

# EXECUTED

## TO SUPPRESS

## HIS MESSAGE



Understanding the Holy Spirit

D. A. Taylor

## **Executed to Suppress His Message**

*Understanding the Holy Spirit*

## Introduction

Most Christian churches teach that God is a “Trinity” of three divine beings. But these churches never tell us how this doctrine cannot be found in the original Scriptures. Neither do they tell us how the Trinity was created by the Catholic Church, then inserted into the Scriptures so that it would appear that God is a group of three separate beings.

So why did the Catholic clergy create the Trinity doctrine? So Christians would believe they cannot learn about God without churches and preachers.



This book will show you the truth about the Holy Spirit. And it will do so by sharing what the Old and New Testament Scriptures actually say about the Spirit, along with identifying counterfeit Scriptures that were inserted into the Bible to support the Trinity doctrine.



## 1 — The Holy Spirit and the Old Covenant

Most churches teach the Holy Spirit was first given during the Old Covenant festival of Pentecost, shortly after our Lord's death. And this is not true, because the Holy Spirit was also available under the Old Covenant.

For example, notice what King David wrote in the Psalms:

*Do not cast me away from Your presence. And do not take Your Holy Spirit from me (Psalm 5:11).*

David lived approximately 1,000 years before Jesus came to earth. Yet he claimed to have the Holy Spirit. And what David wrote is part of what our Lord called "the scriptures," which He affirmed cannot be broken ([John 10-35](#)).

The Bible also speaks of several other cases where the Holy Spirit was given to people under the Old Covenant. Here is another example:

*Then the Spirit of the LORD will come upon you mightily, and you shall prophesy with them and be changed into another man (I Samuel 10:6).*

So the prophet Samuel also had the Holy Spirit.

But I once heard a preacher say the Holy Spirit was merely resting "upon" Samuel — and he didn't actually have the Spirit "within" him as Christians do. But before we accept this preacher's line of reasoning, let's review a few scriptures which describe how the Holy Spirit also came "upon" Christ:

*Then a shoot will spring from the stem of Jesse, And a branch from his roots will bear fruit. The Spirit of the LORD will rest on Him, The spirit of wisdom and understanding, The spirit of counsel and strength, The spirit of knowledge and the fear of the LORD (Isaiah 11:1-2).*

*"Behold, My Servant, whom I uphold; My chosen one in whom My soul delights. I have put My Spirit upon Him; He will bring forth justice to the nations. "He will not cry out or raise His voice, Nor make His voice heard in the street. "A bruised reed He will not*

break. And a dimly burning wick He will not extinguish; He will faithfully bring forth justice. “He will not be disheartened or crushed. Until He has established justice in the earth; And the coastlands will wait expectantly for His law” (Isaiah 42:1-4).

*The Spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me, Because the LORD has anointed me. To bring good news to the afflicted; He has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, To proclaim liberty to captives And freedom to prisoners; To proclaim the favorable year of the LORD. And the day of vengeance of our God; To comfort all who mourn (Isaiah 61:1-2).*

Of course, The Holy Spirit was not merely resting “on” the surface of the Lord’s skin. And we know this because [John 3:34](#) tells us Jesus was filled with the Spirit without measure.

—

Now let’s look at Isaiah 63:10-12, where the prophet wrote how Moses — whom was wholly under the Old Covenant — had the Holy Spirit “within” him:

But they rebelled, and vexed his Holy Spirit: therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and he fought against them. Then he remembered the days of old, Moses, and his people, saying, Where is he that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherd of his flock? *Where is he that put his Holy Spirit within him?* That led them by the right hand of Moses with his glorious arm, dividing the water before them, to make himself an everlasting name? (KJV).

And then we should consider the Old Testament prophets, about whom Peter wrote:

As to this salvation, the prophets who prophesied of the grace that would come to you made careful searches and inquiries, seeking to know what person or time the Spirit of Christ within them was indicating as He predicted the sufferings of Christ and the glories to follow (I Peter 10-11).

And finally, there are several Old Testament prophets where the “upon / within” argument is not an issue:

Psalms 51:11 Do not cast me (king David) away from Your presence And do not take Your Holy Spirit from me.

Micah 3:8 On the other hand I (the prophet Micah) am filled with power — With the Spirit of the LORD — And with justice and courage To make known to Jacob his rebellious act, Even to Israel his sin.

Luke 1:67 And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Spirit, and prophesied, saying ...

Therefore, the Bible is very clear on this issue: references to the Holy Spirit being “upon” or “within” a person are interchangeable. So people under the Old Covenant actually had the Holy Spirit dwelling inside of them — just Jesus Christ did (although not with the same “measure” as Christ).

