a self-contradictory or unreasonable thing. The secret that St. Paul explained in 1 Cor. 15:51—that the last part of the Church, those alive at our Lord's Second Advent, would not sleep in death—is certainly not an ununderstandable thing; for we understand it. The secret that St. Paul told us—that Adam and Eve are a type of Jesus and the Church (Eph. 5:32)—is certainly not an ununderstandable, unreasonable or self-contradicting thing; for we understand it. That God made *clear* the hidden mystery to the saints (Col. 1:26, 27) proves that it is not an ununderstandable thing, since we understand it—that the Christ is not one person, but a company of persons. St. Paul directly tells us that he *understood* the mystery of God (Col. 2:2); hence it is not an ununderstandable thing. We certainly understand the mystery of lawlessness (2 Thes. 2:7); for it is the Papacy as the counterfeit of the mystery of God, Christ and the Church as the one new man consisting of many members (Eph. 2:15; 1 Cor. 12:12-14, 20, 27). So, too, do we understand the mystery of the seven stars (Rev. 1:20) as representing the seven composite messengers that God has sent, one for each stage of the Church, even as we understand the mystery of seven candlesticks as representing the seven stages of the Church.

We likewise understand the mystery of the woman (Rev. 17:5, 7) as representing the Roman Catholic Church. These clearer examples of the cited passages enable us to see that all of them use the Greek word *mysterion* as we have defined it. Hence the use of the word mystery as a Bible proof that the trinity doctrine is to be accepted with blank unquestioning minds as a Biblical doctrine is wrong. Such use of the word is a Satanic counterfeit employed to deceive the guileless, in which it also succeeded.

We offer a second line of argument against this doctrine. It is contrary to the seven axioms for Biblical interpretation. These axioms are as follows: An interpretation of a Scripture or a doctrine to be true must be (1) harmonious with itself; (2) with every Bible passage; (3) with every Bible doctrine; (4) with God's Character; (5) with the Ransom; (6) with facts; (7) with the designs of the Bible, *i.e.*, glorify God as Supreme, honor Christ as the Executive and Mouthpiece of God, and contribute to the outworking of God's plan for the Church and the world. If any interpretation or doctrine is in harmony with all these seven axioms, it gives us *prima facie* evidence of being true; but if it in any way impinges against any one of these axioms, it gives us *prima facie* evidence of being false. The trinitarian doctrine violently impinges against every one of these seven axioms, and is evidently, therefore, false. Let us now compare it with these seven axioms: (1) Being self-contradictory— $3 \times 1 = 1$, $1 = 3$ and $3 = 1$ —it is evidently false. Other self-contradictions we will bring out under axioms (3) and (5). (2) It contradicts many Scriptures, *e.g.*, (a) those that teach that the Father in contrast with all others is God alone; and that He in contrast with all others is the Supreme Being (John 17:3; 1 Cor. 8:4, 6; 1 Tim. 2:5, compared with Gal. 3:20; Jude 25, A. R. V.). These contrasting the Father and the Son, call the Father alone the One God, therefore

imply that He alone is the Supreme Being. Here belong the passages that teach the Father's sole supremacy (John 14:28; 10:29; 1 Cor. 3:23; 11:3; 15:28; 1 Pet. 1:3; Ps. 45:6, 7; Is. 42:8). All of these passages teaching the superiority of the Father to the Son, who is, next to God, the highest Being in the Universe, God, His Father, must exclusively hold the place of supremacy. (b) All the passages that treat of God's unity treat of Him as but one person or Being, none ever mentioning Him as being three persons in one being. These passages, therefore, prove that the Father alone is the Supreme Being (Deut. 6:4, compare with Mark 12:29; 1 Kings 8:60; Zech. 14:9, A. R. V.; 1 Cor. 8:4; Gal. 3:20; 1 Tim. 1:17, A. R. V.; Jas. 2:19). Please, on this point (b), see also the passages under (a). These passages most explicitly teach that there is but one God; and neither they nor any other Scripture intimates in the slightest degree that there are three persons that are and constitute the one God.

The only passage that seems to give some color to such a doctrine is 1 John 5:7, 8; but this passage is now universally recognized by the students of the original, the Greek text, to be an interpolation. It first crept into the Greek text in the fourteenth century. Nor do any translations made before that century contain it; but some late Latin, Vulgate MSS., copied not more than five centuries before, contain it. This interpolation was first inserted into some Vulgate MSS. and was therefrom in the fourteenth century translated into the first Greek text having it. Had this text been in the Bible when the trinitarian controversies were going on, in the fourth to the eighth centuries, certainly the trinitarians who were hard pressed by their opponents to produce such a text, would have used it as a proof text; but none of them ever so used it, for the good reason that it was then not in the Bible. It doubtless crept into the Latin

text by a copyist taking it from the margin, where it was written by somebody as his comment on the text, and inserting it into the Latin text itself, whence, as just said, it was first translated into a Greek MS. in the fourteenth century. The next Greek MS. that contains it is from the fifteenth century. But even assuming that this text were genuine, it would not prove that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one God; for the Greek word for "one" here is "*hen*," and is neuter; and the masculine word *Theos* (Greek, God) cannot be supplied after it; for the Greek word for one in that case would have to be *heis* (masculine for one). Nor can the Greek word for being (*ousia*) be supplied after it, because *ousia* is feminine, which would require the feminine of one, *mia*. If the passage were genuine we would have to supply a neuter noun, *e.g.*, like *pneuma* (disposition), after *hen* in this text even as we have to do in John 10:30: "My Father and I are one" (*hen*) disposition. It could not be *theos* (God) nor *ousia* (Being); which would respectively require the masculine *heis* and the feminine *mia*. We agree that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one in disposition, one in heart, mind and will; but not one God. Nowhere, as the trinitarian doctrine requires, does the Bible distinguish between three persons in one Being, as God. Nor does it ever teach that there is a being who is more than one person; for one person is one personal being, and one personal being is one person always, and not more than one in the Bible. It was Satan who, in producing a counterfeit for everything in the Bible in the dark ages, counterfeited the true God as one Being composed of three persons. Let us avoid this unbiblical, unreasonable and unfactual distinction between the words *person* and *being* when referring to a personal being; for it surely is an error invented by Satan to deceive—a work of darkness, a self-contradiction,

which no one can understand or explain, while Bible doctrines are all explainable and understandable.

(c) This trinitarian doctrine contradicts the fact that in the Bible God's Name, Jehovah, applies to the Father alone, and is never used as the personal name of the Son, who repeatedly in contrasted passages is shown not to be Jehovah; for He is in them distinguished from the Father, who by contrast is alone called Jehovah. In Is. 42:6-8, not only is the name Jehovah applied to the Supreme Being as His exclusive name; but as Jehovah he is shown not to be the Son, who is here represented as being called, held, kept, given by Jehovah, which is the Hebrew word used in the text always where we have the word Lord written entirely in capitals in the A. V., as is the case with the word LORD used in Is. 42:6-8. Jer. 23:6, when properly translated, markedly distinguishes between God as Jehovah exclusively, and Christ. Trinitarians have grossly mistranslated and miscapitalized this passage to read their trinitarianism into it, as they have done in other cases. The proper translation shows that Christ is not Jehovah: "This is the name which Jehovah shall call Him [Christ], Our Righteousness." Please compare this with 1 Cor. 1:30. Thus He is Jehovah's appointed Savior for the world, not Jehovah Himself. See the literal translation of Dr. Young, who, though a trinitarian, translates it substantially as we do. While mistranslating Jer. 33:16, they have not miscapitalized it, and that because they doubtless feared that the same kind of capitalization would suggest that the Church was also Jehovah, which their translation actually makes her, if their procedure in Jer. 23:5, 6, be allowed to rule as a parallel case. Here the proper translation is: This is the name that Jehovah shall call her, Our Righteousness. The following are the violations of grammar committed in almost all trinitarian translations in rendering these two closely resembling passages: They have rendered

an active verb, shall call, as a passive verb—shall be called; they have made the subject of this active verb, Jehovah, an attributive object, hence one of its objects, and they have made the object of this verb, *him*, its subject, *he* shall be called; so greatly did their error on the trinity blind the translators to these elementary matters of Hebrew syntax. Rightly translated, the first passage proves that Jesus is not Jehovah, while the false translation of both passages makes Jesus and the Church, Jehovah, which on trinitarian principles would give us 144,003 in one! Rightly translated, how clearly Jer. 23:6 distinguishes between Jehovah and Christ, and Jer. 33:16 between Jehovah and the Church! This passage proves our point.

Ps. 110:1 demonstrates that Jesus is not Jehovah: "The LORD [Jehovah, in the Hebrew] said unto my [David's] Lord (*adon*, not Jehovah, in the Hebrew), sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Here they are clearly distinguished from one another; and our Lord is shown not to be Jehovah. Is. 6:1, 3, 5, 8, 11, 12, treats of our Lord Jesus and of Jehovah as separate and distinct Beings. In vs. 1, 8, 11 our Lord Jesus is referred to under the Hebrew word *adonai*, which is indicated to the English readers as such by the translation of the word *adonai* by the word Lord being written with only an initial capital letter, while in vs. 3, 5, 12 Jehovah is the Hebrew word, as indicated by its translation LORD being written entirely in capitals. Both of them are in v. 8 indicated by the word "us" in the sentence, "Who will go for us?" Jesus here asks: "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" The fact that these two words *Adonai* and *Jehovah* are used in this chapter, the former to designate Jesus and the latter to designate God, proves that Jesus is not Jehovah, which proves that He is Jehovah's Vicegerent, not Jehovah Himself, and which disproves the trinity doctrine, since it proves that the Father alone is the Supreme

Being, and Jesus is His subordinate, as His Vicegerent. Mal. 3:1 is an illustration of the same facts, while Josh. 5:14, with some variation in form, makes similar distinctions to the above.

In many other places Jesus is distinguished from Jehovah, and is thus proven not to be Jehovah, *e.g.*, as the Servant of Jehovah, not Jehovah Himself (Is. 42:1, 6, 19; 52:13; 53:11). He is Jehovah's Arm, Agent, not Jehovah Himself (Is. 53:1). He is Jehovah's Son, not Jehovah Himself (Ps. 89:27; 2:7, 12, compare with Acts 13:33; Heb. 1:5; 5:5). He is Jehovah's Angel, not Jehovah Himself (Gen. 22:11, 15; Ex. 3:2; Num. 22:22-27, 31, 34, 35; Ps. 34:7). He is Jehovah's Companion, not Jehovah Himself (Zech. 13:7; Prov. 8:30). In another connection we will discuss the passages that are alleged to prove that Christ is called Jehovah, and will show that in them Christ acts as God's Representative, speaks, is spoken to and spoken of as Jehovah, because in that representative relation Jehovah speaks, is spoken to and is spoken of representatively in Christ. Thus the lines of thought given in these last two paragraphs prove that the name Jehovah belongs exclusively to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and prove Him to be the only Supreme Being. In this part of our subject we have proven that the trinitarian doctrine, contradicting the second axiom for Biblical interpretation, *i.e.*, a doctrine to be true must be in harmony with all Scriptural passages, must be false.

(3) The trinity doctrine contradicts numerous Bible doctrines, which is a violation of the third axiom of Biblical interpretation. We have already seen this as to the doctrines of God's unity and also the subordination of the Son of God, for the trinity doctrine teaches His equality with the Father. It also contradicts the doctrine of Christ's being the firstborn of all God's creatures (Col. 1:15; Rev. 3:14), claiming His coeternity with the Father. It also contradicts

the Bible doctrine that first in His resurrection Christ attained the Divine nature (Heb. 1:3-5; Phil. 2:7-11; Eph. 1:19-21; 1 Cor. 15:42, 49, compared with 2 Pet. 1:4; John 5:26 and 1 Tim. 6:16, compared with John 6:53 and 1 Cor. 15:53, 54); whereas it teaches that from eternity He had the Divine nature. Consequently it contradicts the Bible teaching that His pre-human nature was lower than the Divine, proven among other ways by the fact that He emptied [divested] Himself of that pre-human nature (Phil. 2:7), which could not have been done had it been Divine, since the Divine nature is unchangeable into another nature. It contradicts the Bible doctrine that Christ, emptying Himself of His pre-human nature, *became flesh*, *i.e.*, the doctrine of Christ's carnation (John 1:14; Phil. 2:6, 7; 2 Cor. 8:9; Heb. 2:9, 14, 16). It contradicts the functions of all of Christ's offices, since in them He has acted and still acts as God's Agent, not as His equal. It contradicts the nature and offices of the Holy Spirit, as we will show later on. It contradicts the creative work, inasmuch as it denies Christ's agency therein for the Father. It contradicts the Ransom; for if the trinity doctrine be true, some one outside the trinity would have to be the Ransomer, since under the theory the trinity's, justice would have to be satisfied before it would deal with man; hence somebody outside of the trinity would have to bring the Ransom merit to the trinity to satisfy its justice. It contradicts the Ransom from another standpoint, *i.e.*, a member of the trinity could not die; hence could not furnish the Ransom. Nor could such a being as the second person of the trinity furnish the exact equivalent of Adam's debt, since a Divine being does not correspond in value to a perfect human being. The trinity doctrine violates not only the doctrines of Creation and Ransom as executed by an *Agent* of Jehovah, not by Jehovah Himself, but for the same reason contradicts the Bible doctrines of

providence, revelation, instruction, justification, sanctification and deliverance, all of which are Biblically represented as being performed for God by an Agent (1 Cor. 1:30; 8:6). Indeed it is difficult to point out any Biblical doctrine that is not in some way or other impinged against by the doctrine of the trinity. Hence it cannot be a Biblical doctrine.

(4) The trinity doctrine is false, because it contradicts the character of God and thus violates the fourth axiom for Biblical interpretation—a doctrine or a Scriptural interpretation to be true must be in harmony with God's character, since the Bible teachings are an outflow of God's character (Ps. 45:1). Any doctrine that contradicts that character must be false. God's character blends in perfect harmony His wisdom, justice, love and power. Job 37:23; Jer. 4:2; 9:24, show that these are attributes of God's character, and that they also characterize all His acts. This thought is symbolized by the four living creatures of Ezek. 1 and Rev. 4. Ps. 45:1 shows that every feature of the Bible Plan is an outflow of God's character. And since God's being and character are harmonious, any teaching that would introduce a contradiction between it and God's being and character must be false. But the trinity doctrine does this very thing; for it reduces God, who is supreme in every attribute of His being and character, and who therefore is, among other things, more wise, just, loving and powerful than any one else, to equality with Christ, a subordinate of God, or to put it another way, it exalts God's Son, who is God's inferior, to equality with God in all His attributes of being and character. Hence the trinity doctrine, which does this, must be false, and cannot be a Bible doctrine. That the Son is in every way inferior to the Father is evident from John 14:10; 10:29. That He is inferior to the Father in knowledge is manifest from Mark 13:32; Acts 1:7. That He is inferior to the Father in justice and love

appears from John 3:16, 17. That He is inferior to the Father in power is shown by the fact that His power is that of God's Vicegerent, as is seen in John 5:30; Matt. 28:18. Hence the trinitarian doctrine is false, since it makes Him the Father's equal in these, as well as in other attributes. No creature can be the Creator's equal; and the Son is a Creature of the Father (Col. 1:15; Rev. 3:14). Hence He can in no way be God's equal, though He is as great as it is possible for a creature of God to become.

