

www.1atime.org
Reflections



Many verses can be quoted from polluted "bible versions" to support the Trinity doctrine. This is founded on syncretism. The Thurah, the Prophets, Yahusha and the Followers of the Way never mentioned it. The first ecumenical council of the "Roman Church", the Council of Nicea in 325 C.E, marked a milestone in the theological development of the "Mother Church" In that council was finally decided what would be the official doctrine of the Church around the Deity. **The "TRINITY" was born! **

Do the Scriptures really teach the elaborate—and highly contradictory—doctrine of the Trinity?

KJV-Genesis 1:1 In the beginning "God" created the heavens and the earth

.

Hebrew - בראשית ברא אלהים את השמים ואת הארץ

LT-Genesis 1:1 Literal translation: **H7225**-*First, beginning*, **H430**- *The Mighty ones*, **H1254**- *shaped, formed, created*, **H853**- *The First and the Last (eth, אֵת the first and last letters of the Hebrew Alphabet, sign of the definite direct object, not translated)* **H8064**- *heaven*, **H853**- *The First and the Last (eth, אֵת the first and last letters of the Hebrew Alphabet, sign of the definite direct object, not translated)* **H776**- *earth, land, whole earth*.

Many have read Genesis 1:1 several times. There are a vast number of reasons to read it *once again*, in the original Hebrew language, and see how much blessing and knowledge can be restored. The first detail is that this Hebrew Scripture has 7 words, is this coincidence? **NO it is not!** The number 7 is all through Scriptures symbolizing completion and perfection! Genesis 1:1 indeed is one of the most profound and misunderstood verses in Scripture and denotes the plurality of Elahym with the signature, a mark showing the אֵת and the אֵת probably from תּוֹא (H225)-(sign, signal, a distinguishing mark, banner, remembrance, miraculous sign, etc) as two Mighty ones, not Three. Yahusha referred to Himself in Rev 1:8 as the "αΩ" Greek for the alpha and the Omega, since we know He could have not told Yochanan this in Greek, Yahusha, a Hebrew, spoke to a Hebrew in their own language, He clearly said: *I am the אֵת, (I am the one back there in the beginning with the Father creating all things, Prov 8:22)*. To put it another way, these two members, the Father and the Son, reside in heaven in maximum authority over all things, The Father seats on the throne and The Son seats at the right hand of The Father, but where is the throne for the *Holy Spirit?*, and what about this "*Holy Spirit*"?

KJV-Genesis 1:2 And the "Spirit of God" moved upon the face of the waters.

LT-Genesis 1:2 Literal translation: And the H7307-wind, breath, mind, force and power of H430-The Mighty ones, (the אַח and the אַת)they both moved upon the face of the waters.

The Set Apart Spirit (H7307 *Ruach*) is the invisible dynamic force, the mind, the power flowing of the Father and His Son, Luke 24:49, John 3:8, 14:17, 15:26; 1Cor 2:10-16. The Set Apart Spirit is like a strong wind, John 3:8, Acts 10:45, a dynamic force, invisible and is not a "person". The word H7307- *Ruach*, appears 378 times in Scripture.

Many millions believe that (H1408-אלהים)"God" consists of three distinct persons or entities—"the Father, Son and Holy Spirit"—in one being. How do we choose between explanations regarding His nature? Simply stated, only the Scriptures can give us the true answer. The fact that the word *Trinity* appears nowhere in Scripture also gives us reason to reflect. We must not cling to long-held religious traditions if they contradict the Scriptures. Our beliefs must rest on a strong foundation. Yahusha declared; Elahym, Your word is truth (John 17:17; compare Psalm 119:160).

Historical evidence

The fact of the matter is that Scripture does *not* teach the Trinity. The opening words of *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* under the article "*Trinity*" are enlightening: "*Because the Trinity is such an important part of latter Christian doctrine, it is striking*

that the term does not appear in the New Testament. Likewise, the developed concept of three coequal partners in the "Godhead" found in later creedal formulations cannot be clearly detected within the confines of the [New Testament] canon" (Bruce Metzger and Michael Coogan, editors, 1993, p. 782).