### **Think About This**

God's people were given the Holy Spirit at least 1,000 years before the 30 CE Pentecost where Christ's disciples received the Spirit.

~~~~~

## 2 — A Biblical Contradiction?

So considering what you just read, let's now examine this scripture:

“He who believes in Me, as the Scripture said, ‘From his innermost being will flow rivers of living water.’” But this He spoke of the Spirit, whom those who believed in Him were to receive; *for the Spirit was **not** yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified* (John 7:38-39).

John wrote how the Holy Spirit was not given until after Jesus was glorified (resurrected).

*But didn't we just prove the Spirit was given hundreds of years earlier under the Old Covenant?*

And John's statement becomes even more confusing, when we read what he wrote in John 20:19-22:

So when it was evening on that day, the first *day* of the week, and when the doors were shut where the disciples were, for fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in their midst and said to them, “Peace *be with you.*” And when He had said this, He showed them both His hands and His side. The disciples then rejoiced when they saw the Lord. So Jesus said to them again, “*Peace be with you; as the Father has sent Me, I also send you.*” And when He had said this, He breathed on them and said to them, “*Receive the Holy Spirit.*”

This passage plainly states that Jesus gave the Holy Spirit to His disciples many weeks before the Day of Pentecost! Jesus had just been resurrected and still had His human body, which carried the injuries from His crucifixion. So the Lord had not yet risen to meet His Father — and He was not yet glorified (remember that) as described in Revelation 1:16, where “His face was like the sun shining in its strength.”

So this conversation between Jesus and His apostles had to take place almost 50 days before the Holy Spirit was given on Pentecost. Nevertheless, the Scripture plainly states that Jesus gave the Holy Spirit to His apostles at this precise time.

So we are left with what appears to be a direct contradiction with what we

read in John 7:38-38, where the apostle wrote how the Holy Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified.

—

So now that we've discovered one apparent Bible contradiction, let's look at another:

To these (the apostles) He also presented Himself alive after His suffering, by many convincing proofs, appearing to them over a period of forty days and speaking of the things concerning the kingdom of God. Gathering them together, He commanded them not to leave Jerusalem, but to wait for what the Father had promised, "Which," He said, "you heard of from Me; for John baptized with water, *but you will be (in the future) baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days from now*" (Acts 1:3-5).

This conversation occurred almost 40 days after the event we just read about in John 20:21-22, where Jesus gave the Holy Spirit to His apostles. Nevertheless, Jesus told His disciples they would receive the Holy Spirit in the future!

### **Think About This**

There's a great paradox here. Just a few weeks before this conversation, Jesus breathed on His disciples and gave them the Holy Spirit. But now He tells them they will receive the Spirit in the future, approximately 50 days after He ascended into the heavens!

And according to the Bible, both of our Lord's statements were factual and true.

~~~~~



### 3 — Unraveling the Mystery of the Holy Spirit

If we make the assumption most Christians do — that there is only one Holy Spirit — the words of Jesus make little sense. But what if Jesus was talking about two separate Holy Spirits?

I'm sure many Christians would respond to that suggestion with something like, "Well, that sounds ridiculous!" Nevertheless, I going to respectfully ask that you bear with me as we consider this possibility.

---

The King James Bible uses the word "Comforter" as another term for the Holy Spirit. Here's an example from John 15:26, where Jesus was speaking:

*But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me (John 15:26 — KJV).*

So according to Jesus, the "Comforter" is just another name for the "Spirit of Truth," which proceeds (Greek: *comes out of*) God the Father.

Now add this precious gem of truth:

*And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you **another Comforter**, that he (God the Father) may abide with you for ever. Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you (John 14:16-17 – KJV).*

Just as we saw in John 15:26 (above), Jesus again uses the term "Spirit of Truth" to refer to the Comforter. But take special note of how Jesus said this particular Spirit of Truth is "another" Comforter.

*Another Comforter?*

Clearly, Jesus was talking about two Comforters! So there has to be two Holy Spirits. And we should also should note how the Greek word translated "another" (al'-los), means "different."

*So there are two holy spirits, both of which are somehow different from one another.*

---

We already saw how Jesus gave the Holy Spirit to His disciples approximately 40 days before He ascended into heaven. But then in John 16:7, Jesus told the disciples this second and “different” Comforter would not come until after he ascended into heaven:

Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you (John 16:7 – KJV).

### **Think About This**

The Lord told His disciples how God the Father would send a “different” Comforter than the one He gave to them after His resurrection.

So there indeed are two Holy Spirits!

~~~~~

## 4 — Identifying the Holy Spirits

So who or what are these Holy Spirits? The Bible gives the answer with two short and easily-understood passages:

Spirit Number 1:

God (the Father) is *spirit*, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth (John 4:24).

Spirit Number 2:

Now the Lord is the *Spirit*, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty (II Corinthians 3:17).

So God the Father is Spirit. And Jesus Christ is Spirit. Therefore, understanding the Holy Spirit is a matter of simple arithmetic: the Father (with His Spirit) + Christ (with His Spirit) = two Spirits.

And why are these two great beings called “holy” spirits? The apostle Peter tells us in I Peter 1:15-16:

But like the Holy One who called you, be holy yourselves also in all your behavior; because it is written, “YOU SHALL BE HOLY, FOR I AM HOLY.”

God the Father and Jesus Christ are “holy.” And we’ve already seen how these great beings are spirits. Now simply put these two facts together:

The Father and Jesus Christ are separate *Holy Spirits*.

### **Think About This**

*If there are two separate Holy Spirits, then the “Holy Spirit” cannot be a single third person of the Godhead. God cannot be trinity of three separate beings.*

~~~~~

## 5 — The Oneness of God

Jesus also revealed how the individual spirits of He and the Father dwell together as one. As He said in John 10:30: “I and my Father are one.” So these two great beings are able to share their spirits with each other, perhaps in a manner similar to what they ordained for a man and a woman to become “one” in marriage.

But there’s far more to this “oneness” of God — and this gets to the central issue of why many Christian churches withhold the truth about the Holy Spirit. Look at what Jesus said in John 17:20-23:

“I do not ask on behalf of these alone, but for those also who believe in Me through their word; that they may **all** be one; even as You, Father, are in Me and I in You, **that they also may be in Us**, so that the world may believe that You sent Me. **“The glory which You have given Me I have given to them, that they may be one, just as We are one; I in them and You in Me, that they may be perfected in unity**, so that the world may know that You sent Me, and loved them, even as You have loved Me.