(5) The trinity doctrine is false, because it contradicts the Ransom, the central doctrine of the Bible: The Ransom doctrine is this: "The Man, Jesus, is the corresponding price for Adam, and Adam's race condemned in his loins (Matt. 20:28; 1 Tim. 2:6). This doctrine is the hub of the plan of God. It conditions every Bible teaching, and assigns to each its place and function in God's plan, as it is also the support of all of them. Any doctrine, therefore, that does not fit in with it, or any doctrine that contradicts it, cannot be true. This the trinity doctrine does, as the following things clearly prove. It makes it impossible that Christ could become a ransom—a corresponding price, a price equal in value to Adam's value as a perfect man—because it makes Him a God-man who must be as much more valuable than a perfect man as God is valuable. Hence a God-man was more than the corresponding price. God's justice must forbid receiving more than the corresponding price, just as much as it must forbid accepting less than the corresponding price. Again, the trinity doctrine makes the Ransom impossible from the standpoint that it makes the death of Christ factually impossible; for the trinity doctrine teaches that Christ, as the God-man, had two natures, Divine and human (a thing that actually makes Him a hybrid), and that the personality of the God-man was that of His Divine nature, not that of His human nature. This it teaches to escape the thought that the God-man is

two persons, and to hold to the thought that He is but one person. But this makes it impossible for the person to have died, since God cannot die. Hence the trinitarian doctrine makes the Ransom impossible, *i.e.*, that a perfect human person died for the perfect human person Adam. Thus we see that the trinity doctrine makes it impossible for Christ to become the Ransom and also to give the Ransom. But, thirdly, the trinity doctrine makes it impossible from another standpoint for Christ to give the Ransom; because if God is a trinity the entire trinity's justice must be satisfied, not simply a part of it. Hence the Son, as a part of the trinity, would have to have His justice satisfied. Hence He could not give the Ransom; He must receive it. The Ransomer would have to be someone outside of the trinity. Hence this point proves that the Ransom could not be received, since it could not satisfy the entire God; and it also proves that a member of the trinity could not bring it. Thus it is apparent that from many vital standpoints the trinity doctrine is in most violent opposition to the Ransom, the central and dominating doctrine of the Bible. Hence it cannot be a true Bible doctrine.

(6) The trinity doctrine must be false because it is contrary to facts; and any teaching that is contrary to facts must be false. The following are some of the facts that the trinity doctrine contradicts: The Father's exclusive past eternity, His all-time supremacy, the Son's creatureship, beginning, inferiority to the Father in all attributes of being and character, His being God's Executive and Mouthpiece in creation, providence, revelation, instruction, justification, sanctification, deliverance for the Church and the world, His carnation, development as a human being and as a new creature, His suffering, His temptation, His trial for life, His dying, His remaining dead parts of three days, His resurrection, the exercise of everyone of the offices of His Saviorhood. It is contrary to

every fact of the Church and the world experiencing through Him the separate, operations of salvation. In a word, the trinity doctrine is in violent conflict with almost every fact in the unfolding of God's plan. This will appear in a clearer light when certain facts as to the nature and office of the Holy Spirit are explained in their pertinent place.

(7) Finally, as being contrary to the seventh axiom for the truth of any interpretation or doctrine, the trinity doctrine is false. The seventh axiom is this: An interpretation or doctrine to be true must be in harmony with the design of the Bible, which is a threefold one: (1) To glorify God as Supreme; (2) to honor Christ as God's Executive and Mouthpiece; and (3) to work out God's plans as to the Church and the world. When the Bible purpose is realized, it will result in there being given "glory to God in the highest," *i.e.*, as supreme (Luke 2:14; Phil. 2:11; Rev. 5:13; 15:3, 4; Eph. 1:12; 1 Cor. 15:28); it will also result in the highest honor under the Father being given to the Son (John 5:23 [the expression, "as they honor the Father," means not that the Son is to be honored in the same degree, but as a matter of fact as the Father, because He is the Father's Vicegerent. That it does not mean that the Son is to receive equal honor with the Father can be seen from some of the following passages]; Phil. 2:9-11; Eph. 1:19-23; 1 Cor. 15:27, 28; Rev. 5:13); and finally it will result in the development and deliverance of the faithful Elect and of the faithful non-elect of the world. But the trinity doctrine makes the first of these purposes impossible, for it makes two others share equally with God in the glory of supremacy, acknowledged and yielded to by all the saved. Again, the trinity doctrine makes it impossible to realize the second of these two purposes, for it denies the Son the office of Vicegerent of God, on the alleged ground that He is God Himself, the second person in God, and hence not God's Vicegerent,

but a part of God. It makes the third purpose of the Bible impossible, since in setting aside the Ransom, and making impossible the Saviorhood offices of Christ, there can be no such a thing possible as the realization of the third design of the Bible, the development and deliverance of the faithful elect Church and the faithful non-elect of the world. Hence the trinity doctrine is false. Accordingly, we see from the comparison of the trinity doctrine with the seven axioms of Truth as to an interpretation or doctrine, that the trinity doctrine is a masterpiece of Satanic invention making logically void the entire plan of God, with which it is in most violent conflict. It is therefore not a doctrine of the Bible. It is a doctrine of devils, a masterpiece of Satan, palming off his counterfeit of God on the world of Christendom.

We now offer a third general argument against the doctrine of the trinity: It is contrary to sanctified reason. That the proposition, that sanctified reason, in subordination to the Scriptures, may properly be made a test of truth, so that if anything contradicts it, while it is subject to the Scriptures, it may be regarded as untrue, is true, appears from God's inviting His people to use it (Is. 1:18); from the fact that it must be used in arriving at Scriptural knowledge (Acts 17:2; 18:4; 24:25); from the fact that the Apostles used it in dealing with the Church (Acts 6:2) and used it in their writings. Please instance St. Paul's reasoning in his epistles, particularly in Romans, Galatians and Hebrews. Accordingly, any teaching that contradicts sanctified reason, while it is subject to the Bible, must be false. Under our first argument we pointed out that Bible mysteries are reasonable and not contradictory to sanctified reason. Let us here note a few cases where the trinity is unreasonable, as is conceded by its acceptors, and thus is contrary to sanctified reason: It implies that $3=1$, $1=3$, and $3 \times 1=1$, that a son is as old as his father, that a part of God

died, that a part of God prayed to God, was tempted, suffered, remained dead part of three days, that there is a God-man, that a son is his own father and vice versa, that while God is a Spirit Being (John 4:24), He has in Him a spirit being that is the Holy Spirit, *etc.* These things baffle and contradict sanctified reason, and are untrue; but every one of them is implied in the trinitarian doctrine. Hence it is not a doctrine of the Bible, since sanctified reason is invited to reason on Bible doctrines by God and to be used in arriving at the understanding of Biblical things.

As a fourth general argument against the trinity we present the thought that it entirely lacks genuine Scripture support. Trinitarians admit that there is no Scripture that clearly states their doctrine. Yet they allege a number of passages as direct proofs of it. We will examine each one of these; and we will find that in none of them is their thought stated or implied, but into every one of them they read their thought without its being there, and that by every one of them their doctrine is refuted. In other words, whenever they find a reference to the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, or to one or two of them, they assume without proof that they teach or imply a trinity. What they should do but fail to do to prove their doctrine is to produce passages that prove that these are and constitute a trinity; but instead of producing such proof they merely assume that these passages prove the trinity. Hence their course with these passages is the sophistry of eisegesis—reading foreign thoughts into their alleged proof texts. They have been sorely pressed by the fact that no Scripture clearly states their doctrine, and have felt deeply the need of such a Scripture. The sense of the need of such a Scripture led to the fraud of interpolating parts of 1 John 5:7, 8 into the Bible. But even this interpolation does not teach the doctrine. If it were genuine, it would merely prove that the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit are one in

disposition—one in heart, mind and will, which thought is a Scriptural one. But such a thought is a far cry from the trinity thought, that three persons are and constitute one God. Hence even this fraudulent passage does not teach the trinity doctrine, that three persons are and constitute one God. Hence they treat this passage with the sophistry of eisegesis. Again, Matt 28:19, "baptizing them *into* [so the Greek] the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit" is quoted by trinitarians as a direct proof of their doctrine. But this passage does not say that these are three persons, though doubtless two of those mentioned in it are persons. Nor does it say nor imply that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are the one God—The Supreme Being. Please note that the passage charges that believers are to be immersed into the name [character] of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. What does this mean? That the Lord's people by the real baptism are to be given such experiences as to their humanity and new creatures as will make them become character images of God and Christ and Their holy disposition (Holy Spirit). Thus this passage does not teach the doctrine of the trinity—that three persons are and constitute one God; hence trinitarians treat it with the sophistry of eisegesis. Nor does 1 Cor. 12:4-6 teach nor imply the trinity—three persons being and constituting the one Supreme God, for which trinitarians allege it as a direct proof. Those who use it to teach the trinity say v. 4 refers to the Holy Spirit, which is true, that v. 5 refers to Jesus, which is also true, and that v. 6 refers to the Father, which is also true. But please notice that v. 4 does not call the Spirit God, nor does v. 5 call Jesus God, while of these three subjects in vs. 4-6 the Father alone is called God, *i.e.*, in v. 6. On the contrary, v. 5 calls Jesus Lord in contrast to v. 6 calling the Father God, which disproves the trinity doctrine. Thus in vs. 5, 6 the Son and the Father are contrasted, the former as being the Lord (not Jehovah), the latter as being God,

which is the same contrast we find more strongly stated in 1 Cor. 8:6, where the Father is called the one God and the Son is called the one Lord, which contrast in both passages proves that the Father and not the Son is God. Hence 1 Cor. 12:4-6 refutes the trinitarian doctrine. Hence they treat it with their habitual sophistry of eisegesis, a bad thing indeed.

Trinitarians quote also, as fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh direct proofs of their doctrine, Eph. 4:3-6; Matt. 3:16, 17; 1 Pet. 1:2; Rev. 1:4, 5. But even a surface examination of these passages disproves that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are and constitute the one Supreme God. We will consider these passages in the order just cited and thus will begin with Eph. 4:3-6. While the Spirit and Jesus and the Father are referred to in this passage, they are so contrasted with one another as to show that the Father alone is the Supreme Being. Please note that the passage neither calls the Spirit Lord or God. Please note that while the passage calls the Son the one Lord (*adon* being the Hebrew equivalent, as distinct from Jehovah) it does not call Him the one God, which the passage calls the Father alone. The contrasts in the seven features of Christians' oneness—(1) one Spirit, (2) one body, (3) one hope, (4) one Lord, (5) one faith, (6) one baptism and (7), one God—clearly prove that none of the first six are God, since He is the seventh feature of our oneness. Thus this passage disproves the trinity. Please note the trinitarian sophistry of assuming that the mere mention of the Father, Son and Spirit is of itself a proof of the trinity. This sophistry runs through their use of every passage that they give as direct proofs of the trinity doctrine, whereas not one of them implies, much less states such a thought. The same remarks apply to their use of Matt. 3:16, 17 as a direct proof of their doctrine. It is true there is mention here made of Jesus, of God and of the Spirit; but the passage certainly does not say they are and constitute

the one God. The fact that the Spirit of God was here poured out on Jesus positively proves that Jesus is not God; for if He had been, He would have had the Spirit from eternity, while here as a new thing it is spoken of as given to Him, and that as a qualification for His ministry (Is. 61:1, 2). Had He been God, He would always have had supreme qualification for everything that He might attempt to do. Then, too, please note that the passage shows that the Spirit is not God; for It is called not God, but God's Spirit. Hence this passage, which trinitarians quote to prove it, disproves the trinity doctrine. They are in their use of it guilty of their sophistry of reading their doctrine into it. We will continue to stress such sophistry.

Trinitarians use 1 Pet. 1:2 as one of their alleged direct proofs for the trinity doctrine. In harmony with their course of reading their thought into every passage that they allege as a direct proof of their doctrine, they read their thought into this passage—their habitual sophistry of eisegesis. It neither says nor implies that there are three persons who are and constitute God. On the contrary, the Father here alone is called God, while Jesus is called Lord, the same distinction as we have noted in most of the trinitarians' other alleged direct proofs. Moreover v. 3 refutes the trinitarian doctrine for it directly calls the Supreme Being "The God ... of our Lord Jesus Christ." Moreover the word Spirit in v. 2 evidently does not mean a Spirit being, but our new creature, that which is begotten of God in us (1 John 5:4); for St. Peter is here showing how our foreknown selection for the kingdom is accomplished—in [so the Greek] the sanctification of the Spirit, the new creature undergoing the sanctification process, the selection being made for developing proper obedience and for the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, *i.e.*, our humanity continuing in the justification experience through the continued imputation of Jesus' merit on our behalf. So also do they read

their thought into Rev. 1:4, 5, which neither says nor implies that there are three persons who are and constitute the one God. Undoubtedly God is meant by the "Him which is, and which was, and which is to come," though in this verse the word God does not occur. And He is in vs. 4, 5 pointedly distinguished from Jesus Christ; for if the trinitarian doctrine were true Jesus would be included in the terms "Him which is, and which was, and which is to come"; but the expression, "which was," implying God's past eternity, cannot be applied to Jesus, since He had a beginning, hence was not eternal (Col. 1:15; Rev. 3:14). Moreover He is proven in v. 6 not to be God; for there God is called His Father (see A. R. V.). The Greek expression for the A. V. rendering, "unto God and His Father," were best rendered, unto *the* God, *even* His Father. Thus Rev. 1:4-6 disproves that the Son is God Almighty. This Scripture does not mention the Holy Spirit at all. Hence should not be used as an alleged proof of the trinity. The seven spirits of God of v. 4, in harmony with one of the twelve meanings of the word spirit, mean teachings (2 Thes. 2:2, 8; 1 John 4:1-3; 5:6; Rev. 19:10) and represent the sevenfold teachings of the Bible: (1) doctrinal, (2) ethical, (3) promissory, (4) hortatory, (5) prophetic, (6) historical and (7) typical. Through these grace and peace, as v. 4 teaches, are ministered to us: This passage, like the wished grace and peace in the start of all the apostolic writings that contain such wishes, never mention these as coming from the Holy Spirit, those wishing them mentioning them as coming from God and Christ, which disproves the trinity. Accordingly our investigation of this alleged direct proof passage for the trinity disproves from this and the preceding passages the trinity doctrine. It is a false teaching.

As an eighth direct proof for the trinity, the threefold Aaronic benediction of Num. 6:24-26 is quoted

by trinitarians. At least it must be conceded that the passage says nothing about there being three persons, nor about their being one God, nor about their constituting the one Supreme Being. Hence the trinitarian doctrine of three persons being and constituting one God is read into this passage. How is it that trinitarians read their doctrine into this passage? They claim that there are three blessings referred to therein; hence they read their trinity into it. But there are six, not three blessings in this passage, which presents these blessings in three pairs; and six blessings in three pairs are not three persons, nor does the fact that six blessings are imparted imply that there must be three persons imparting them; for one person has often conferred even more than six blessings. Nor does the threefold occurrence of the name Jehovah here imply three Gods in one. Hence the trinity doctrine is not here presented. These six blessings refer to the good things that God bestows upon His people in their *three* conditions, as these three conditions are pictured by Israel in its relation to the Tabernacle—the Camp, the Court and the Sanctuary, two blessings for each condition. Hence the threefold occurrence of the name Jehovah in Num. 6:24-26. The first of these double benedictions applies to the Camp, which pictures the condition of the nominal people of God. These God by His Priesthood blesses with the offer of the first blessing, repentance, and the second blessing, faith, working these in the responsive. The second of these double benedictions applies to the Court, which pictures the justified. These God by His Priesthood blesses with the offer of the third blessing, justification, and the fourth blessing, consecration, and works these in the responsive. And the third of these double benedictions applies to the Sanctuary, which pictures the spiritual condition of the Church in its two phases, spirit-begotten condition (the Holy) and spirit-born condition (the Most Holy). These God by His

Priesthood offers to bless with the favors of the spirit begotten condition as the fifth blessing, and with the favors of the spirit-born condition as the sixth blessing of the Aaronic benediction, working them in the faithful. Moreover the blessing of Jehovah (LORD) is here pronounced. And Jehovah is a name that belongs exclusively to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus. Hence the Aaronic benediction does not teach nor imply the trinity. Trinitarians' use of it is another example of their sophistry—eisegesis.