The term "latter" is a vital key in understanding why general *Christian* belief has been burdened with the Trinity doctrine. Theologians after the first century originally conceived the doctrine, and others added to and elaborated on it over the years that followed.

Notice this admission in the *New Bible Dictionary*: "*The term 'Trinity' is not itself found in the Bible. It was first used by Tertullian [one of the early Catholic Church theologians] at the close of the 2nd century, but received wide currency and formal elucidation only in the 4th and 5th centuries*" (1996, "Trinity"). The same dictionary explains that "*the formal doctrine of the Trinity was the result of several inadequate attempts to explain who and what the "Christian God" really is... To deal with these problems the Church Fathers met in 325 at the Council of Nicaea to set out an orthodox biblical definition concerning the divine identity.*" However, it wasn't until 381, "*at the Council of Constantinople, [that] the divinity of the Spirit was affirmed.*" Another theological source admits that there was "*an impression of binitarianism [that is, two in unity, the Father and Son] given by much second- and third-century thought ... Pluralist thinkers ... maintained the full co-presence of the two (later three) distinct entities within the Godhead*" (Alan Richardson, editor, *A Dictionary of Christian Theology*, 1969, p. 345).

Indeed, the second-century bishop Irenaeus, an earlier church father, stated unequivocally, "*There is none other called God by*

the Scriptures except the Father of all, and the Son, and those who possess the adoption [i.e., son-ship as God's children]" (Against Heresies, Book 4, preface; compare Book 3, chap. 6). We find no mention here of the "*Holy Spirit*" being a third person as "*God*". Rather, the concept here is that of human beings becoming part of the family now consisting of the Father and the Son.

We see, then, that the doctrine of the *Trinity* wasn't formalized until long after the Writings were completed and the emissaries were long dead in their graves. It took later theologians several centuries to sort out what they believed concerning the "*Holy Spirit*". Regrettably, the "*Trinity*" doctrine has been a major barrier to clear comprehension of the truth that Elahym is a *divine family*.

Continuing with the account in *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*: "*While the New Testament writers say a great deal about "God, Jesus, and the Spirit" of each, no New Testament writer expounds on the relationship among the three in the detail that later Christian writers do"* (p. 782). The scholars being quoted here are, of course, somewhat understating what is obvious to those who comprehend the Scriptural explanation of Elahym.

Spurious addition in 1 John 5:7-8

KJV 1 John 5: 7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. 8 And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.

These are additions to prove the famous "holy trinity". The text from the Hebrew and Greek does not contain these words at all. It reads:

Correction: HARV 1 John 5:7-8 And the Spirit bears witness, for the Spirit is truth. 8 and there are three witnesses, spirit and water and blood, and the three of them are as one.

Some translators of past ages were so zealous to find support for their belief in the "Trinity" in the Scriptures that they literally added it, so breaking a Commandment. A case in point is 1 John 5:7-8. Check for yourself in "your KJV" *The words in italics are simply not a part of the accepted New Testament manuscripts.* Regrettably, in this particular passage the *New King James Version* reads essentially the same.

Most Bible commentaries tell us that this is a spurious addition to the biblical text. Consider the words of *The New Bible Commentary: Revised*: "Notice that AV [the Authorized Version] includes additional material at this point. But the words are clearly a gloss [an added note] and are rightly excluded by RSV [Revised Standard Version] even from its margins" (1970, p. 1269).

In the New Revised Standard Version, 1 John 5:7-8 correctly and more concisely reads, ***"There are three that testify: the Spirit and the water and the blood, and these three agree."*** John personifies the three elements here as providing testimony, just as Solomon personified wisdom in the book of Proverbs. The textual evidence is against the KJV in 1 John 5:7, explains Dr. Neil Lightfoot. *"Of all the Greek manuscripts, only two contain it. These two manuscripts are of very late dates, one from the fourteenth or fifteenth century and the other from the sixteenth century. Two other manuscripts have this verse written*

in the margin. All four manuscripts show that this verse was apparently translated from a late form of the Latin Vulgate" (How We Got the Bible, 2003, pp. 100-101).