So Jesus affirms how God the Father and Jesus Christ are “one.” But He then goes on to explain how this godly “oneness” includes *every single Christian!*

And this spiritual “oneness” has no earthly borders. It transcends churches, Christian denominations and even church doctrines. And why? Because God the Father and Jesus Christ dwell with the spirit of each and every Christian, regardless of where they attend church — and even if they not attend a church.

*And that’s a special privilege few Christians know anything about!*

—

Finally, let’s go to Job 32:8 (KJV), which shows how this spiritual this “oneness” between God and Christians operates:

*But there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.*

Job revealed how human beings also have a spirit. And thus according to

Jesus, when we become Christians and receive His Spirit — along with the Spirit of God the Father — we become part of God's sacred and holy spiritual family!

### **Think About This**

God's spiritual family consists of multiple spirits (God the Father, Jesus Christ, and each and every Christian), all combined together through some miraculous spiritual process we cannot even begin to understand. And each and every Christian is part of this intimate spiritual family, even though we remain separate human beings.

~~~~~

## 7 — God’s Dwelling Place

The Bible has much more to say about our Christian relationship with God the Father and Jesus Christ. For example, look at John 14:23:

Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, *and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.*

Here the Greek translated into the English “abode” is *μονή* — and it specifically means a home or dwelling place. And this means the worldwide assembly of God’s people is where God the Father and Jesus Christ have chosen to make their “home.”

*Therefore, every born-again Christian is part of God’s literal dwelling place!*

So Christians always have the spirits of the Father and Christ dwelling within them, always ready to give whatever spiritual inspiration, understanding and guidance we require.

Here is how the apostle John stated it:

*As for you, the anointing (the Holy Spirits of the Father and Christ) which you received from Him abides in you, and you have no need for anyone to teach you; but as His anointing teaches you about all things, and is true and is not a lie, and just as it has taught you, you abide in Him (1 John 2:27).*

~~~~~

## 7 — The New Covenant: Access to a New Spirit

Look at I Peter 1:10-11:

As to this salvation, the prophets who prophesied of the grace that would come to you made careful searches and inquiries, seeking to know what person or time *the Spirit of Christ within them* was indicating as He predicted the sufferings of Christ and the glories to follow.

As we have already seen, the Old Covenant prophets had the Spirit of Christ, but they did not have the Spirit of the God the Father. In fact, Jesus explained how people under the Old Covenant did not even know the Father existed:

No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared `him (John 1:18 — KJV).

Now contrast this with New Covenant, where Jesus told the disciples the Father would send them His Holy Spirit:

But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you *from the Father*, even the Spirit of truth, *which proceedeth from the Father*, he shall testify of me (John 15:26 — KJV).

And so again, we see how God consists of two eternally-living spirit beings who are unified as one through their spirits. And these two great beings created two covenants. Those involved with the Old Covenant had access to the spirit of Christ. While those involved with the New Covenant have access to both the spirit of Christ and the spirit of God the Father.

### Think About This

The most important aspect of the New Covenant is that it allows human beings to receive the spirit of God the Father. And the Father's Spirit is "different" from the spirit available under the Old Covenant, because it emanates from a different and much greater God being (John 14:28).

---

And here are a few other things Jesus said about His Father:

All things have been handed over to Me by My Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father; nor does anyone know the Father except the Son, *and anyone to whom the Son wills to reveal Him* (Matthew 11:27).

No man hath seen God at any time; *the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him* (John 1:18 — KJV).

And the Father who sent Me, He has testified of Me. *You have neither heard His voice at any time nor seen His form.* You do not have His word abiding in you, for you do not believe Him whom He sent (John 5:37-38).

Until Jesus revealed His existence, God the Father was totally unknown to human beings. And so again, this proves how those under the Old Covenant weren't dealing with the spirit of the Father, but the Spirit of Christ.

### **Think About This**

Jesus was the God of the Old Covenant.

But God the Father is the God of the New Covenant.

~~~~~



## 8 — Churches Are Hiding Something from You

Under the New Covenant, it's God the Father's Spirit that provides Christians with the ability to understand the Scriptures and His spiritual principles. Jesus explained how this works in John 16:13:

When the Spirit of truth (Spirit of Christ) comes, he will guide you into all the truth, for he will not speak on his own authority, but whatever he hears (from God the Father) he will speak, and he will declare to you the things that are to come (John 16:13 — ESV).

So instead of depending upon human teachers to learn God's truth, those called into the New Covenant get help directly from God the Father to discern spiritual truth, as His spirit opens our minds to understand the teachings of Christ.

Two scriptures explain how this works:

But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost (spirit), whom the Father will send in my name, *he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you* (John 14:26 — KJV).

So spiritual truth originates with God the Father. And this is why Jesus called the Father's Spirit "The Spirit of Truth."

*And this means that under the New Covenant, spiritual truth is no longer revealed through human beings, as it was under the Old Covenant.*

---

Yet someone might ask: "But what about the apostles, certainly they were teachers of God's truth? And what about the "gifts" of the Spirit? Doesn't God give certain Christians wisdom and prophetic ability?" And indeed, both of these statements are true. But if we are not extremely careful here, we can easily jump the track into doctrinal error.

Above all, Christians need to remember how Jesus Christ is their highest spiritual authority. So when Christ says something is black, then it is black. And when He says something is white, then it's white — regardless what an apostle or any other human being says.

So we can use Christ's own words to establish a “definition” for spiritual truth — and how this definition relates to pastors, preachers spiritual guides and other human teachers:

Do not be called leaders; for One is your Leader, that is, Christ (Matthew 23:10).

Here the Greek translated into the English “leader” is pronounced kath-ayg-ay-tace'. And it specifically means a *spiritual guide* or *teacher*. So Jesus Christ — our spiritual Lord and Master — clearly and specifically instructed His followers to never consider a human being our spiritual guide or teacher!

And why? Jesus tells us in Matthew 23:8:

But do not be called Rabbi (a title the Jews used for their spiritual teachers); **for One is your Teacher**, and you are all brothers (Matthew 23:8).

Under the New Covenant, only Jesus bears the title of “spiritual guide and teacher,” as He instructs His followers through His words as recorded in the Scriptures, with the help of God the Father's Spirit of Truth.

Here's how John the Baptist testified of this:

For he whom God hath sent *speaketh the words of God*: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him (John 3:34 — KJV).

—

And so there's far more to spiritual learning than just hearing church sermons. And this is clearly demonstrated by thousands of Christian denominations — most of which have measurably different doctrines, even though they all claim to derive their beliefs from the Bible.

So without the Spirit of God the Father, it's impossible to properly understand what Jesus said. And this is why we cannot fully understand Christ's teachings, until we are “born again” as a child of God the Father, so the His “Spirit of Truth” dwells within us:

Jesus said to them, “If God were your Father, you would love Me, for I proceeded forth and have come from God, for I have not even

come on My own initiative, but He sent Me. *Why do you not understand what I am saying? It is because you cannot hear My word*" (John 8:42-43).

*"He who is of God hears the words of God; for this reason you do not hear them, because you are not of God"* (John 8:47).

So as Christians, we must make Jesus is our one and only spiritual teacher. But to truly understand what Jesus taught, we must also possess the Spirit of Truth from God the Father.