The ninth and last alleged direct proof that trinitarians offer for the trinity doctrine is the Apostolic benediction: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the participation of the Holy Spirit be with you" (2 Cor. 13:14). Here again we note that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are referred to, but be it also noted that they are not mentioned as being three persons, though two of them are undoubtedly persons, as the third is not, which we will prove in another connection. It will be further noted that the passage does not say that these three are one God. On the contrary, only the Father is in it called God. Again, instead of Jesus being called God He is called the Lord. Here again we find the same contrast between the Father and the Son that we have found in 1 Cor. 8:6 and in six of the other genuine passages alleged to prove the trinity directly. The Father here is called God; and the Son is here called Lord. Hence this contrast proves that the Son is not God Almighty, which the Father alone is. Hence this passage disproves the trinity. In it the Apostle Paul wished three things for the Corinthians: (1) that the Lord Jesus' favor exercised through His office as Savior may be theirs; (2) that the love of God may continue to be theirs; (3) that a share in the Holy Spirit may continue to be theirs. But such wishes are a far cry from teaching or implying the trinity—that three persons are and constitute the one God, the Supreme

Being. Thus we have examined the nine alleged proofs offered as direct evidence by trinitarians that God is a trinity—that He as one God consists of three persons; and we have found that none of these passages prove or imply their view, that in the trinitarians' use of them they practice the sophistry of eisegesis; yea, that these passages contradict the doctrine that trinitarians quote them to prove. We will in this chapter examine their suggested indirect proofs. We ask our readers to hold their minds in abeyance on the nature of the Holy Spirit until we treat that subject later in this discussion, for we will give abundant Bible proof that the Holy Spirit is not a person at all, but is (1) God's power, and (2) God's disposition in Himself and in all who are in harmony with Him. Such a proof as to the Holy Spirit does away with the "third person" in the alleged trinity, as we shall see.

We present a fifth general argument against the trinity doctrine: It is an invention of Satan. This follows from several facts. In the first place, as we have seen, the Bible does not at all teach it. Hence it was not God who invented it; for if it were God's view of the subject, He would have revealed it in the Bible, which is given to reveal God truly to us. Since it is an error it must have come ultimately from Satan, the father of lies (John 8:44); for it is he, the god of this world, who blinds by error the minds of those who believe not, in order to prevent their seeing the glory of God shining in the face of our Lord Jesus (2 Cor. 4:4). It is he who by his servants puts light for darkness and darkness for light (Is. 5:20). When doing this he transforms himself and his servants into angels of light and righteousness, *i.e.*, he pretends to be a messenger of light and righteousness (2 Cor. 11:14, 15). This trinity doctrine has every mark of a Satanic origin. By it he sought to belittle God by making an inferior of His equal to Him; by it he sought to grieve our Lord who is so loyal to the Father that it grieves

Him to be palmed off as the Father's equal; by it he sought to darken God's plan and make it appear unreasonable, self-contradictory and indefensible; by it he sought to make the Bible appear to be a book containing nonsense; by it he sought to baffle the minds of saints, and more or less deprave their hearts through making it impossible appreciatively, and understandingly, to worship and reverence God; by it he sought to make its acceptors amenable to priestcraft and consequent degradation; by it he sought to make infidels out of thinking people, who were by him deceived into believing the Bible teaches such a doctrine; and last, but not least, he sought to deprive the Father of the supremacy and highest reverence and worship in the affections of the people. These fell purposes, germane to the nature and effects of the trinity doctrine, prove it to be of Satanic origin. Hence it is only another lie of the father of lies, and therefore is to be rejected as such; for once seeing an error is to reject it.

As a sixth general argument against the trinity doctrine we note that it is a heathen doctrine, which discredits it, since the heathen gods the Bible says are devils (Deut. 32:17; 1 Cor. 8:4, 5; 10:20). It is the conception of God that is to be found in all the ancient and practically all modern heathen religions. This is true of the Chinese religion, whose emperor offered yearly a sacrifice to the spirit of the trinity. Confucius said: "Tao (God) is by nature one; the first begat the second; both together brought forth the third; these three made all things." The Japanese view is very similar. The trinity of India (Trimurte), Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva, is worshiped as three persons, though originally the Divine principle Brahma, was but one. One of its sacred writings declares: "The great Unity is to be distinctively recognized as three gods in one person." One of its hymns reads: "There are three deities; but there is only one Godhead, the great soul." The Chaldean Oracle declares: "The

Unity brought forth the Duality, which dwells with it and shines in intellectual light; from these proceeded the trinity." The names of the Chaldean trinity are Anos, Illinos and Aos. The Babylonian trinity is shown in the three images in the temple of Belus; the Phoenicians' trinity was Ulomus, Ulosuros and Eliun. That of the Egyptians was Kneph or Ammun, Phthas and Osiris. That of the Greeks was Zeus, Poseidon and Pluton. That of the Romans was Jupiter, Neptune and Pluto. The money of the Dalai Lama (Thibet) is stamped with a picture of a threefold Deity. A Tartar coin is stamped with a human figure with three heads, which according to the superscription on the reverse side represents their trinity. The trinity of the heathen Irish was Kriosan, Biosena and Siva; of the heathen Scandinavians, Thor, Wodan and Fricco; and of the heathen Germans, Odin, Thor and Freya. The ancient Indians of North and South America called their three in one God Tangalanga (one in three and three in one) and Trinimaaka (trinity). Accordingly we see that the supreme God of practically all heathen nations is a trinity. But since the Bible teaches that the heathen worshiped devils, we infer that Satan secured the worship of himself and two other devils under the name of the heathen trinities. These facts demonstrate the erroneousness of so-called Christian trinitarianism.

A seventh general argument against the trinity is the fact that it is the counterfeit of the Bible God palmed off on the world by Satan, through the Papal Antichrist. The Roman hierarchy with the pope as its head is Satan's counterfeit of the true Christ; for Antichrist means literally, instead of Christ, *i.e.*, counterfeit Christ. The Bible teaches that Jesus, the Head, and the faithful saints, His Body, are the true Christ, *i.e.*, the true Anointed, since the word Christ means Anointed, as the following points will show: These are all anointed by the Spirit (Matt. 3:16; Acts 10:38; 2:1-4; 10:45-47; 2 Cor. 1:21; 1 John 2:20, 27).

Hence they are called Christ, Christ-partakers, sharers in Christ as parts of Him, are in the Christ company, of the Christ, in Christ, Christ in me or in you (1 Cor. 12:12, 13; 15:23; Gal. 3:16, 29; Eph. 4:13; Col. 1:24; 1 Pet. 4:13; Heb. 3:14; Col. 1:27; Rom. 8:10; Gal. 2:20; Phil. 2:21). Being The Christ, they are the one Company in which Jesus is the Head and the faithful saints are the Body (John 17:23, 26; Rom. 12:4, 5; 1 Cor. 12:12-14, 27; Eph. 1:22, 23). This makes them the one new and perfect (symbolic) man (Eph. 2:15; 4:13, 24; Col. 3:10). The reason the faithful saints are with Jesus called Christ is twofold: (1) Like Him they are anointed (Christed) by the Spirit; and (2) a bride bears her husband's name, the faithful saints being the Bride of Christ (2 Cor. 11:2; Rev. 19:7; 21:2, 9; 22:17).

This fact that The Christ is a company is the mystery of God and Godliness (Col. 1:26, 27; 2:2; Eph. 3:3-6, 9; 1 Tim. 3:16). But this mystery stands in contrast with Satan's counterfeit of it, the Antichrist as the mystery of iniquity, the very opposite of the mystery of Godliness (2 Thes. 2:7). The relation between the two is the following: The mystery of God is The Christ; the Mystery of iniquity is the Antichrist, *i.e.*, counterfeit Christ. This counterfeit arose as follows: Satan was one of the most studious listeners to the preaching and teaching of Jesus and the Apostles. From these he learned every feature of God's plan. Then he proceeded to counterfeit it in every detail. He thus produced Antichrist, papacy, as the counterfeit of the true Christ, in which counterfeit the pope, as the head of the hierarchy, is the counterfeit of Jesus, the true Head of the saints, and in which counterfeit the hierarchy, the body of the pope, is the counterfeit of the true saints, the Body of Christ. This explains the relation between Christ and Antichrist. But every other feature of God's plan Satan counterfeited in the papacy, either in its doctrines, organization,

practices or discipline, and in this counterfeit the true God, Jehovah, the One Supreme God, who is only one Person and Being, was counterfeited by Satan through Antichrist by the trinity—three Gods are one God. Since, therefore, the trinity is Satan's counterfeit of the true God in the Antichrist, it must be a false teaching. Satan, proud of the trinity that he invented in the heathen religions, through Antichrist introduced among Christians his heathen doctrine of the trinity, for which we should repudiate it.

The fruits of this trinity doctrine prove it to be wrong, which we present as our eighth general argument against it. Some of these fruits we showed when pointing out that Satan introduced this doctrine to disparage God, grieve Christ, injure God's real people and enslave the nominal people of God. Here we will give some others: There is no doubt that this doctrine is conducive to superstition, priestcraft, and the degradation of the people by making them believe unscriptural, unreasonable, ununderstandable, self-contradictory and unfactual things, which in turn make them susceptible to believe other unscriptural, unreasonable, ununderstandable, self-contradictory and unfactual things. It has made clear thinkers disbelieve the Bible, which they were deceived into believing taught the trinity and its connected errors. It has also been responsible for persecution, since it naturally makes bigots and fanatics of its whole-hearted believers. Calvin brought Servetus to the stake for disbelieving this doctrine. The inquisition tortured many a disbeliever in the trinity. Its detailed elaboration makes the Father appear repellent, cruel and vindictive, and the Son full of mercy, pleading with this repellent, cruel and vindictive Being to exact vengeance on Him, and let the sinner go free in pardon. This view makes people dread God, not love Him, and results in the actual exaltation of Jesus in the affections of the people above the Father. This doctrine turns faith into credulity.

It makes it almost impossible to love God supremely, as well as results in Jesus being loved more than the Father of all compassion, all mercy and all goodness, and this greatly weakens in its believers the power of godliness to make saintly characters. It certainly undermines hope in God. It makes it almost impossible to obey God from faith, hope and love. Accordingly, by its fruits this doctrine gives evidence of being an error, while the truth that the Father is the only Supreme God conduces to sanctification (John 17:17). This should move us to concordant acts.

This doctrine is false, because it is based on wrong methods of interpretation and of propaganda. This we present as our ninth general argument against it. It sets aside clear statements and stresses obscure ones. It ignores contrasts between the Supreme Being and Christ that, if heeded, would give the trinity doctrine a death blow. It reads into its main proof texts thoughts that they do not contain, and ignores the features of those texts that refute the doctrine that those texts are by trinitarians supposed to prove. Nowhere in the Bible is it either clearly or even obscurely stated. In a word, it is read into the Bible and not drawn out of the Bible. Or to put it in another way, it is based on eisegesis, not on exegesis. It was not originally accepted by weight of argument; but by the power of Emperor Constantine and his successors, who forced the doctrine upon the Christian world, banishing and degrading its opponents, who had decidedly the better of the argument in the debate on the question. The majority of Christian people at first were on their side and recognized the trinity teaching as a thing foreign to the belief that had prevailed from the days of Christ and the Apostles; but they had to bow to the might of emperors who forced their subjects to receive this error. The controversy lasted several centuries before the opponents of this doctrine were forced to give up, the trinitarians owing their victory to armies, generals

and emperors, which again shows that the doctrine was not spread by the sword of the Spirit, but by the sword of the Roman Empire—a sure proof that it was championed by Satan and Antichrist.

As a tenth general argument against the trinity doctrine we present the following: A right understanding of our Lord's three natures overthrows the thought of His being God Almighty or a part of God Almighty. On this point, as on our preceding and following points, lack of space prevents our giving details; therefore as on all our other points we, on this point, will summarize our pertinent thoughts. According to the Bible Jesus has had three natures: (1) A prehuman nature, lower than the Divine, but higher than the angelic natures; (2) human nature, and (3) a posthuman nature, the Divine nature. If this is true, it destroys the possibility of His being the so-called second person in the trinity. We have treated rather detailedly on His prehuman nature above. As we, as well as trinitarians, believe that Jesus existed as the Logos before He came to earth as the human being, Jesus, there is no need of discussing that phase of the subject here; since details on it are given above. The following things may be said on His prehuman relations to the Father, all of which prove that he was not God Almighty or a part of God Almighty. He is said to have been created by God (Col. 1:15; Rev. 3:14), hence had a beginning, was therefore a creature, hence could not have been God Almighty. Instead of being God Almighty, He was then (and since) called the Son of God, the firstborn of, and the only begotten by God (Ps. 89:27; John 3:16, 18; 1:14, 18; 1 John 4:9; Ps. 2:7-10). Hence He was not God Himself, but God's Son in His prehuman condition. Being a Son of God, having been begotten by God, He is not so old as the Father; hence He had a beginning; hence is not eternal; hence is not God Almighty. In His prehuman condition He is called: (1) Michael, the Archangel

(Dan. 10:13, compare with 12:1; Jude 9, compare with 1 Thes. 4:16); (2) the Angel, and (3) the Angel of God, or of the Lord (Ex. 14:19; Judg. 6:11-22; 13:3-21; 2 Sam. 24:16; 1 Kings 19:7; 2 Kings 1:3, 15; Ps. 34:7; Zech. 1:11, 12, *etc.*). Hence in His prehuman condition He was not God Almighty or a part of God Almighty, but was His Chief Angel or Messenger, which proves that He was in His prehuman condition neither co-eternal, consubstantial (of the same substance or essence) nor co-equal with the Father, things absolutely necessary for Him to have been in His prehuman nature, if He was God Himself, or an essential part of God Himself.

In the passages in which His prehuman condition and carnation are described He is set forth in terms that exclude the thought of His being God Almighty or an essential part of God Almighty. In Phil. 2:5, 6 He is directly said in His prehuman form to have been a Spirit Being inferior to God. Please see the A. R. V. for the proper translation of this verse. Moreover in v. 7 His becoming a human being is said to have occurred by His emptying [divesting] Himself, a thing a Divine Being cannot do, since such a being is unchangeable. John 1:14, literally translated, reads thus: "The Word [the prehuman Christ] *became* flesh," *i.e.*, became a human being. Notice the passage does not say, as the trinitarians' thought requires, "The Word remained the Word and assumed into the unity of His person human nature." But this passage shows us that the Word ceased to remain the Word, the highest being next to God, and became a human being, just as the water at Cana ceased to be water when it became the wine in Christ's first miracle. Because of God's invariableness, it would have been impossible for Jesus to become a man had He been God. The same thought is taught in 2 Cor. 8:9, by the fact that the passage tells us that He who was rich [in nature, *etc.*] became poor, an impossibility for God. Indeed, to harmonize

with the trinity doctrine this passage would have to read something like this: He who was rich became richer, inasmuch as He retained His rich nature and added to it as much more of riches as perfect humanity is worth. Does the passage give such a thought?