The Expositor's Bible Commentary also dismisses the King James and New King James Versions' additions in 1 John 5:7-8 as "*obviously a late gloss with no merit*" (Glenn Barker, Vol. 12, 1981, p. 353). *Peake's Commentary on the Bible* is very incisive in its comments as well: "*The famous interpolation after 'three witnesses' is not printed in RSV and rightly [so] ... No respectable Greek [manuscript] contains it. Appearing first in a late 4th century Latin text, it entered the Vulgate [the 5th-century Latin version, which became the common medieval translation] and finally NT [New Testament] of Erasmus [in the 16th century]" (p. 1038).*

Again, *Trinity* did not come into common use as a religious term until after the Council of Nicaea in A.D. 325, several centuries after the last books of the Latter Writings were complete. It is *not* a Scriptural concept.

Why the "*Holy Spirit*" is sometimes called "he" and "him"

Many people assume that the "*Holy Spirit*" is a personal entity, based on references to the "*Spirit*" as "*he*," "*him*" and "*himself*" in the Latter Writings. This confusion arises from two factors—the use of gender-inflected pronouns in the Greek language and bias on the part of some translators.

Greek, as do the Romance languages deriving from Latin, invokes a specific gender for every noun. Every object, animate or inanimate, is designated as either masculine, feminine or neuter. The gender is often unrelated to whether the item is indeed masculine or feminine. For example, in French the word

livre, meaning "book," is of the masculine gender and is referred to by a pronoun equivalent to the English "*he*", and in Spanish, *mesa*, or "table," is in the feminine. Clearly, although these nouns have gender, their gender does not refer to actually being male or female.

In the English language, in contrast, most nouns that do not refer to objects that are male or female are referred to in the neuter sense, with the pronoun "*it*".

In Greek, both masculine and neuter words are used to refer to the "*Holy Spirit*". The Greek word translated "*Helper*", "*Comforter*" and "*Advocate*" in John 14-16 is *parakletos*, a masculine word in Greek and thus referred to in these chapters by Greek pronouns equivalent to the English "*he*", "*him*", "*his*", "*himself*", "*who*" and "*whom*."

Because of the masculine gender of *parakletos*, these pronouns are grammatically correct in Greek. But to translate these into English as "*he*", "*him*", etc., is grammatically *incorrect*. By the same token, you would never translate a particular French sentence as "*I'm looking for my book so I can read him.*" While this grammatical construction makes sense in the French Language, it is *wrong* in English. Thus the supposition that the "*Holy Spirit*" is a person to be referred to as "*he*" or "*him*" is incorrect.

Only if the *parakletos* or helper were known to be a person could the use of a gender-inflected pronoun justifiably be used in English. And the term *parakletos* certainly *can* refer to a person—as it refers to Yahusha in 1 John 2:1. Yet the "*Holy Spirit*" is nowhere designated with personhood. So personal pronouns should not be substituted for it.

Neuter in nature, not personal

Indeed, there is absolutely *no* justification for referring to the term "*Holy Spirit*" with masculine pronouns, even in Greek. The Greek word *pneuma*, usually translated "*spirit*" but also properly translated from the Hebrew word *Ruach* (h7307) "*wind*" and "*breath*" is a grammatically neuter word. So, in the Greek language, pronouns equivalent to the English "it," "its," "itself," "which" or "that" are properly used in referring to this word for "*spirit*".

Yet when the *King James or Authorized Version* was produced (early in the 1600s), the doctrine of the *Trinity* had already been accepted for more than 1,000 years. So naturally the translators of that version usually chose personal rather than neutral pronouns when referring to the "*Holy Spirit*" in English (see, for example, John 16:13-14; Romans 8:26).

Notice, however, that in some passages in the *King James Version* the translators properly used neuter pronouns. For example, Romans 8:16 says, "*The Spirit itself* [not *himself*] beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of Elahym." Matthew 10:20 and 1 Peter 1:11 are other places in the *King James Version* where the proper neuter pronouns are used. Regrettably, later English translators of have gone even further than the *King James* translators in referring to the "*Holy Spirit*" as masculine rather than neuter. Thus the "*Holy Spirit*" is almost always referred to as "*he*" or "*him*" in the more modern versions. This reflects *not* linguistic accuracy, but the doctrinal bias or incorrect assumptions of religious translators.

If you would like to discuss this material further, contact me at:
abmosheh@gmail.com

Until the next time,

שלום