~~~~~

## 9 — The Real Christian Calling

Genuine Christians are identified by their desire to learn and follow the words of their Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ — rather than church doctrines. As our Lord said in Matthew 28:19-20:

“Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, *teaching them to observe all that I commanded you*; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age.”

So here we have a definition of the Christian calling: *Learn what Jesus taught, and then share it with others.*

So when the apostles taught something they received directly from Christ, they were doing their job. But when they shared personal ideas that were not received from Christ, they were sharing their own ideas and concepts. And even though many Christians believe the apostles had the authority to make decisions and set doctrine, it's clear that Jesus disagreed. His instructions were very clear: “teach them to observe all that I commanded you.”

—

Unfortunately, one apostle (Paul) disobeyed the Lord's instructions and set up a congregational hierarchy in Gentile churches. Spiritual leaders were ordained, with certain Christians placed into authoritative positions over their brethren. Paul then instructed these congregations to look to these men as spiritual leaders, and to honor them for their “positions” within the church.

But all of this was a direct violation of Christ's command in Matthew 23:10:

Do **not** be called leaders; for One is your Leader, *that is, Christ* (Matthew 23:10).

And apostle John (the apostle whom Jesus loved) was in full agreement:

As for you, the anointing (the Holy Spirit) which you received from Him abides in you, *and you have no need for anyone to teach you*; but as His anointing teaches you about **all** things, and is true and is

not a lie, and just as it has taught you, you abide in Him (I John 2:27).

It's also important to know that in his early years (56-57 CE), before he was dealing with rebellious Gentile Christians, even Paul was in agreement with Jesus and the apostle John, when he wrote this:

I myself am convinced, my brothers, that you yourselves are filled with goodness *and full of all the knowledge you need to be able to instruct each other* (Romans 15:14).

—

So as Christians, it's imperative that we make a decision:

Will we follow writings of the apostle Paul or the teachings of our church pastors?

Or will we follow Jesus Christ?

And the result of this decision will determine the quality of our relationship with both God the Father and Jesus Christ.

~~~~~

## 10 — Conclusion

Unlike those under the Old Covenant, we should not seek our spiritual information from human leaders. Instead, Christians are to learn spiritual truth through the Father's Spirit, as it guides them into understanding the Bible, and especially the teachings of Christ.

Jesus never directed His followers (including the apostles) to take charge of His church and teach God's people. Instead, God alone is responsible for this task, as He does so through the Bible and His Holy Spirit. And even though the Father may choose to give give special gifts of understanding to certain individuals, such brethren must always point Christians to Christ and His teachings, and never assume a position of spiritual leadership over their brethren.

---

God the Father and Jesus Christ are patiently waiting for Christians to believe they have the ability to teach their religion. But unfortunately, most of God's people have decided the Father and Christ can't handle the job — so they place their trust in churches and preachers.

But if you truly want to understand God's truth, then you should get yourself a quality Bible. Then spend your time reading, praying and beseeching God to open your mind to what you are reading. And why? Because Jesus is the only spiritual messenger who can bring the true gospel message directly from God the Father:

For I did not speak on My own initiative, but the Father Himself who sent Me has given Me a commandment as to what to say and what to speak (John 12:49).

---

Therefore, a Christian's primary responsibility is to believe what Jesus taught (John 6:29). Those who believe and follow their Lord and Savior are given eternal life, which Jesus promised in John 10:27-28. These Christians possess God the Father's Spirit of Truth, which teaches them all things spiritual, just as they were promised by their Lord and Savior in John 14:26:

But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost (spirit), whom the Father will send in my name, *he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you* (KJV).

As Jesus said in Revelation 3:20:

Behold, I stand at the door and knock; ***if anyone hears My voice and opens the door, I will come in to him and will dine with him, and he with Me.***

### **Think About This**

For almost 2,000 years, Jesus has been knocking at the doors to our minds and spirits, ready to serve people the “food” of God’s truth. But how many who call themselves “Christians” have opened the door and inviting Him inside?