Heb. 2:9, 11, 16, 17 overthrows the trinity doctrine; for this doctrine teaches that He as God remained higher than the angels, and that when He assumed in addition the human nature, He still was higher than the angels, remaining God Almighty. To become a little lower than the angels, *i.e.*, a perfect man as Adam was (vs. 7, 8), He had to give up the nature that was higher than theirs (Heb. 2:16, see A. R. V.), which would have been impossible, if He were God Almighty. In His prehuman condition He is shown not to be God Almighty by the contrast that John 1:1, 2 brings out, as the literal translation shows: "In a beginning (hence not in eternity) was the Word; and the Word was with *the* God [the Supreme Being]; and the Word was *a* God. The same was in a beginning with *the* God [the Supreme Being]." It will be noted that there is a strong contrast made here between *a* God, which the prehuman Jesus was, and *the* God. By the latter term the Almighty God is meant; by the former term a Spirit Being inferior to Almighty God is meant. This will become clear, if we remember that about 200 times in the Bible angels, good and bad, are called Gods, as, among others, can be seen in the following: Ps. 97:7, compare with Heb. 1:6, where St. Paul gives an inspired comment on Ps. 97:7; Gen. 3:5; Ex. 12:12; 15:11; 18:11; Deut. 7:25; 10:17; Josh. 22:22; 1 Sam. 28:13; Ps. 95:3; 96:4; 97:9; 136:2; Acts 14:11; 1 Cor. 8:5; 2 Cor. 4:4. Hence the Logos as the Archangel is in John 1:1, 2 called a God; but the very contrast between *a* God and *the* God shows that he was not the Supreme God, nor a so-called second person of the Supreme God. Hence in this paragraph and the two preceding paragraphs, where His prehuman condition

and His carnation are described, He is set forth in such Biblical terms as disprove His being Divine before and during His carnation. Therefore He was not then God Almighty, which fact proves that He never was nor could be God Almighty, which is fatal to the trinity doctrine as an alleged Bible doctrine.

Then, too, during the days of His flesh, *i.e.*, of His human nature, He is set forth in such terms as disprove His being God Almighty. We have already seen from Phil. 2:5-7; 2 Cor. 8:9; Heb. 2:9, 14, 16, 17; John 1:14 that He could not have become a human being without giving up His prehuman nature, which could not have been given up, had it been Divine, since Divinity is unchangeable. This, of course, proves that while He was in the flesh He was not in the Divine nature. Hence He never was God Almighty. The Bible is most explicit that He was a sinless man among sinful men for 33½ years. That He was a human being during those 33½ years follows from His having been born of a human mother (Gal. 4:4), by His growing as a human being into manhood (Luke 2:52; 3:23), by His oft-given title as the pre-eminent descendant of Adam, literally, the Son of the man, and the Son of David, by his hungering and thirsting (Matt. 21:18, 19; 4:2; John 19:28), by His becoming weary (John 4:6), by His weeping (Luke 19:41-44; John 11:35), by His praying (Matt. 26:39-44; Heb. 5:7), by His temptations (Matt. 4:1-10; Luke 22:28; Heb. 2:18; 4:15), by His sorrowing (Is. 53:3; Matt. 26:38), by His suffering (1 Pet. 2:21; 3:18), by His dying (1 Cor. 15:3), by His crying, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt 27:46), by His being buried as a dead man (Matt. 27:57-61) and by His resurrection after being dead parts of three days (Matt. 28:1-6).

Had He been God Almighty during those 33½ years, He could not have been born of a woman, grown into manhood, been rightly called the Son of the man, and

the Son of David. Nor could He have hungered and thirsted, become weary, weak, prayed to God (which would have been praying to Himself), been tempted, sorrowed, suffered, been forsaken by God, died, been buried and resurrected. Had He been God Almighty, we would have to consider these experiences as a pretense, a *pro forma* exhibition, a sham. The doctrine that He was God Almighty, and that His only personality was the personality of God Himself, must make these experiences a sham, a *pro forma* matter, since the trinity doctrine denies the possibility of His human nature having a personality of its own, and does this to *evade* the logical conclusion that His having two natures at the same time—"The God—man" each of which had its own intellect, sensibilities and will, the constituents of personality, there must be two persons in Him. These facts prove that He was only a human being—a perfect one, it is true—during those 33½ years. Accordingly we see that Christ's having human nature, and only human nature, during those 33½ years, He could then not have been God Almighty. And if He then was not God Almighty, He never was such, since this would imply that God Almighty in His alleged second person was out of existence during those 33½ years. The absurdity that He was during those 33½ years "the God-man" and is such yet is the basis of such absurd trinitarian expressions as: "the Mother of God," "God died" and the words of a trinitarian hymn, "O great woe! God Himself lies dead!" Such absurd and blasphemous expressions never occur in the Bible, because they inculcate a grossly unreasonable and unbiblical thought. Rather the thoughts set forth in this paragraph prove that, Christ having been a human being 33½ years, the trinity doctrine must be false.

The trinity doctrine is false because it implies, among other things, that our Lord had the Divine nature from eternity, whereas the Bible teaches that

he became Divine in nature at and by His resurrection. What was above proven of His nature as the Logos and as a man proves that He was not Divine in nature before His resurrection. We will now prove that He became Divine in nature at and by His resurrection. This will appear from a number of considerations. (1) On condition of being faithful unto death He was offered, among other things, the Divine nature as the joy set before Him (Heb. 12:2). To reach this condition He had to undergo the resurrection process, which begins with the begetting of the Spirit to the Divine heart and mind, proceeds through the development into perfection of that which is begotten—the Divine heart and mind—and is completed in the birth of the Spirit. The begetting occurs at consecration, the resurrection of the spiritual heart and mind proceeds hand in hand with the sacrificial death and the bestowal of the Divine body or nature occurs at the awakening from death. This resurrection process is a regeneration. That Christ underwent this rebirth is evident from several facts: (1) from the fact that His resurrection process is set forth as forming the pattern of ours (Rom. 6:4, 5), which this passage proves begins at our consecration and proceeds unto perfection, as we carry out that consecration faithfully unto death; (2) from the fact that our resurrection process is called a rising with Christ (Col. 3:1; 2:12, 13; Eph. 2:5, 6), and the power of His resurrection (Phil. 3:10); and (3) from the fact that the Bible teaches that we are dying *with* Him (hence undergoing the same kind of a sacrificial death as His) and at the same time rising in life *with* Him. This thought is taught in all the passages quoted under (1) and (2); it is also taught in the following: Rom. 6:3-11; 8:10; 2 Cor. 4:10; Gal. 2:20. These three points prove that Christ and the Church from their consecration onward until they are raised from the dead undergo the regenerative process, the resurrection process.

The regenerative process as undergone by both Christ and the Church is described as a new creation. It begins with the begetting of the Spirit (John 1:12, 13; 1 Cor. 4:15; Phile. 10; Jas. 1:18; 1 Pet. 1:3, 23; 1 John 5:1), which begetting made them embryo new creatures (2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15; compare with 1 Pet. 3:16; 5:10, 14). It proceeds through a quickening process (Eph. 2:5; Col. 3:13; 1 Tim. 6:13). It passes through a growth process until developed enough for the birth (2 Pet. 3:18; Eph. 4:15; 1 Pet. 2:2; 5:10; Eph. 4:12). The birth from the dead makes them Spirit beings of the Divine nature (John 3:5; Jas. 1:18; 2 Pet. 1:4; 1 Cor. 15:50-54). This process beginning with the begetting and ending with the birth of the Spirit constitutes the creative acts whereby God brings into existence a new order of beings, that of the Divine nature. This new creation consists of Jesus and His faithful followers. The passages treating of this creative process just given prove that the Church undergoes this creative process unto the Divine nature. The Scriptures teach that Jesus also underwent it. Thus as the Church was begotten of the Spirit, in its Jewish and Gentile parts (Acts 2:1-4; 10:44-47)—so was Jesus begotten of the Holy Spirit (Matt. 3:16). As the Church was quickened, so was Jesus (Eph. 2:5). As the Church is developed unto character perfection and thus fitted to be born of the Spirit in the resurrection, as the passages in the first part of this paragraph prove, so was Jesus (Heb. 2:10; 5:8, 9). And after being so perfected He was born of the Spirit in His resurrection as the Beginning and Chief One of the class so to be born (Col. 1:18; Rev. 1:5; Rom. 8:29). This entire re-creation process that changed Him from a human to a Divine being is described in Ps. 2:7; Acts 13:33; Heb. 1:5; 5:5; Rev. 1:5, as a bringing to birth. Hence in Jesus' resurrection He was given the Divine nature for the first time.

The following considerations also prove that He was made Divine in His resurrection. Immortality, which the Bible defines as life in oneself (1 Tim. 6:16; John 5:26; 6:53), is an exclusive quality of the Divine nature, as we see from 1 Tim. 6:16 and from the first clause of John 5:26. Its second clause shows that while Jesus did not then have it, God had promised it to Him. This promise God fulfilled to Him in His resurrection, as we see from the fact that in the resurrection all the Faithful, one of whom He was, obtain immortality (1 Cor. 15:53, 54) and from the fact that in the resurrection the saints will be like Him (1 John 3:2); hence He must then have gotten it, since they partake in His resurrection (Phil. 3:10). This likeness consists in their having His, the Divine nature, in their resurrection, which is the same kind of a resurrection as His (2 Pet. 1:4; Phil. 3:10, 21; 1 Cor. 15:45-49). Thus in His resurrection He obtained the Divine nature and its kind of life, immortality. That Jesus did not have immortality before His resurrection is evident from the fact that He died, which an immortal being cannot do. And since immortality is an inherent quality exclusively of the Divine nature (1 Tim. 6:16), before His resurrection Jesus was not Divine since before that He died; and since His resurrection changed him from a human into a Spirit being (1 Cor. 15:45-49), it was in His resurrection that He became Divine. But we have yet more proof for it.

His exaltation to the Divine nature, whereby He became "the exact impress of the Father's substance [Divine]," is clearly shown to have occurred in His resurrection by Heb. 1:3-5; for the whole passage treats of Him after His resurrection at the time of His glorification. We will quote it from the Improved Version, asking our readers to note particularly the tenses of the verbs: "Who, being the effulgence of His Glory [like God in splendor of character] and the very image of His Substance [a body just like God's,

hence Divine in nature] and upholding all things by His powerful Word [acting as God's Vicegerent throughout the universe (Matt. 28:18)], after making a purification of sins [sprinkled His blood on the Mercy Seat], sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in the highest, *after becoming* [a thing that He while in the flesh (Heb. 2:9) had not been; but yet a thing that prior to His sitting down at the right hand of God He had become] by so much superior to angels as He has inherited a more excellent name [nature] than they; for unto which of the angels did He ever say, Thou art my Son; today I have brought Thee to birth." Please note that in Acts 13:33 St. Paul quotes the last two clauses from Ps. 2:7 as a proof of Christ's resurrection, which proves that he quotes them here to prove the same thing. Hence this passage proves that Jesus in His resurrection inherited the more excellent name [nature], the Divine nature, than angels have.

Here it is important to note that the word *name* in the Bible has seven meanings, three of which are nature (Is. 62:2; Rev. 3:12), honor (Ex. 9:16; Neh. 9:10) and official authority (Ex. 5:23; Esth. 8:8, 10). While in Heb. 1:4 the word undoubtedly means nature, which is proven by the fact that the resurrection passage in Ps. 2:7, compared with Acts 13:33, is quoted in proof that His resurrection made Him higher than angels, whereas, while a man, He was a little lower than angels (Heb. 2:9), all three of these meanings occur in Phil. 2:9-11, where the "name above every name," the Father's of course excepted (1 Cor. 15:27), means nature, honor and official authority. Here the Apostle tells us that because of our Lord's emptying [divesting] Himself of His prehuman nature in becoming a man and then obeying God even unto the death of the cross, God highly exalted Him, by giving Him a name above every other name, *i.e.*, a nature, honor and official authority above every other nature, honor and official authority. The same thought

of God's exalting Christ in His resurrection above every other name (nature, honor and official authority) we find in Eph. 1:19-22. Col. 2:9 assures us that in Christ now all the fullness of the Deity dwells bodily, *i.e.*, in Christ as God's Vicegerent lodges God's character, nature, honor, power and official authority; but a comparison of Col. 1:18, 19 proves that this is since Christ's resurrection, and is a reward for His faithfulness to God unto death. Having thus proven that Christ attained the Divine nature in His resurrection, it follows that the trinity doctrine cannot be true; for it implies that Christ always has been Divine in nature.

Trinitarians seek to meet this argument by the claim that Christ's exaltation in His resurrection was not in His Divine nature, which they claim was always exalted, but in His human nature. To this we answer, the Bible never says that He was exalted in His human nature in His resurrection; but it says that He, the person, and not a part of Him was exalted. Again, the Bible by at least 21 separate lines of thought teaches that Jesus was not resurrected as a human being, which would have made Him take back the ransom price, and thus vitiate the whole plan of salvation, but was resurrected as a Spirit Being of the Divine nature (P' 28, 11-15). Hence their evasion falls to the ground. If it were kept in mind that God, among other things, set before the Logos the joy of His exaltation to the Divine nature, honor and official authority, if He would give up His prehuman nature, become a sinless human being and give Himself as such to become man's ransom price to be laid down by a sacrificial death and to be paid to God after Jesus' ascension (Heb. 9:24; 1 John 2:2; 4:10), God would as a reward exalt Him in His resurrection to the Divine nature, honor and official authority (Heb. 12:2; 1:3-5; Phil. 2:9-11; Eph. 1:19-22; Col. 2:9; 1:18, 19), the futility of this evasion will at once be recognized. Why did God require such stringent tests of our Lord before exalting

Him to the Divine nature? He desired a Vicegerent that could be absolutely depended upon to take God's side—the side of truth and righteousness—and be faithful to that side, regardless of any pressure whatsoever to the contrary. Hence He deferred His exaltation until by His obedience in carnation, life and death He proved Himself worthy—"Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength and glory and blessing" (Rev. 5:12). If He received these after He was slain, as appears from Matt. 28:18 and the last passage quoted, He did not have them before, hence was not Divine before He was slain. The trinity doctrine cannot stand up in the presence of the Bible and the Plan of God therein contained. The fact that Jesus was raised to the Divine nature in His resurrection gives a fatal blow to the trinity doctrine, as we trust our readers see.

Having proven that our Lord is not God Almighty and hence that the trinity doctrine is not true, we will now proceed to discuss the Holy Spirit in relation to the trinity doctrine, as our twelfth general argument against it. We will first briefly define the Holy Spirit: It is (1) the power or influence, and (2) the disposition of God, either in Himself or in those in harmony with Him. One or the other of these two definitions will fit every occurrence of the expression Holy Spirit in the Bible. We will now give, first in its first sense, afterward in its second sense, proof of the correctness of this definition. That the Holy Spirit is God's power or influence is evident from Luke 1:35: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee; and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee." Here the Holy Spirit is defined as the power of the Highest. How do we know this? Because Gabriel in using this language used a parallelism, which is one of the ways the Hebrews made their poetry. While English poetry is made by rhythm of words, often accompanied by rime of words, Hebrew poetry, among other ways, is made

by rhythm of thought, whereby the same thought is repeated in different words, called parallelism. Accordingly the expression, "The *Holy Spirit* shall come upon thee," means the same thing as, and is defined by the expression, "The *power of the Highest* shall overshadow thee." This parallelism proves that the word *kai*, which in Greek means *and, also and even*, in this passage means *even*. Hence this passage proves that the Holy Spirit means the power or influence of God. Luke 24:49 defines the Holy Spirit "power from on high," which also proves the first sense of our definition. So also does John 20:22, 23 prove the first sense: "He (Jesus) breathed on them and said unto them, Receive a [so the Greek] Holy Spirit [power. That holy power is shown in the immediately following words to be the holy power to declare as God's mouthpieces the forgiveness of sins to penitent believers and the retention of sins to the impenitent]; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." In other words, Christ by His death, providing the ransom price as the basis for forgiveness of sins, in John 20:22, 23 gave the disciples the holy power to act as His representatives in declaring the basis and conditions on which sins are to be forgiven or retained, and to assure those concerned of these two facts. Before Pentecost (when for the first time the Holy Spirit was given in the sense of the spiritual disposition to any of Adam's fallen race, John 7:39) whenever the Spirit is spoken of as acting in nature or on fallen men, it is always in the sense of God's holy power or influence. This is implied in John 7:39, since it shows that before Pentecost the Spirit was not on or in any fallen man in the sense in which it has been since Pentecost.

The second sense of the words Holy Spirit is the disposition of God in Himself and in others, *i.e.*, those who are in harmony with His disposition, His Spirit. It is in them a holy mind, holy affections and a holy

will. During the Gospel Age this is in saints a spiritual disposition begun in them at their begetting of the Spirit, and developed in them unto perfection by the Spirit (in the sense of power), Word and providences of God, working in and upon them. In the saints it is therefore called: the Spirit [disposition] of God and Christ (Rom. 8:9, 14; Phil. 1:19; 1 Pet. 4:14); the Spirit [disposition] of Holiness (Rom. 1:4); the Spirit of sonship [a filial disposition Godward], in contrast with a servile, cowardly and time-serving disposition (Rom. 8:14, 15); the Spirit of meekness [a meek disposition] (Gal. 6:1); the Spirit of power [a strong disposition], of love [a loving disposition] and of a sound mind [a wise disposition], in contrast with the spirit of fear [a cowardly disposition] (2 Tim. 1:7); the Spirit of the Truth [the disposition worked in us by the Truth, John 17:17] (John 14:17); the Spirit [disposition] of the Truth, contrasted with the spirit of error [erroneous disposition] (1 John 4:6); the Spirit of the promise [the disposition wrought in us by the Oath-bound promise] (Eph. 1:13, 14); a watchful Spirit [disposition] in contrast with the spirit of slumber [a sleepy disposition] (Rom. 11:8; 1 Cor. 16:13); the Spirit of wisdom, understanding, counsel, might, knowledge, and reverence [a disposition that is wise, understanding, practical, strong, intelligent and God-fearing] (Is. 11:2); the Spirit of glory [the glorious disposition, because transforming our characters into God's glorious likeness] (1 Pet. 4:14); the Spirit which is of God [the Divine disposition], in contrast with the spirit of the world [worldly disposition] (1 Cor. 2:12), and the Spirit [spiritual disposition], in contrast with the flesh [fleshly disposition] (Rom. 8:5-9; Matt. 26:41; Gal. 5:16-25).

These passages all clearly prove that God's Spirit therein referred to is His disposition, either in Himself or in those in harmony with Him in disposition. Especially do the contrasts between the filial and the servile

and cowardly spirit in Rom. 8:15, between the cowardly spirit and the strong, loving and wise spirit in 2 Tim. 1:7, between the Spiritual and fleshly spirits in Rom. 8:5-9; Matt. 26:41; Gal. 5:16-25, between the Truth Spirit and the erroneous spirit of 1 John 4:6, between the watchful Spirit and sleeping spirit of Rom. 11:8; 1 Cor. 16:13, between the Divine Spirit and the worldly spirit in 1 Cor. 2:12, prove that the Lord's Spirit is His disposition. Certainly the servile, cowardly, erroneous, sleeping and worldly spirits of these passages are not spirit beings, but are dispositions; hence the filial strong, loving, wise, heavenly, Truth and Divine Spirits of these passages are, by the contrasts drawn between them and the servile, cowardly, worldly, erroneous, earthly and sleeping spirits, shown to be dispositions. Hence these passages prove that the Holy Spirit in its second sense is God's Holy disposition, in Himself and in all in harmony with Him—Christ, the good angels and the saints.

We ought also to remember that in Is. 11:2 a definition of the Holy Spirit is given. "The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him [the Christ]—*the Spirit* [disposition] *of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit* [disposition] *of counsel and might, the Spirit* [disposition] *of knowledge and reverence of the Lord.*" Please note that in John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13 the Holy Spirit is defined as the Spirit of *the* [so the Greek] Truth, *i.e.*, the disposition that God's Word, *the* Truth (John 17:17); works in His people. So in Eph. 1:13 it is defined as the Spirit of *the* [so the Greek] promise [the disposition that the Oath-bound promise works in the saints]. These definitions prove that the Holy Spirit is not a person, but is God's disposition, in Himself, His Son, Jesus, His saints and the good angels. The same conclusion follows from St. Paul's statement in 1 Cor. 2:10, where we are told that "the Spirit searches [studies out] all things, even the deep things of God." If the Spirit were God Almighty,

It would know all things intuitively, as God does, and would not study out anything; but God's mind, disposition in the saints, does not know everything, and must study out the deep things of God to understand them. This same thought is implied in Rom. 8:26, 27, where we are told the Spirit groans, unable to express its feelings. But God Almighty neither groans nor is He unable to express His feelings; but His disposition in His saints often groans (Rom. 8:23), and often is unable to express its feelings. Again, when we are exhorted in 1 Thes. 5:19 not to quench God's Spirit, we are admonished not to do anything that would put out the holy fire of God's disposition in us. To understand God's Spirit here to mean Almighty God would imply that we can put God Almighty out of existence! Every passage in the Bible using the expression Holy Spirit, not using the words, Holy Spirit, in the sense of power, influence, uses them in the sense of God's disposition, in Himself and in His faithful—the mind, heart, will of God. This view stands all tests of the Bible.

While God is a person and while Jesus is a person, The Holy Spirit is not a person. There is no Scripture, apart from mistranslation, that speaks of It as a person, yet numerous passages do speak of God and Christ as persons. The trinitarian mistranslation, Holy Ghost, and certain other mistranslations, suggest this thought, which translation—Holy Ghost—was rightly rejected by the A. R. V., *etc.*, in favor of Holy Spirit. On the contrary, the Bible statements with reference to It are of such a kind as are incompatible with the thought that It is a person. That the Holy Spirit is not God Almighty is evident from the fact that It can be quenched by us (1 Thes. 5:19), which would mean, if It were God Almighty, that we can destroy God Almighty! How Almighty would God be, if we could quench, destroy Him? The Bible says that Jesus (Acts 10:38) and the saints (2 Cor. 1:21) are anointed with

the Holy Spirit. It is absurd to say that we could be anointed with a person, *i.e.*, that a person is the symbolic oil with which the anointing is done. But how reasonable is the thought that we can be anointed with God's disposition, His thoughts, affections, graces and will; for this is just what the anointing is (Is. 11:2, 3; 61:1-3). Again, the Bible teaches that we are baptized with (not by) the Holy Spirit (Matt. 3:11; John 1:33; Acts 1:5). How could we be baptized with, as distinct from by, a person? But we can be and are baptized with God's disposition and into God's disposition (Matt. 28:19; 1 Cor. 12:13, the phrase "by one Spirit," in the Greek reads, "*in* one Spirit"). Again, we are exhorted to be filled with God's Spirit (Eph. 5:18). How could we be filled with the Spirit, if the Spirit is God Almighty, a person? But we could be and are filled with God's disposition. Again, if the Spirit is God Almighty, a person, how could He be given (Luke 11:13) to us and thus be owned by us? But if It is God's disposition begun, developed and completed in us, we see that It has been given to and is owned by us (Rom. 8:15; 2 Tim. 1:7). So, too, the Bible assures us that the Spirit was given to Jesus not by measure (John 3:34), *i.e.*, not with any limitations, because of His perfection, while, by reason of our imperfection (2 Cor. 4:7), to us it is given by measure, limitedly, and that variously (Rom. 12:6-8; 1 Cor. 12:11-14, 27; Eph. 4:7). But how could a person be given to one without limitations and to others by limitations? But a disposition could and must be so given as between perfect and imperfect beings and the varying imperfections of imperfect beings. Then, the Bible tells us that we are sealed with the Holy Spirit (Eph. 1:13, 14). A person cannot be a seal and thus be used as a seal of others; but God does seal us as His own by giving us His holy disposition. If the Holy Spirit were a person, how could He be poured out. (Joel 2:28, 29; Matt. 3:16;

Acts 2:1-4; 10:44, 45)? If It is a holy power and a holy disposition, we can see how this can be. In a prophecy (Ps. 133:1-3) the Spirit is shown (v. 1) to be the good and pleasant disposition of the saints in unity, the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace (Eph. 4:3). In v. 2 its bestowment is spoken of as pictured by the anointing of Aaron. Then in v. 3 it is represented by the dew of Herman descending on Zion's mountains, because It tempers the heat of temptation and produces the blessing that gives everlasting life, *i.e.*, a character like God's—God's disposition.

Other things Scripturally said of the Holy Spirit could be brought forward, proving that It is not God Almighty, a person; but is God's power and disposition, in Himself and in all in harmony with Him; but enough has been given, we believe, proving this thought. Accordingly, we will now end this feature of our discussion, and will leave for study later on the examination of the arguments that trinitarians use as alleged *indirect* proofs of their doctrines, since in this installment we have reviewed their alleged *direct* proofs.

Having presented twelve general arguments against the trinity doctrine, in the course of which we refuted the nine alleged *direct* Biblical proofs that trinitarians offer for their doctrine, we will now examine the alleged indirect proofs that they offer for it; and our examination of these will prove them to be likewise fallacious. One of the alleged indirect proofs that they offer for the trinity is the unity of the Father and Son (John 10:30), "I and the Father are one" (*hen*, neuter in Greek, not *heis*, masculine, or *mia*, feminine). The same refutation applies to their use of John 10:30 as we gave of the same view based on the Father, Word and the Holy Spirit being *one* (*hen*) in the interpolated passage forming parts of 1 John 5:7, 8 in the A. V. (but omitted in almost all translations since 1870), a refutation offered on the contingency that 1 John 5:7, 8 be conceded to be genuine. Additionally we might

say, if the logic were valid that the Father's and Son's oneness of John 10:30 must be that of being, we would have to say that Paul and Apollos were one being (1 Cor. 3:6-8)! Of course they were two separate beings. *Hen* being used of them in 1 Cor. 3:8 (not *mia*, which would be necessary to agree with the feminine *ousia*, being) proves that their oneness was not one of being but of spirit, disposition (Acts 4:32; 1 Cor. 1:10; Eph. 4:3-6, 13; Phil. 1:27; 2:2; 4:2). Hence John 10:30 does not by the Greek word *hen* prove that the Father and Son are one being any more than 1 Cor. 3:8 proves by the word *hen* that Paul and Apollos were one being; but the same word and form of that word, proving Paul and Apollos to be one in heart, mind and will, gives presumptive evidence that the same word and form of that word in John 10:30 proves the same of the Father and Son.

But we have more than presumptive proof for this; for Jesus praying (John 17:11, 21, 22) that all of the saints may be one (*hen*, not *heis*, nor *mia*) did not pray that they be all one being, which would be nonsense, but that their unity may be one in mind, heart and will. Since the oneness for which He prayed for them was not a oneness of being, the oneness between Him and the Father cannot be that of being, because Jesus in John 17:11, 22 prays that the oneness for which He prayed on their behalf be patterned after the oneness that exists between the Father and Himself, "That they may be one *as we are*." Hence the oneness between the Father and Him is not one of being, but one of mind, heart and will. Moreover Jesus defines this oneness in v. 21 as follows: "that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me [God was in Him by His Holy Spirit, disposition, even as Jesus is in the saints by the Holy Spirit, disposition, (John 14:17, 20)] and I in thee [Jesus was in the Father (John 14:10, 11, 20) by accepting and keeping the Father as His Head, *i.e.*, by His being

and remaining in the consecrated attitude (1 Cor. 3:23; 11:3, passages that also strongly prove Christ's inferiority to the Father, and the Father's being the Supreme Being)], that [thus the Father and the Son, by their Spirit, disposition, being in them and they by their spirit of consecration, being in Them (1 John 5:20; Col. 3:3; 1 Cor. 12:12, 13)] they also may be one in us ... that they may be one, *even as we are one.*" Thus these verses prove that the same kind of oneness as exists between the saints, exists between the Father and the Son and vice versa; but since the oneness that exists between the saints is not one of being, but one of heart, mind and will, the oneness that exists between the Father and Son is not one of being, but one of will, heart, and mind. Furthermore, if the Father and Son were but one Being, they could not be the two Beings bearing required witness, as John 8:17, 18 says they were, since the law required at least two different beings to be witnesses sufficient to establish a matter. But since they gave sufficient witness, they must be two Beings. Hence their oneness is not that of being; for they are two Beings. It must be that of mind, heart, and will. Accordingly, John 10:30 does not prove the Son's equality with the Father; rather it proves the Son's subordination to the Father; for John 17:21, which shows the kind of unity that exists between them to be connected with the Son's being in the Father, implies that the Father is the Son's Head and that the Son is His in the sense that we are Christ's, in subordination to Him; hence He must be subordinate to the Father (1 Cor. 3:23; 11:3), even as the headship of Christ makes the Church subordinate to Christ (Col. 1:18; Eph. 1:22, 23; 4:15; 5:23, 24, compared with Col. 3:19).

Sometimes, as a second alleged indirect proof of the trinity, John 14:9 is used: "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." Unless one should hold that the Father and the Son are one and the same person,

which of course the passage does not say nor mean, nor do the trinitarians profess to believe such, it is difficult to understand the mental process of one claiming this passage to teach the trinity. The thought rather is that the Son, being the character image of the Father (Heb. 1:3; Col. 1:15), is a picture of the Father, and thus He could say that whoever sees Him as the character picture of the Father sees the Father, *i.e.*, in His character, but of course not in His body, even as we would say that one who sees a statue of Lincoln, sees Lincoln, or as we would say of it, That is Lincoln. Thus we cannot see God's body or shape (John 5:37); but we can see how He looks in character, when we see Jesus' character. This is evidently our Lord's thought in these words, and is given by our Lord to disabuse Philip of the thought of Christ's showing him and the other disciples God's body, which Philip requested. Another, a third, alleged indirect proof that God is a trinity is the following: The perfection of God requires a trinity, *e.g.*, God is perfect in active love. But one cannot love unless there is an object to love. Hence God had from all eternity an object to love, *i.e.*, His Son, and eternally must have had a channel for manifesting this love, the Holy Spirit; hence, like the Father, both of these must be eternal, and therefore must be God! This is certainly far-fetched. Replying further we would say: (1) Since, under the theory that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are God, this object of God's love would have to be one outside the trinity, since it is God, *i.e.*, the One alleged to be the trinity, that does the loving, there would be no need of concluding that there is a trinity from the standpoint that God's love from eternity would have to have an object to love; and (2) if we can love things not existing, but whose existence we expect in the future, *e.g.*, the Millennial Kingdom, the new heavens and earth, *etc.*, God could

of course from all eternity have loved the Son, the Church, the World, before any of these existed.