~~~~~

## 11 — Scripture References

[John 3:34](#) For He whom God has sent speaks the words of God; for He gives the Spirit without measure.

[John 10:35](#) If he called them gods, to whom the word of God came (and the Scripture cannot be broken).

~~~~



## **12 — Scholarly Views About Scriptures Supporting the Trinity**

Historic records prove the doctrine of the Trinity was created in the early 3rd century by the Roman Christian author Tertullian, who explicitly defined the Trinity as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The majority of Catholic Christians disagreed this new doctrine. But Tertullian worked hard to defend his new Trinity, and it was eventually adopted by the Catholic Church at the First council of Constantiaople (381 CE).

Matthew 28:18-20 and I John 5:7 are the only biblical passages that support the Trinity doctrine. And numerous biblical scholars take issue with the veracity of these verses, claiming they were not in the original Scriptures. This section of the book shares what these scholars have written about these two verses, along with their views on the veracity of the Trinity doctrine.

## **Matthew 28:18-20**

And Jesus came up and spoke to them, saying, "All authority has been given to Me in heaven and on earth. Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age."

### The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics:

As to Matthew 28:19, it says: It is the central piece of evidence for the traditional (Trinitarian) view. If it were undisputed, this would, of course, be decisive, but its trustworthiness is impugned on grounds of textual criticism, literary criticism and historical criticism. The same Encyclopedia further states: "The obvious explanation of the silence of the New Testament on the triune name, and the use of another (JESUS NAME) formula in Acts and Paul, is that this other formula was the earlier, and the triune formula is a later addition."

### Edmund Schlink, The Doctrine of Baptism, page 28:

"The baptismal command in its Matthew 28:19 form can not be the historical origin of Christian baptism. At the very least, it must be assumed that the text has been transmitted in a form expanded by the [Catholic] church."

### The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, I, 275:

"It is often affirmed that the words in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost are not the ipsissima verba [exact words] of Jesus, but...a later liturgical addition."

### Wilhelm Bousset, Kyrios Christianity, page 295:

"The testimony for the wide distribution of the simple baptismal formula [in the Name of Jesus] down into the second century is so overwhelming that even in Matthew 28:19, the Trinitarian formula was later inserted."

### The Catholic Encyclopedia, II, page 263:

"The baptismal formula was changed from the name of Jesus Christ to the words Father, Son, and Holy Spirit by the Catholic Church in the second century."

Hastings Dictionary of the Bible 1963, page 1015:

"The Trinity ... is not demonstrable by logic or by Scriptural proofs. The term Trias was first used by Theophilus of Antioch (c AD 180) ... (The term Trinity) not found in Scripture..." "The chief Trinitarian text in the NT is the baptismal formula in Mt 28:19. This late post-resurrection saying, not found in any other Gospel or anywhere else in the NT, has been viewed by some scholars as an interpolation into Matthew. It has also been pointed out that the idea of making disciples is continued in teaching them, so that the intervening reference to baptism with its Trinitarian formula was perhaps a later insertion into the saying. Finally, Eusebius's form of the (ancient) text ("in my name" rather than in the name of the Trinity) has had certain advocates. (Although the Trinitarian formula is now found in the modern-day book of Matthew), this does not guarantee its source in the historical teaching of Jesus. It is doubtless better to view the (Trinitarian) formula as derived from early (Catholic) Christian, perhaps Syrian or Palestinian, baptismal usage (cf Didache 7:1-4), and as a brief summary of the (Catholic) Church's teaching about God, Christ, and the Spirit."

The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge:

"Jesus, however, cannot have given His disciples this Trinitarian order of baptism after His resurrection; for the New Testament knows only one baptism in the name of Jesus (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:43; 19:5; Gal. 3:27; Rom. 6:3; 1 Cor. 1:13-15), which still occurs even in the second and third centuries, while the Trinitarian formula occurs only in Matt. 28:19, and then only again (in the) Didache 7:1 and Justin, Apol. 1:61. Finally, the distinctly liturgical character of the formula is strange; it was not the way of Jesus to make such formulas. The formal authenticity of Matt. 28:19 must be disputed..." (page 435).

The Jerusalem Bible, a scholarly Catholic work, states:

"It may be that this formula, (Triune Matthew 28:19) so far as the fullness of its expression is concerned, is a reflection of the (Man-made) liturgical usage established later in the primitive (Catholic) community. It will be

remembered that Acts speaks of baptizing "in the name of Jesus ..."

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. 4, page 2637, under "Baptism:"

"Matthew 28:19 in particular only canonizes a later ecclesiastical situation, that its universalism is contrary to the facts of early Christian history, and its Trinitarian formula (is) foreign to the mouth of Jesus."

New Revised Standard Version says this about Matthew 28:19:

"Modern critics claim this formula is falsely ascribed to Jesus and that it represents later (Catholic) church tradition, for nowhere in the book of Acts (or any other book of the Bible) is baptism performed with the name of the Trinity..."

James Moffett's New Testament Translation:

In a footnote on page 64 about Matthew 28:19 Moffat makes this statement: "It may be that this (Trinitarian) formula, so far as the fullness of its expression is concerned, is a reflection of the (Catholic) liturgical usage established later in the primitive (Catholic) community, It will be remembered that Acts speaks of baptizing "in the name of Jesus, cf. Acts 1:5 +."