But the two main indirect proofs that trinitarians offer for there being a trinity are, they allege, that the names, attributes, works and honors that belong to God exclusively are by the Bible expressly ascribed to the Son and to the Holy Spirit; hence, they conclude that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are God, *i.e.*, are a trinity. We will examine these two alleged indirect proofs separately, first considering that respecting the Son as their fourth alleged indirect proof of the trinity, and will in their turn consider the four things alleged to prove His Supreme Deity. First, then, trinitarians allege that the Bible ascribes to Jesus the names that belong exclusively to God. They further say that these names are Jehovah, God and Lord. To begin, we deny that the name Jehovah is given our Lord Jesus as His name, though there are certain Scriptures wherein He speaks, is spoken to, or is spoken of as God's Representative, *i.e.*, speaks, is spoken to or is spoken of as Jehovah, because Jehovah in these situations speaks, is spoken to or spoken of in Him as His Representative. As we have already seen from a variety of standpoints, He is pointedly distinguished from Jehovah, *e.g.*, as Lord in contrast with Jehovah, as *the* Angel, as the Archangel, as Michael, as the Angel of Jehovah, as the Servant, Arm, Son, Firstborn, Companion, appointed King, *etc.*, of Jehovah. Jehovah is said to be His God, in whose strength, hence not in His own, He will stand and feed God's Flock in His glorified condition (Mic. 5:4). These passages clearly show Him not to be Jehovah; and be it noted that such passages should be the controlling ones in this matter, and not passages where He speaks or acts or stands as Jehovah's Representative; for, properly regarded, this latter set of passages disproves His being Jehovah from the standpoint that He is in them acting as Jehovah's

Representative, not as Jehovah Himself, and a representative of course is not the one whom he represents.

We will now examine briefly the main occurrences of the name Jehovah, claimed by trinitarians as applicable to Jesus. We have already refuted their use of Jer. 23:5, 6, and from it proved the reverse of their claim. In Gen. 18 the chief Messenger of the three was undoubtedly our prehuman Lord; but in that chapter He speaks as Jehovah, because He there acted as God's Angel, Messenger, Representative, just as in the case of His speaking as Jehovah in Gen. 22:16, compare with vs. 11, 15; and in Ex. 3:4-7 compare with v. 2. To the claim that the expression in Is. 40:3, "Prepare the way of Jehovah," applies the name Jehovah to Jesus, because the charge was given to John the Baptist to prepare the way for our Lord, we reply: In preparing the way for Jesus, John was preparing the way for Jehovah, *i.e.*, making preparations for the fulfillment of God's plan, which is the "way of Jehovah"; and in the carrying out of that plan Jesus acts as Jehovah's Executive and Plenipotentiary. Hence the name Jehovah is not in this passage applied to Jesus. To the claim that in Is. 2:2-4; Mic. 4:1-3 the expressions, "mountain [kingdom] of the house of Jehovah" and "mountain [kingdom] of Jehovah," apply the name Jehovah to Jesus, because He will be the Millennial King, we answer as follows: In the first expression, "the house [family] of Jehovah" means Christ and the Church (Heb. 3:6). Hence Jehovah is shown to be different from each member of His house or family, in which Jesus is the Firstborn (Rom. 8:29). The second expression is shown by our Lord's prayer not to give the name of Jehovah to our Lord (Matt. 6:10). Moreover, as the Millennial King, our Lord will act as Jehovah's Representative (Ps. 2:6).

Combining the clause of Mic. 5:2, "goings forth have been from old, from everlasting," with the clause

of Ps. 90:1, 2, "Jehovah ... from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God," some trinitarians claim that our Lord is Jehovah. We answer that Jehovah being spoken of in Mic. 5:4 as our Lord's God disproves such a thought. The expression of Ps. 90:2, "from everlasting to everlasting," describes God's eternity, while the "goings forth," *etc.*, of Mic. 5:2 refer to the giving of prophecies of the Messiah's first and second advents (of old) and to God's fixing these prophecies in His plan before the world was (from everlasting). In answer to the claim that by the expression in Is. 25:6, "In this mountain [kingdom] Jehovah of hosts will make a feast of fat things," the name Jehovah is applied to Jesus, we answer no, on the basis of Matt. 6:10. Moreover St. Paul's quotation of part of the words of this passage (v. 8), "Death is swallowed up in victory," and his comment thereon, "Thanks be unto God who giveth us the victory through Jesus Christ our Lord" (1 Cor. 15:57), prove that Jehovah here is God, not Christ. Is. 40:1, 9, 10 is quoted by some trinitarians as proof that Jesus is called Jehovah. We answer, it proves the opposite; for Christ is here called Jehovah's Arm, Representative, Executive (Is. 53:1; 51:5, 9; 52:10; 59:15-20). To the claim that Is. 8:13, 14 is a proof that the name Jehovah is applied to Jesus, we answer: The connection shows that Jesus is spoken of as waiting on Jehovah and calls attention to the children of Jehovah that Jehovah has given Him as brethren (Is. 8:16-18; Heb. 2:13). Trinitarians claim that the fact that in Is. 54:13 Jehovah is said to be the Teacher of God's children, and the further fact that our Lord is said to be their Teacher (Matt. 23:8), prove that our Lord is Jehovah. We reply, Jesus quotes the word from Is. 54:13 as a proof that His Father is the one who teaches God's children (John 6:45). However, the Father in teaching us does it through our Lord (1 Cor. 1:30; 8:6). The foregoing are the main passages

that trinitarians use to prove that the Bible applies the name Jehovah to our Lord. They not only do not do so, but in their connections there are such expressions used as refute their claims, while the passages that we quoted in proof that Jesus is not Jehovah completely refutes their idea. So, then, their claim that this name, which belongs exclusively to God, is Scripturally expressly applied to Jesus, is found to be untrue, which makes the pertinent conclusion based on this claim fall to the ground, as to this name.

Next, they claim that the name God applies exclusively to Jehovah, and is expressly applied to Jesus in the Bible, which they claim proves Him to be God Almighty, and thus the second person of the trinity—a proof of the trinity. This claim by an examination of the pertinent Scriptures will be found to be as erroneous as the claim that the exclusive name of God, Jehovah, is Scripturally applied to our Lord. In the first place, we deny that the term God applies exclusively to the Supreme Being. In a former part of this discussion we stated that the word god (Hebrew, *el*, *elohim*, and Greek, *theos*) is in the Bible used about 200 times for angels, good and bad, and gave about 20 references in proof of our statement. But it is because the word *el* and *elohim* mean mighty one, the latter also meaning mighty ones, that they are also used of prominent and powerful humans (Gen. 23:6; Ex. 7:1; 21:6; 22:8, 10, 28, compared with Acts 23:5 for an inspired comment; Ps. 82:1, 6; see John 10:34, 35 for Jesus' comment thereon). So, too, *theos* is used in the Greek New Testament (2 Thes. 2:4 twice, John 10:34, 35). Accordingly, the claim that the word God is exclusively applicable to the Supreme Being is an error. The following will enable us to see clearly in this matter: The word God is both a proper noun, and that the name of but one person, and it is also a common noun, a substantive applicable to many persons, human and spiritual. As

a proper noun it belongs to the Supreme Being exclusively; But as a proper noun it is never applied to Jesus, though it may be as a common noun.

It is applied to Jesus as a common noun and to God as a proper noun in John 1:1, 2, as can be seen in the Greek, which, as we have shown, distinguishes between Jesus as a God and the Father twice, as *the* God. As a God Jesus is a very mighty one, mightier than any of the other gods (angels); but He is not *the* Almighty, which the Father alone is. Again, in Ps. 45:6, 7, quoted by St. Paul in Heb. 1:8, 9, the common noun use of *elohim* and *theos*, "O God" (O Mighty one), is applied by St. Paul to Jesus; but the proper noun use of it is applied to the Father, "*Thy God*," which expression proves the Father's superiority over the Son, since it calls Him our Lord's God. So, too, in Is. 9:6 the word *el*, God, is used for our Lord; but it is a common noun, and refers to Him as *a*, not *the* Mighty God; for the article "*the*" before the words "Mighty God" should not have been used, as it is not in the Hebrew, neither is it in the Hebrew before the words, "Everlasting Father and Prince of Peace," the former title referring to His millennial and post-millennial fatherhood of the race, and the latter to His millennial rule of peace and prosperity. Some trinitarians quote 1 John 5:20 as a proof that Jesus is God Almighty, though most of them and the ablest of them have given it up: "This is the true God." But the preceding part of the verse refers to the Father as the True One; for it shows that the True One is Jesus' Father, whom Jesus reveals to us. It will be noted that the word *even* before the expression, "in His Son" is in italics, *i.e.*, it is inserted without having a corresponding word in the Greek. The connection, showing that we are in the Father (Col. 3:3), proves that the word *and*, not *even*, should have been put into italics. Since the preceding part of v. 20 shows that Jesus has given us an

understanding of God as the True One, in whom we are, as well as in His Son, the expression, "This [one] is the true God," evidently refers to the Father, as now most of the ablest trinitarians concede.

Some, a minority of trinitarians, use the expression, "God was *in* Christ, reconciling the world to Himself" (2 Cor. 5:19), as a proof that Christ is God Almighty. But note that God is here and also in vs. 18, 20, 21 markedly distinguished from Christ; for not only do vs. 18, 19, 20, 21 show them to be doing different things in the work of reconciliation, but also show that God is the Reconciled One, not Jesus, and that God used Him to do the work of reconciliation. Moreover the Greek word here translated "in" should, as in very many places it is, be translated with the word by or through, because it is through Christ that the reconciliation is effected. Rom. 5:10, 11, as well as 2 Cor. 5:18-21, proves the same thing. Hence this verse does not teach that Jesus is God Almighty; for He is not here even called God, as a common noun, let alone as a proper noun, which the Father alone is here called. 1 Tim. 3:16, "God manifest in the flesh," was formerly used as a proof of the trinity; but the word God was mistakenly read into this passage for the word who, as even all trinitarian scholars now admit and as can be seen by the note to this verse in the A. R. V., or in critical recensions.

Tit. 2:13 is also alleged as a proof of the trinity by some, who to find in it their thought, render the words in question as follows: "the appearing of the glory of our Great God and Savior Jesus Christ." This rendering is not preferred by a majority of the learned trinitarians, though it is a possible rendering. Rendered as in the A. V., A. R. V. text, and a majority of modern translations, not our Lord Jesus but the Father is here called God. The fact that, properly translated, Paul never calls Jesus God, but always contrasts Him as Lord with the Father as God, is decisive

on which is the right translation. Again, the connection (v. 11) naturally suggests that the bright shining is of the Father and of the Son. St. Paul's use of language, calling the Father God over 500 times and never once calling Jesus God, must rule in this case as to which is the right translation. Force, too, is added to our view by the words [A. R. V.] *the glory of the Great God*. This leads us to remark that while Thomas' exclamation, "My Lord and my God" (John 20:28), is not that of an inspired man, it is nevertheless true; for Jesus is not only our Lord (Head), but also our God (Mighty One); but not our Almighty One, which the Father alone is. Hence this uninspired utterance of Thomas does not prove the trinity, as some trinitarians claim. Acts 20:28, "Feed the Church of God, which He purchased with His own blood," is quoted by some trinitarians to prove the trinity. If, by the term God, the Father here is meant, it is used as a proper noun, and therefore cannot refer to Jesus. But if the Father is here meant we would have to say that God has blood, which is nonsense, for a spirit does not have flesh, bones or blood. There is, then, an unsolvable difficulty here by taking the passage as the A. V. reads. But considering that the great majority of the Greek MSS. have here, instead of the word God, the word Lord, which is the proper reading (A. R. V.), the difficulty vanishes: "Feed the Church of the Lord, which He purchased with His own blood." So read, there is nothing in this passage in favor of trinitarianism, rather a disproof of it.

Some ancient MSS. read in John 1:18, "an only-begotten God," instead of "the only begotten Son"; and this reading is seized upon by trinitarians as a proof that Jesus is Almighty God, and that therefore the trinity doctrine is true. If this reading is correct, it gives trinitarians sorry comfort, for it carries on its face the proof that the word God here is a common noun. An only-begotten God implies that there are

other Gods who are not only-begotten; hence this proves that Jesus is not God Almighty. It, however, proves that He was the only direct Creation of God, God having created all the other gods, angels, through His agency (John 1:3; Col. 1:16). Sometimes in 2 Pet. 1:1 the expression, translated in the A. V. as follows: "through the righteousness of God and our Savior Jesus Christ," is by trinitarians rendered as follows: "the righteousness of our God and Savior Jesus Christ," and in this form is used to prove the trinity. But the Sinaitic MS. reading, Lord, instead of God, is by Biblical numerics proven true, and thus we are relieved of another supposed argument for the trinity, based on the word God being allegedly used of Jesus. The expression, "our Lord and Savior," is a favorite one in 2 Peter—1:11; 2:20; 3:2, 18—to designate Jesus. Finally, trinitarians allege Rom. 9:5 as a proof that Jesus is God Almighty, and that therefore the trinity doctrine is true. They translate it thus: "Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen." The A. R. V. offers in its margin what we consider a better translation: "Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh; He who is over all, God, be blessed forever. Amen." According to this translation it is not Christ who in this verse is spoken of as over all; but it is the Father.

The following things favor this rendering: The word Amen at the end of the sentence favors the idea of the last clause of v. 5 being a doxology. A doxology is in place here in view of the great favors, as the connection shows, that St. Paul enumerates as having been given his people, culminating in Christ's Advent, which is a prophecy of the return of special favor to Israel, because of those that they had had, as enumerated in vs. 4, 5. While St. Paul almost never in his writings makes a doxology to Christ, 1 Tim. 6:16 being the only undoubted one, he frequently does to God. Again, the Greek words, *ho on*, should not be

translated *who*, as trinitarian translators give this passage, for they so translate it to make the last clause refer to Jesus. But they should be rendered, "*He who*," which proves that at least a semicolon, but preferably a period, should follow the word *flesh*, so that the rest of the verse is a coordinate or full sentence. Finally the trinitarian interpretation of this verse makes it contradict the universal teaching of the Bible that Christ is not God over all, *i.e.*, the Supreme Being; but the Father, as God Almighty alone, is such. Thus we have examined every passage that trinitarians allege speak of Christ as God and have from these very passages shown that whenever the word God is applied to Him, it is as a common noun, which proves that He is not the Supreme God. Whenever the name God refers to the Supreme Being, it is used as a proper noun, and belongs alone to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus. This fact overthrows the contention of the trinitarians that the ascription of the word God to Jesus proves the trinity; for used as a common noun, as it is, when used of Jesus, it is not an exclusive name of God, since, as we have shown above, as a common noun it applies to angels and powerful and great men. Hence their argument that the name God is an exclusive appellation of the Deity, and, being applied to Jesus, proves Him to be the Deity is an error. It is not an exclusive appellation of Deity. Hence where to Jesus it is applied they must have other pertinent things beside to prove their point, which trinitarians have not yet been able to produce.

Trinitarians claim that the title Lord, applied to our Lord Jesus, proves that He is God Almighty. They darken this phase of the question by ignoring several facts: (1) That the word lord is a common noun, and not a proper noun; and (2) by conveying the impression that the Greek word Kyrios, Lord, means Jehovah, which it does not mean. That the word kyrios is a common noun, and not a proper

noun, is manifest from the following passages: Matt. 6:24; 10:24, 25; 15:27; Luke 19:33; John 12:21; 15:15, 20; 20:15; Acts 16:16, 19, 30; 25:26; 1 Cor. 8:5; Gal. 4:1; Eph. 6:5, 9; Col. 3:22; 4:1; 1 Pet. 3:6; Rev. 7:14. Accordingly, it is a title for rulers, nobles, owners, superiors, and is used in polite address. Hence it is not a title of God exclusively; therefore its use in connection with our Lord does not prove Him to be God Almighty. Trinitarians try from this title *Kyrios* to convey the thought that our Lord is Jehovah, because the latter word is translated Lord in the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, and is in the Greek of the New Testament when quoting from the Septuagint given by *Kyrios*. In reply we would say, because the Jews in their superstitiousness refused to pronounce the Hebrew word translated Jehovah, the Jewish translation of the Old Testament into Greek, the Septuagint, never uses the word Jehovah, but in its stead uses the word *Kyrios*, whereas the word Jehovah, being a proper noun, should have been transliterated into Greek. It should never have been translated Lord; for it is a proper name, as it is *Jehovah*.

The course of the Septuagint led to the fact that the name Jehovah was never carried over into Greek; hence the New Testament uses the word Lord for *Jehovah*, *Adon* and *Adonai* without any distinction, which fact, since in the Old Testament the name Jehovah is the exclusive name of the Father, refutes the trinitarians' claim that the title Lord, applied to Jesus, proves Him to be Jehovah, and thus God Almighty. *E.g.*, using *Kyrios* for both *Jehovah* and *Adon*, Jesus, St. Peter and St. Paul quote Ps. 110:1, "The Lord [*Jehovah*] said unto my Lord [*Adon*]," and apply the word that stands for *Adon*, not the word that stands for *Jehovah*, to our Lord, while the word that is used for Jehovah they apply to the Father (Matt. 22:41-45; Acts 2:34-36; Heb. 1:13),

which, among other examples, proves that Jehovah as a name did not go over into Greek, but through a Jewish superstition it was rendered into Greek by *Kyrios*, Lord. Trinitarians to ward off the force of the one God and one Lord and the God and Lord contrasting passages, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. 8:6; Jude 25, see A. R. V., *etc.*, claim that calling the Father here the one God, no more proves that Jesus is not God than calling Jesus the one Lord proves that the Father is not Lord. To this we reply that Deity in its very nature always implies lordship, while lordship does not necessarily imply Deity, as the examples above show. Hence this evasion of theirs does not meet the point. Our examination of the trinitarians' claim that the names, Jehovah, God, Lord, belong exclusively to God, and being applied to Jesus prove Him to be God Almighty, and thus prove the trinity doctrine, has resulted in this, that the only one of these words that is exclusively applicable to God, Jehovah, is never applied to our Lord as His name, that the word God, when used as a proper noun, is the name of the Supreme Being alone, and is never applied to Jesus in the Bible, though the common noun God is, and that the word Lord is a common noun, and is applied in the Bible to any superior or any one treated as a superior in politeness. Hence the trinitarian argument on the alleged exclusive names of God being applied in the Bible to Jesus, falls to the ground, which leaves the point intended to be proved by it hanging in the air.

We will now take up their second argument for their fourth alleged indirect proof of the trinity, *i.e.*, the attributes that the Bible exclusively ascribes to God it expressly ascribes to Jesus Christ. These attributes they claim are, past eternity, supremacy, omnipresence, omnipotence and omniscience. We have already refuted their idea that our Lord always was and is God's equal, and hence is supreme. We have also shown that their claim of the Logos' being from

eternity is not proven by Mic. 5:2 (goings forth have been from old, from everlasting); nor by Is. 9:6 (everlasting Father); nor by John 1:1, 2 (in *a*, not *the* beginning). The Bible teaches many beginnings, none of them meaning *without* beginning, which is meant by the past eternity, *e.g.*, of the universe (Gen. 1:1), of man (Matt. 19:4, 8), of the Gospel Age (Luke 1:1, 2; 2 Thes. 2:13), of the second world (Heb. 1:10), and of the period of angelic creation before the creation of the universe (John 1:1, 2). In every one of the passages just cited the original read in *a* beginning, not in *the* beginning; the very word means the reverse of eternity, which is without a beginning. They quote Heb. 13:8, "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, today, and forever," as an alleged proof of our Lord's past eternity, interpreting its yesterday as meaning the past eternity, its today as the present, and its forever as the future eternity. Our understanding of this verse is that the yesterday refers to the Jewish Age, which is Biblically referred to as a day, while eternity is never Biblically called a day (Rom. 10:21; Heb. 1:2, literally, "the last one of these days." These days are the three Days or Ages of the second world, (the Patriarchal, Jewish and Gospel Days or Ages], whose last day is the Gospel Day or Age); its today refers to the Gospel Age (Rom. 8:36; 2 Cor. 6:2; Heb. 3:13, 15) and its forever refers to the future eternity. Had St. Paul here referred to Jesus as having existed from eternity he would not have used the word yesterday, which does not imply duration without a beginning, just as the word today does not mean eternity; rather he would have used some term meaning the past eternity, even as when he refers to the future eternity he does not use the word tomorrow but uses a term expressive of eternity. That in this verse St. Paul did not mean that our Lord was without a beginning is manifest from the fact that he believed Him to have had a beginning,

as the firstborn of every creature (Col. 1:15, compare with Rev. 3:14). Hence neither this verse nor any other teaches that Christ is from eternity.

We have already in the following passages given sufficient proof to the effect that Jesus is inferior to the Father: John 14:28; 10:29; 1 Cor. 3:23; 11:3; 15:28; Phil. 2:6, A. R. V.; 1 Pet. 1:3; Ps. 45:6, 7; Mic. 5:4, which are a few among many that might be quoted to prove it. The only passage that they quote to prove He is the Father's equal is John 10:30, which says nothing about the subject. We have already discussed the passage as not proving that He and the Father are one God. To their use of Matt. 18:20, "Where two or three are gathered ... there am I in the midst," and Matt. 28:20, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the Age," to prove His bodily omnipresence, we reply: Their interpretation must be wrong; for His bodily presence throughout the Age has been in heaven (Acts 3:21). Moreover His presence with His Church has been by the Holy Spirit as His Representative (John 14:16-18, 26; 15:26; 16:7). To their use of Matt. 28:18, "All authority was given me in heaven and on earth," as a proof of His being omnipotent, we reply: (1) This passage proves that there was a time when He did not have all authority in heaven and earth (*has been given* unto me), which disproves His having omnipotence as an inherent quality; (2) this passage proves that He is God's appointed Vicegerent; (3) this passage ascribes to Him as God's Vicegerent not all power (*dynamis*), but all authority (*exousia*); (4) this passage proves that whatever authority He exercises, He exercises it not as His own, but as God's, whose Vicegerent He was made in His resurrection (Heb. 1:3-5; Phil. 2:9-11; Eph. 1:19-23; Rev. 5:9-13). No passage of the Bible ascribes omnipresence and omnipotence to Christ, as inherent qualities of His own. To their use of John 21:17, "Lord, thou knowest

all things," as a proof of His having omniscience, we reply: Peter did not utter these words by inspiration. Moreover, Peter likely meant by the expression, "Lord, thou knowest all things," not that Jesus was omniscient, but that He knew everything about Peter and therefore knew that Peter loved Him. There is no inspired Scripture that teaches that Jesus is omniscient. Mark 13:32; Acts 1:7 prove that He is not omniscient. Eternity, supremacy, omnipresence, omnipotence and omniscience are attributes that belong exclusively to the Father inherently. Hence the assertion of trinitarians to the effect that the attributes which the Bible exclusively ascribe to the Father are by the Bible expressly ascribed to Jesus, is a false statement, as to matters of fact; hence their second argument for their fourth alleged indirect proof of the trinity falls down.

The third argument for the fourth alleged indirect proof that trinitarians give for their doctrine is, that the works that the Bible ascribes to God alone are expressly in it ascribed to Jesus. These works they enumerate as follows: Creation and preservation (John 1:3; Heb. 1:3), power to forgive sins (Matt. 9:6) and the execution of judgment (John 5:27). To this we reply, that these powers were all used by our Lord, not of His own inherent possession, but as God's Agent and Representative. This is proven as to creation and preservation by the following passages: 1 Cor. 8:6; Eph. 3:9; Heb. 1:2, 3. In none of the passages treating of His creating all things (John 1:3; Col. 1:16) is the preposition *hypo* (*by*) used, but the prepositions *en* and *dia* (*through*) are used, which do not indicate original creatorship, as *hypo* does, but agent or subordinate creatorship. Accordingly, His acting as God's Agent in creation not only does not prove that He is God Almighty, but disproves it. That original authority to forgive sins belongs to God alone, and that God delegated to Jesus, by virtue of His bringing the Ransom, authority as God's direct Agent

to forgive sins, is evident from the following passages Rom. 4:8; 2 Cor. 5:18-21; Eph. 4:32; Col. 2:13; 1 John 1:7, 8; Luke 24:47; Acts 2:38; 10:36; 13:38, 39; 1 John 2:1, 2. Thus in this matter His authority is a derived, not an original one, which is evident from the fact that sin is an offense against God, not against Christ, and that God to forgive sins arranged for Christ to provide the Ransom for its forgiveness. The same principle applies as to matter of executing judgment. God is the original judge (Heb. 10:30; 12:23, please note how He is in v. 23 contrasted, as judge, with Jesus, as Mediator, in v. 24; Rom. 3:6); but He delegates to Jesus, as His Agent, the judging work, as the following passages show: John 5:22, 27; Acts 17:31; Rom. 2:16. Thus the relation of the Father and Son in the work of judging proves that the Son is God's Agent therein, and does not act as original judge; hence this work of executing judgment does not prove Him to be God. Accordingly, none of God's exclusive works does He do, which disproves the third argument for the fourth alleged indirect proof that the Son is God Almighty; and this fact of His being God's Agent in these works, accordingly, does not prove the trinity doctrine; rather it disproves it; for an agent is inferior to his employer.

The fourth and final argument for the fourth alleged indirect proof that trinitarians offer for Jesus being God Almighty, and that they claim, accordingly, proves the trinity doctrine, is that in the Bible the honor that belongs to God alone is expressly ascribed to our Lord. This honor they say is worship, reverence.

In proof that Jesus is given such honor and worship they cite John 5:23; Phil. 2:10; Heb. 1:6. We agree that our Lord is to be honored by our exalting Him highly in our motives, thoughts, words and deeds, and is to be worshiped. But we deny that He is to have such equally with the Father; but is to receive them as the Father's Representative and Plenipotentiary.

We have already shown that John 5:23 does not teach that an equal honor is to be given our Lord with the Father. The honor to be given them is not to be one of the same degree, but one of fact, because the Son is the Father's Representative and Plenipotentiary in all things. Thus they honor Him as the Father in a Representative. Phil. 2:10 indeed shows that every knee will bow to Christ; but it is to Him as God's Representative, and not to Him as the final goal of every creature's honor; but, as the next verse shows, Christ's exaltation is a means to a higher end—that God be the one finally honored. Indeed our Lord is to be worshiped. But a Divinely pleasing worship is not a thing given exclusively to God; for God says that He will cause the enemies of the Church to worship Her (Is. 60:14; Rev. 3:9). When Protestant trinitarians stress Matt. 4:10 as a proof that God alone may receive worship in harmony with God's will, they leave out of consideration numerous Scriptures to the contrary, and the implied contrast in Jesus' warding off Satan's suggestion that He worship him. What is forbidden is to worship anyone not in harmony with God, or one in rivalry with God, *e.g.*, Satan, Antichrist. In His own God alone may be worshiped, which includes the Bible worship given God's representatives as such, as was frequently done to the angelic representatives of God in the Bible, as is done to Jesus, and as will be done to the glorified Church by mankind in the Millennium.

A consideration of the Greek and Hebrew words translated worship will show this. The Hebrew word, *shachah*, is the one usually translated worship and means to bow down in reverence. In the 170 occurrences of this word only about one half refer to the worship of God, which is hidden from the English reader, because the word in nearly half of its occurrences is translated to bow, bow down, do reverence, do obeisance, as can be seen from the following passages:

Gen. 18:2-4; 19:1; 23:7, 12; 27:29; 1 Sam. 24:8; 25:23, 41; 2 Sam. 9:6; 14:4, 22. The Greek word usually translated worship is *proskyneō*, and means to kiss the hand, as a dog licks one's hand. Like the Hebrew *shachah*, it means reverence. Is. 60:14; Rev. 3:9 are conclusive proof that it is permissible to worship God's representatives, as the Israelites did to the Lord's angels who came to them with God's message. Had the Jews the extreme view of Protestant trinitarians on this subject, they would have stoned those who worshiped our Lord; for none of these Jews believed Him to be God Almighty, they understanding the prohibition of worship to be limited to idols and rivals of God. Hence Jesus' receiving worship by God's sanction no more implies that He is God Almighty, than the Church (Is. 60:14; Rev. 3:9), the herald angels, David, *etc.*, receiving worship by God's sanction are thereby proven to be God Almighty. Our study of the four arguments for the fourth alleged indirect proof that Jesus is God Almighty, *i.e.*, the names, attributes, works and honors that belong to God alone are by the Bible expressly ascribed to Him, proves that they fall to the ground for the reason that, as we have seen, none of the names, attributes, works and honors that are exclusively God's are ever ascribed to our Lord of His own inherent right; as we have found that Jesus' relation to God in these four respects is never more than that of a Representative, Executive, Vicegerent, Plenipotentiary, or Mouthpiece.

The fifth alleged indirect proof that trinitarians offer for the trinity doctrine, like the fourth, is alleged to be demonstrated by four separate arguments. It is this: The Holy Spirit is God Almighty, because in the Bible the names, attributes, works and honors that belong to God alone are expressly ascribed to Him. But if we remember that the words Holy Spirit mean (1) God's power and (2) God's disposition—His

mind, heart and will—we will find that their attempted proof breaks down at every point. In the first place, they cannot quote one passage that expressly calls the Holy Spirit, as such, Jehovah. They try to read it into Num. 6:24-26 and Is. 6:3; but the words Holy Spirit do not occur in either passage. Our explanation above disproves the thought that the trinity is referred to in Num. 6:24-26. They think that the threefold use of the word "Holy" in Is. 6:3 proves it. Surely a farfetched proof! The three double blessings, one for each one of three pertinent conditions of God's people implied in Num. 6:24-26, being the things for which holiness is ascribed to God, because they are the way God's wisdom, justice, love and power (the seraphim of Is. 6:2 and the four living creatures of Ezek. 1; Rev. 4) operate, symbolically speak, are doubtless the occasion of using the word holy three times of God in Is. 6:3. Not only is the name Jehovah never applied to the Holy Spirit in the Bible, but even the Hebrew words *Adon*, *Adonai*, and the Greek word *Kyrios* are never applied to the Holy Spirit. That leaves only one other proper name ascribed to the Father only, God, in the supreme sense, to be considered. Does the Bible ever call the Holy Spirit God? We answer, it does not!