Tom Harpur, former Religion Editor of the Toronto Star in his "For Christ's sake," page 103:

"All but the most conservative scholars agree that at least the latter part of this command [Triune part of Matthew 28:19] was inserted later. The [Trinitarian] formula occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, and we know from the only evidence available [the rest of the New Testament] that the earliest Church did not baptize people using these words ("in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost") baptism was "into" or "in" the name of Jesus alone. Thus it is argued that the verse originally read "baptizing them in My Name" and then was expanded [changed] to work in the [later Catholic Trinitarian] dogma. In fact, the first view put forward by German critical scholars as well as the Unitarians in the nineteenth century, was stated as the accepted position of mainline scholarship as long ago as 1919, when Peake's commentary was first published: "The Church of the first days (AD 33) did not observe this world-wide (Trinitarian) commandment, even if they knew it. The

command to baptize into the threefold [Trinity] name is a late doctrinal expansion."

The Bible Commentary 1919 page 723:

Dr. Peake makes it clear that: "The command to baptize into the threefold name is a late doctrinal expansion. Instead of the words baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost we should probably read simply "into My Name."

Theology of the New Testament:

By R. Bultmann, 1951, page 133 under Kerygma of the Hellenistic Church and the Sacraments. The historical fact that the verse Matthew 28:19 was altered is openly confesses to very plainly. "As to the rite of baptism, it was normally consummated as a bath in which the one receiving baptism completely submerged, and if possible in flowing water as the allusions of Acts 8:36, Heb. 10:22, Barn. 11:11 permit us to gather, and as Did. 7:1-3 specifically says. According to the last passage, [the apocryphal Catholic Didache] suffices in case of the need if water is three times poured [false Catholic sprinkling doctrine] on the head. The one baptizing names over the one being baptized the name of the Lord Jesus Christ," later expanded [changed] to the name of the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit."

Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church:

By Dr. Stuart G. Hall 1992, pages 20 and 21. Professor Stuart G. Hall was the former Chair of Ecclesiastical History at King's College, London England. Dr. Hall makes the factual statement that Catholic Trinitarian Baptism was not the original form of Christian Baptism, rather the original was Jesus name baptism. "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," although those words were not used, as they later are, as a formula. Not all baptisms fitted this rule." Dr Hall further, states: "More common and perhaps more ancient was the simple, "In the name of the Lord Jesus or Jesus Christ." This practice was known among Marcionites and Orthodox; it is certainly the subject of controversy in Rome and Africa about 254, as the anonymous tract De rebaptismate ("On rebaptism") shows."

The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles Volume 1,

## Prolegomena 1:

The Jewish Gentile, and Christian Backgrounds by F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake 1979 version pages 335-337. "There is little doubt as to the sacramental nature of baptism by the middle of the first century in the circles represented by the Pauline Epistles, and it is indisputable in the second century. The problem is whether it can in this (Trinitarian) form be traced back to Jesus, and if not what light is thrown upon its history by the analysis of the synoptic Gospels and Acts.

According to Catholic teaching, (traditional Trinitarian) baptism was instituted by Jesus. It is easy to see how necessary this was for the belief in sacramental regeneration. Mysteries, or sacraments, were always the institution of the Lord of the cult; by them, and by them only, were its supernatural benefits obtained by the faithful. Nevertheless, if evidence counts for anything, few points in the problem of the Gospels are so clear as the improbability of this teaching.

The reason for this assertion is the absence of any mention of Christian baptism in Mark, Q, or the third Gospel, and the suspicious nature of the account of its institution in Matthew 28:19: "Go ye into all the world, and make disciples of all Gentiles (nations), baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." It is not even certain whether this verse ought to be regarded as part of the genuine text of Matthew. No other text, indeed, is found in any extant manuscripts, in any language, but it is arguable that Justin Martyr, though he used the trine formula, did not find it in his text of the Gospels; Hermas seems to be unacquainted with it; the evidence of the Didache is ambiguous, and Eusebius habitually, though not invariably, quotes it in another form, "Go ye into all the world and make disciples of all the Gentiles in My Name."

No one acquainted with the facts of textual history and patristic evidence can doubt the tendency would have been to replace the Eusebian text (In My Name) by the ecclesiastical (Catholic Trinitarian) formula of baptism, so that "transcriptional evidence" is certainly on the side of the text omitting baptism.

But it is unnecessary to discuss this point at length, because even if the ordinary (modern Trinity) text of Matthew 28:19 be sound it can not represent historical fact.

Would they have baptized, as Acts says that they did, and Paul seem to confirm the statement, in the name of the Lord Jesus if the Lord himself had commanded them to use the (Catholic Trinitarian) formula of the Church? On every point the evidence of Acts is convincing proof that the (Catholic) tradition embodied in Matthew 28:19 is a late (non-Scriptural Creed) and unhistorical.