Trinitarians claim to find a proof that the Holy Spirit is God in Acts 5:3, 4, "Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Spirit? ... thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." They reason as follows: Lying to the Holy Spirit is lying unto God; Ananias lied to the Holy Spirit; hence the Holy Spirit is God. We, too, claim that lying to the Holy Spirit is lying to God; but deny that the Holy Spirit is God. An illustration will show this: Whatever one does, *e.g.*, to one of the English King's judges in their capacity as judges, who while acting as such are the King's representatives, they do to the King; but who would say that such

judges are the King? So Ananias lied to Peter, who, acting on the occasion as an Apostle, God's representative, was as such not only then the instrument of the holy power of God, but also a partaker of the heart, mind and will of God, God's Holy Spirit, disposition. Hence he lied to the Holy Spirit; and because the Holy Spirit both as God's power and disposition in Peter represented God on that occasion, Ananias in lying to God's representative lied to God. This proves that this passage does not show that the Holy Spirit is God. Therefore this peculiar name of God is in the Bible not ascribed to the Holy Spirit. Hence the first argument for the fifth alleged indirect proof of the trinity—that the Bible ascribes God's peculiar names to the Holy Spirit—falls to the ground. Trinitarians cite passages where the terms, Spirit of God, Spirit of the Lord and His (God's) Spirit, occur, and claim that these expressions prove that the Spirit is God. As logically could we say that the terms, the hair of the head, the scabbard of the sword, the tail of the horse, mean respectively the head, sword and horse. This is the same kind of logic that claims, the expression, "Son of God," proves that Jesus is God, which means that one can be his own father and his own son, and that at the same time! Trinitarians, with a combination of their logic on Acts 5:3, 4 and of that which we have just exposed on the expressions, Spirit of God, *etc.*, use, as a proof that the Spirit is God, 1 Cor. 3:16, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." This passage neither says, nor implies that the Holy Spirit is God. The saints are God's temple, and that because God's Spirit dwells in them; but that does not prove the Spirit of God is God. God is in us not personally; for personally He is in Heaven; but He is in us, and dwells in us by His Holy Spirit, holy power and disposition, as His Representative, which makes us God's habitation as His temple (Eph. 2:20-22).

But this passage does not say or imply that the Spirit is God. Thus our examination proves that trinitarians have failed to give any passage that calls the Holy Spirit Jehovah, God or Lord. Hence the first argument for their fifth alleged indirect proof of the trinity is not a matter of fact; it is a false claim, and therefore as a proof falls to the ground, and leaves the thing that it was intended to prove, the trinity, high up in the air without any support.

The second argument for their alleged fifth indirect proof of the trinity, that the Holy Spirit is God, is that God's exclusive attributes are in the Bible expressly ascribed to the Holy Spirit. To their claim that Ps. 139:7-10 proves the Spirit has as an attribute omnipresence, which doubtless is exclusively an attribute of God, we reply, first, by a question: How is God omnipresent? Certainly not by His body, which is in Heaven (1 Kings 8:30), but by His attributes, according to Ps. 139:7-10, of power and wisdom. This is proven by vs. 7, 8, 10 where the word Spirit is used in the sense of power and wisdom, not in that of a personal being; for according to v. 8 God is said to be in hell, the death state, oblivion. This cannot be true of Him as a person. It doubtless refers to His wisdom, that permeates even the death state, and to his power that will sometime empty it. Hence it is by His wisdom and power that He is in hell, oblivion; and thus by His power and wisdom, not by His body, He is omnipresent. That God's wisdom and power are in this passage meant by His Spirit is very plain from v. 10, where His hand (power) and right hand (wisdom) are used synonymously with the word Spirit in v. 7. This whole passage proves that nowhere in the universe can one remove himself from the power and knowledge of God. Of course in this sense His Spirit—power, knowledge—extends throughout the universe; but this does not prove the Spirit to be God; it disproves it. To the trinitarians' claim that

the words, "The Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God" (1 Cor. 2:10), are a proof of the Spirit's omniscience, another exclusive attribute of God, we would say that the Spirit here is evidently not God Almighty; for He knows all things that He desires to know, intuitively, and hence needs not to search (study out) the deep things of God. Evidently here, as the connection shows, the Spirit means not God's mind in Himself, but His Spirit, God's mind in us, our new creature, which searches the deep things of God. This experience proves to be true. God's Spirit as His disposition in Himself, through its mental faculties, knows all things that He desires to know without searching; but God's disposition in Himself or in us is no more Himself than our dispositions are ourselves. Hence this passage does not treat of the Spirit's omniscience; hence does not prove the thing it is quoted to prove. Trinitarians quote 1 Cor. 12:11 to prove that the Spirit is omnipotent. Of course God's Spirit in the sense of power is omnipotent; but here the word Spirit is used in both senses, power of God and disposition of God. But God's power is not God, neither is His disposition. Thus these three passages prove that God in His power is omnipresent and omnipotent and in His disposition in Himself is omniscient. But that does not make His power and His disposition (His Spirit) Himself. Hence these passages do not prove the trinitarians' contention that the Spirit is God Himself. The Spirit manifests Itself in these exclusive attributes of God for the reason that the Spirit is these attributes themselves, plus more beside; and, of course, God's attributes are not Himself; they are merely qualities of Himself as a person. Thus this second argument for their fifth alleged indirect proof of the trinity falls down.

The third argument for the fifth alleged indirect proof of the trinity is that God's exclusive works are in the Bible attributed to the Holy Spirit, hence the

Holy Spirit must be God. They enumerate among these works first, Creation, for which they quote Gen. 1:2; Ps. 33:6; Job 33:4 as proofs. Of course God's power and wisdom produced creation, as these passages say, Gen. 1:2 and Job 33:4 referring to His Spirit in the sense of power, while Ps. 33:6 refers to His Word, the "breath of His mouth," in the sense of His wisdom, that part of His disposition that exercises knowledge—His mind. But of course God's power and wisdom are not Himself; they are qualities of Himself. Another of the works that the Spirit does, and that trinitarians allege proves that the Spirit is God, is the begetting, renewal and birth of the Spirit (John 3:3, 5; Tit. 3:5). We grant that the Spirit does these works, and that only God can do them. But God does them by His power, Spirit; and certainly God's power is not Himself. So the fact that the Spirit did the works of Creation, and now does the work of regeneration does not prove that the Spirit is God Himself; it merely proves that the Spirit is God's power, which is not a person but an attribute of a person. So the third argument for the fifth alleged indirect proof of the trinity falls down.

Their fourth argument for their alleged fifth proof of the trinity is that God's exclusive honor—worship—is by the Bible expressly ascribed to the Spirit. But they are even more straitened to find a proof passage on this subject than on their first argument for their fifth alleged proof for the Holy Spirit's being God—God's exclusive names Scripturally attributed to the Spirit. Their main alleged proof is Is. 6:3, the words of the seraphim, "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts." We have already refuted the use of these words as applying to the Son or the Spirit. We may further add that if the Holy Spirit were a person separate and distinct from the Father and Son, Is. 6 (which certainly refers to the Son by its *Adonai* and to the Father by its *Jehovah*, though

disproving that the Son is God Almighty by the title it gives Him as distinct from the Father's title) is surely the place where we ought to find reference made to the Holy Spirit as a person; for Is. 6 describes a scene in Heaven connected with the execution of God's plan. But no mention of the Spirit is made at all in the whole chapter. How straitened must those be for proof of worship ascribed to the Holy Spirit who quote Is. 6:3 for it! More desperate still is their use of Matt. 28:19, "Baptizing them into the name [character likeness] of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit," as a proof of worship given to the Holy Spirit, for the passage has nothing to say of worship or honor. If they did have real proof texts for their thought, they would never quote Is. 6:3; Matt. 28:19 on this point. There is no Bible passage referring to worship given to the Holy Spirit. Hence the Bible does not teach it. But understanding the Holy Spirit in its second sense—God's disposition in Himself—His holy mind, heart and will—we would not say it would be wrong to worship It, understanding such worship to be intended for God in His holy character; because the chief reason we have for worshipping God is His holy character. We therefore in such worship endorse singing such hymns as "Holy Spirit, banish sadness," and "Holy Spirit, faithful Guide"; for if the Bible had charged or endorsed such worship, which it nowhere expressly does, it would mean worshipping the Father (also the Son) in their holy dispositions, thus not meaning that the Spirit is a person, but the disposition of the Father primarily, and secondarily of the Son, and then of the holy angels and of the saints. Accordingly, the fourth argument that trinitarians allege for their fifth indirect proof of the trinity falls to the ground; and thus we have found every one of these arguments to be false, which proves their fifth alleged indirect proof to be false. With this and the fourth one, *i.e.*, as to the Son, goes

to pieces their theory that the Father's, Son's and Holy Spirit's cooperating in the work of Creation, preservation, and salvation, proves the trinity; for this cooperation by the Son is that of an Agent, and by the Spirit is that of God's attributes.

Trinitarians seek as a sixth indirect proof of the trinity to show that the Holy Spirit is a person; and think they find this proof in the fact that the Spirit in the Bible is set forth as thinking (1 Cor. 2:10), feeling (Eph. 4:30) and willing (1 Cor. 12:11). We agree that the Spirit thinks, feels and wills, which proves the personality of the Spirit in the sense of God's disposition, His mind, heart and will, in Himself, in our Lord, in the holy angels and in the saints; for the personality of the Holy Spirit is not a person, but is the Father, Son, good angels and saints in their dispositions. We believe in the personality of the Holy Spirit; but deny that the Holy Spirit is a person. But one's disposition is not a person, it is the sum total of his mental, moral and religious qualities as a person. Thus God's Spirit, in the second sense of that word, is the sum total of God's, Christ's, the holy angels' and the saints' mental, moral and religious qualities as persons. But the sum total of one's mental, moral and religious qualities as a person is not himself, a person; rather it is the attributes of himself, a person, who should not be confused with his attributes. So the sixth alleged indirect proof of the trinity falls to the ground. Trinitarians seek also to prove their thought, that the Holy Spirit is a person, by referring to the masculine pronouns used of It in John 14:17, 26; 15:26; 16:7, 8, 13-15.

On this point we make several replies: (1) The trinitarian translators have sectarianly given a bias in their favor to this subject in John 14:17, where in the Greek all the pronouns referring to the Holy Spirit are neuter, in John 14:26, where one of the two is neuter, in John 15:26, where one of the three is neuter,

and in John 16:7, 8, 13-15, where they are mainly masculine, and in the other cases the gender is not definitely expressed, since in those forms the masculine and neuter genders are alike. (2) This raises the question, Why this diversity? Our answer to this question will show our second point on this subject. The diversity is due to the fact that in Greek gender is not based on sex and non-sex, as in English, but on the endings of the nouns, regardless of sex or non-sex, *e.g.*, the Greek word for Comforter is *Parakletos*, and is masculine, because it is a noun of the second declension ending in *os*, all of which with this ending, with very rare exceptions, are masculine, while the Greek word for Spirit is *Pneuma* and is neuter, because it is a noun of the third declension ending in *ma*. When in the Greek of these passages the pronouns refer to *Parakletos*, they are always masculine; but when they refer to *Pneuma*, they are always neuter. The reason is this: Pronouns in Greek must agree, among other ways, in gender with the nouns to which they refer; hence properly in referring to *Parakletos* they are masculine in the Greek, and properly in referring to *Pneuma* they are neuter in the Greek. And hence (3) from the gender of the pronouns used in connection with these two words we cannot infer anything one way or the other, on whether the Holy Spirit is a person or not. This must be found out from what the teachings of all the Scriptures using the term Holy Spirit are. Our study has surely given us proof in abundance that the Spirit is not a person. Our trinitarian translators know these rules of grammar just given; but seemingly in their sectarianism, which they doubtless honestly held, they gave a bias to these passages favorable to their view. Accordingly, the masculine pronouns of John 14:17, 26; 15:26; 16:7, 8, 13-15 do not prove that the Holy Spirit is a person, just as the neuter pronouns of these passages do not prove that the

Holy Spirit is not a person. Hence the trinitarian contention, based on the masculine pronouns of these passages, that the Holy Spirit is a person, falls to the ground. However, since it is customary to designate powerful things, *e.g.*, the sun, by masculine pronouns, and delicate things, *e.g.*, the moon, by feminine pronouns, we often refer to the Holy Spirit by masculine pronouns, but do not mean thereby that It is a person. We have, however, in this article referred to the Holy Spirit by neuter pronouns designedly, for the sake of clarity, to emphasize its contrast with the error that we have been combating on the subject.

Finally, trinitarians offer a seventh alleged indirect proof of the trinity—man's creation in God's image (Gen. 1:26); for they allege man is a trinity—body, soul and spirit in one being; hence they conclude, God, whose image he is, must be a trinity! To this alleged proof of the trinity we offer several refutations: (1) Nowhere does the Bible indicate that God's image in man is man in his body, soul and spirit; (2) God's image in man is His mental, moral and religious likeness to God (Eph. 4:23, 24; Col. 3:10); (3) God's image as such in man has been effaced, proven by the fact that it is being renewed in the saints (Eph. 4:23; Col. 3:10; Rom. 12:2; Tit. 3:5); but man's body, soul and spirit are not effaced; hence God's image in man does not consist of these; and (4) man is not a trinity. He is a unity; for man is a soul that has two parts, body and spirit (in the sense of life principle, Gen. 2:7). Thus God is a unity, not a trinity, for He is a soul (Is. 42:1; Matt. 12:18; Heb. 10:38) that has two parts, body (John 5:37) and spirit (which word does not here have the meaning of the Holy Spirit, but the life principle, John 5:26). This fact is true of every other sentient being in the universe, Christ, angels, *etc.* Accordingly, this alleged proof falls to the ground.

Thus we have brought our examination and refutation of the trinity doctrine to an end. As pointed out in the beginning, we have had to be terse in dealing with so vast a subject; but we believe we have fairly presented and sufficiently refuted this error, whose wide prevalence among all nations during the time that darkness prevails among the nations (Is. 60:2), is a sure proof of its being championed by the god [ruler] of this world, Satan (2 Cor. 4:4).

With our discussion of tritheism—trinity—we bring our discussion of false views of God to an end, and therewith conclude our discussion of God. In this discussion we have proved that there is a God: from the universality of the belief as a proof of its being grounded in the constitution of man, from cause to effect, from the order and the reign of law in the world, from design everywhere manifest in the universe, from man's mental, moral and religious nature, from experience and from the impossibility of disproving His existence, or of proving that He does not exist. We have, further, discussed God's attributes of being and shown that the main ones are His personality, corporeality, spirituality, self-existence, eternity, self-sufficiency, immortality, invisibility, unity, omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, supremacy, unfathomableness, all of which attributes of being naturally evoke reverence in a responsive heart. We have learned that the elements of God's character are His righteous attitude toward evil, holy affections, the graces, strength, dominance by the higher primary graces, balance and crystallization. Thereafter we considered God's graces. First we considered His higher primary graces: wisdom, justice, love and power, and found their function to be that of properly coordinated rulership over all other elements of character. Then we considered His lower primary graces of self-esteem, approbateness, restfulness, vitativeness, self-defensiveness, aggressiveness, carefulness, secretiveness,

providence, intelligence, agreeableness, conjugality, fatherliness and kingliness. Next God's secondary graces of modesty, industriousness, longsuffering, forbearance, forgiveness, courage, candor and liberality engaged our attention. After this we studied His tertiary graces, particularizing on His meekness, zeal, moderation, magnanimity, or goodness, and faithfulness. And, finally, we reviewed the various false views of God: in their infidelistic forms of atheism, materialism, agnosticism, pantheism and deism, as well as in their heathen forms of polytheism and tritheism.

In this discussion we omitted a study of God's works, designing it for later treatment. Nor did we attempt to treat exhaustively any of the phases of God under discussion, since that would have carried us into too great detail. But we discussed our subject from general standpoints, designing to give the reader clear, Biblical views of God, so that both by head and by heart he might be drawn to a proper appreciation of, love for, and devotion to God, whose glorious person, Holy Spirit, marvelous plan and great works, properly appraised, will draw the good head and heart into spontaneous appreciation, love and worship of Him. Surely, our study should move all of us to enter in spirit into a life-long realization of the Psalmist's exhortation, "O come, let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord, our Maker" (Ps. 95:6); for in its heart of hearts this passage implies such an appreciation, love and devotion, and of these God is supremely worthy.

Praise God from whom all blessings flow;
Praise Him all creatures here below;
Praise Him aloud with heart and voice,
And always in His Son rejoice!