Neither in the third gospel nor in Acts is there any reference to the (Catholic Trinitarian) Matthaean tradition, nor any mention of the institution of (Catholic Trinitarian) Christian baptism. Nevertheless, a little later in the narrative we find several references to baptism in water in the name of the Lord Jesus as part of recognized (Early) Christian practice. Thus we are faced by the problem of a Christian rite, not directly ascribed to Jesus, but assumed to be a universal (and original) practice. That it was so is confirmed by the Epistles, but the facts of importance are all contained in Acts."

Also in the same book on page 336 in the footnote number one, Professor Lake makes an astonishing discovery in the so-called Teaching or Didache. The Didache has an astonishing contradiction that is found in it. One passage refers to the necessity of baptism in the name of the Lord, which is Jesus the other famous passage teaches a Trinitarian Baptism. Lake raises the probability that the apocryphal Didache or the early Catholic Church Manual may have also been edited or changed to promote the later Trinitarian doctrine. It is a historical fact that the Catholic Church at one time baptized its converts in the name of Jesus but later changed to Trinity baptism.

"In the actual description of baptism in the Didache the trine (Trinity) formula is used; in the instructions for the Eucharist (communion) the condition for admission is baptism in the name of the Lord. It is obvious that in the case of an eleventh-century manuscript \*the trine formula was almost certain to be inserted in the description of baptism, while the less usual formula had a chance of escaping notice when it was only used incidentally."

The Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C. 1923, New Testament Studies Number 5:

"The Lord's Command To Baptize An Historical Critical Investigation," by

Bernard Henry Cuneo, page 27: "The passages in Acts and the Letters of St. Paul. These passages seem to point to the earliest form as baptism in the name of the Lord." Also we find, "Is it possible to reconcile these facts with the belief that Christ commanded his disciples to baptize in the trine form? Had Christ given such a command, it is urged, the Apostolic Church would have followed him, and we should have some trace of this obedience in the New Testament. No such trace can be found. The only explanation of this silence, according to the anti-traditional view, is this the short christological (Jesus Name) formula was (the) original, and the longer trine formula was a later development."

#### A History of The Christian Church:

1953 by Williston Walker former Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Yale University. On page 95 we see the historical facts again declared: "With the early disciples generally baptism was 'in the name of Jesus Christ.' There is no mention of baptism in the name of the Trinity in the New Testament, except in the command attributed to Christ in Matthew 28:19. That text is early, (but not the original) however. It underlies the Apostles' Creed, and the practice recorded (or interpolated) in the Teaching, (or the Didache) and by Justin. The Christian leaders of the third century retained the recognition of the earlier form, and, in Rome at least, baptism in the name of Christ was deemed valid, if irregular, certainly from the time of Bishop Stephen (254-257)."

On page 61 Professor and Church historian Walker, reviles the true origin and purpose of Matthew 28:19. This Text is the first man-made Roman Catholic Creed that was the prototype for the later Apocryphal Apostles' Creed. Matthew 28:19 was invented along with the Apocryphal Apostles' Creed to counter so-called heretics and Gnostics that baptized in the name of Jesus Christ! Marcion although somewhat mixed up in some of his doctrine still baptized his converts the Biblical way in the name of Jesus Christ. Matthew 28:19 is the first non-Biblical Roman Catholic Creed! The spurious Catholic text of Matthew 28:19 was invented to support the newer triune, Trinity doctrine. Therefore, Matthew 28:19 is not the "Great Commission of Jesus Christ." Matthew 28:19 is the great Catholic hoax! Acts 2:38, Luke 24:47, and 1 Corinthians 6:11 give us the ancient original words and teaching of Yeshua/Jesus! Is it not also strange that Matthew 28:19 is missing from the old manuscripts of



Sinaiticus, Curetonianus and Bobiensis?

"While the power of the episcopate and the significance of churches of apostolical (Catholic) foundation was thus greatly enhanced, the Gnostic crisis saw a corresponding development of (man-made non-inspired spurious) creed, at least in the West. Some form of instruction before baptism was common by the middle of the second century. At Rome this developed, apparently, between 150 and 175, and probably in opposition to Marcionite Gnosticism, into an explication of the baptismal formula of Matthew 28:19 the earliest known form of the so-called Apostles Creed."

Catholic Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger:

He makes this confession as to the origin of the chief Trinity text of Matthew 28:19. "The basic form of our (Matthew 28:19 Trinitarian) profession of faith took shape during the course of the second and third centuries in connection with the ceremony of baptism. So far as its place of origin is concerned, the text (Matthew 28:19) came from the city of Rome." The Trinity baptism and text of Matthew 28:19 therefore did not originate from the original Church that started in Jerusalem around AD 33. It was rather as the evidence proves a later invention of Roman Catholicism completely fabricated. Very few know about these historical facts.

"The Demonstratio Evangelica" by Eusebius:

Eusebius was the Church historian and Bishop of Caesarea. On page 152 Eusebius quotes the early book of Matthew that he had in his library in Caesarea. According to this eyewitness of an unaltered Book of Matthew that could have been the original book or the first copy of the original of Matthew. Eusebius informs us of Jesus' actual words to his disciples in the original text of Matthew 28:19: "With one word and voice He said to His disciples: "Go, and make disciples of all nations in My Name, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." That "Name" is Jesus.

~~~~~

## I John 5:7 (KJV)

“For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.”

Commentator Albert Barnes:

1 John 5:7: For there are three that bear record in heaven ... - There are three that “witness,” or that “bear witness” - the same Greek word which, in 1Jo\_5:8, is rendered “bear witness” - μαρτυροῦντες marturountes. There is no passage of the New Testament which has given rise to so much discussion in regard to its genuineness as this. The supposed importance of the verse in its bearing on the doctrine of the Trinity has contributed to this, and has given to the discussion a degree of consequence which has pertained to the examination of the genuineness of no other passage of the New Testament. On the one hand, the clear testimony which it seems to bear to the doctrine of the Trinity, has made that portion of the Christian church which holds the doctrine reluctant in the highest degree to abandon it; and on the other hand, the same clearness of the testimony to that doctrine, has made those who deny it not less reluctant to admit the genuineness of the passage.

It is not consistent with the design of these notes to go into a full investigation of a question of this sort. And all that can be done is to state, in a brief way, the “results” which have been reached, in an examination of the question. Those who are disposed to pursue the investigation further, can find all that is to be said in the works referred to at the bottom of the page. The portion of the passage, in 1Jo\_5:7-8, whose genuineness is disputed, is included in brackets in the following quotation, as it stands in the common editions of the New Testament: “For there are three that bear record (in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness on earth,) the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one.” If the disputed passage, therefore, be omitted as spurious, the whole passage will read, “For there are three that bear record, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one.” The reasons which seem to me to prove that the passage included

in brackets is spurious, and should not be regarded as a part of the inspired writings, are briefly the following:

I. It is missing in all the earlier Greek manuscripts, for it is found in no Greek manuscript written before the 16th century. Indeed, it is found in only two Greek manuscripts of any age - one the Codex Montfortianus, or Britannicus, written in the beginning of the sixteenth century, and the other the Codex Ravianus, which is a mere transcript of the text, taken partly from the third edition of Stephen's New Testament, and partly from the Complutensian Polyglott. But it is incredible that a genuine passage of the New Testament should be missing in all the early Greek manuscripts.

II. It is missing in the earliest versions, and, indeed, in a large part of the versions of the New Testament which have been made in all former times. It is wanting in both the Syriac versions - one of which was made probably in the first century; in the Coptic, Armenian, Slavonic, Ethiopic, and Arabic.

III. It is never quoted by the Greek fathers in their controversies on the doctrine of the Trinity - a passage which would be so much in point, and which could not have failed to be quoted if it were genuine; and it is not referred to by the Latin fathers until the time of Vigilus, at the end of the 5th century. If the passage were believed to be genuine - nay, if it were known at all to be in existence, and to have any probability in its favor - it is incredible that in all the controversies which occurred in regard to the divine nature, and in all the efforts to define the doctrine of the Trinity, this passage should never have been referred to. But it never was; for it must be plain to anyone who examines the subject with an unbiased mind, that the passages which are relied on to prove that it was quoted by Athanasius, Cyprian, Augustin, etc., (Wetstein, II., p. 725) are not taken from this place, and are not such as they would have made if they had been acquainted with this passage, and had designed to quote it. IV. The argument against the passage from the external proof is confirmed by internal evidence, which makes it morally certain that it cannot be genuine.

(a) The connection does not demand it. It does not contribute to advance what the apostle is saying, but breaks the thread of his argument entirely.

He is speaking of certain things which bear “witness” to the fact that Jesus is the Messiah; certain things which were well known to those to whom he was writing - the Spirit, and the water, and the blood. How does it contribute to strengthen the force of this to say that in heaven there are “three that bear witness” - three not before referred to, and having no connection with the matter under consideration?

(b) The “language” is not such as John would use. He does, indeed, elsewhere use the term “Logos,” or “Word” - ὁ Λόγος ho Logos, Joh\_1:1, Joh\_1:14; 1Jo\_1:1, but it is never in this form, “The Father, and the Word;” that is, the terms “Father” and “Word” are never used by him, or by any of the other sacred writers, as correlative. The word “Son” - ὁ Υἱός ho Huios - is the term which is correlative to the “Father” in every other place as used by John, as well as by the other sacred writers. See 1Jo\_1:3; 1Jo\_2:22-24; 1Jo\_4:14; 2Jo\_1:3, 2Jo\_1:9; and the Gospel of John, “passim.” Besides, the correlative of the term “Logos,” or “Word,” with John, is not “Father,” but “God.” See Joh\_1:1. Compare Rev\_19:13.

(c) Without this passage, the sense of the argument is clear and appropriate. There are three, says John, which bear witness that Jesus is the Messiah. These are referred to in 1Jo\_5:6; and in immediate connection with this, in the argument, 1Jo\_5:8, it is affirmed that their testimony goes to one point, and is harmonious. To say that there are other witnesses elsewhere, to say that they are one, contributes nothing to illustrate the nature of the testimony of these three - the water, and the blood, and the Spirit; and the internal sense of the passage, therefore, furnishes as little evidence of its genuineness as the external proof. V. It is easy to imagine how the passage found a place in the New Testament. It was at first written, perhaps, in the margin of some Latin manuscript, as expressing the belief of the writer of what was true in heaven, as well as on earth, and with no more intention to deceive than we have when we make a marginal note in a book. Some transcriber copied it into the body of the text, perhaps with a sincere belief that it was a genuine passage, omitted by accident; and then it became too important a passage in the argument for the Trinity, ever to be displaced but by the most clear critical evidence. It was rendered into Greek, and inserted in one Greek manuscript of the 16th century, while it was missing in all the earlier manuscripts.

VI. The passage is now omitted in the best editions of the Greek Testament, and regarded as spurious by the ablest critics. See Griesbach and Hahn. On the whole, therefore, the evidence seems to me to be clear that this passage is not a genuine portion of the inspired writings, and should not be appealed to in proof of the doctrine of the Trinity. One or two remarks may be made, in addition, in regard to its use.

[As is typical of Trinitarians, the author then goes on to state that the Trinity doctrine is easily proved by other scriptures — but without delineating what those “proof” scriptures might be...]

Commentator Adam Clarke:

1 John 5:7: There are three that bear record - The Father, who bears testimony to his Son; the Word or Λογος, Logos, who bears testimony to the Father; and the Holy Ghost, which bears testimony to the Father and the Son. And these three are one in essence, and agree in the one testimony, that Jesus came to die for, and give life to, the world.

But it is likely this verse is not genuine. It is wanting in every MS. of this epistle written before the invention of printing, one excepted, the Codex Montfortii, in Trinity College, Dublin: the others which omit this verse amount to one hundred and twelve.

It is wanting in both the Syriac, all the Arabic, Ethiopic, the Coptic, Sahidic, Armenian, Slavonian, etc., in a word, in all the ancient versions but the Vulgate; and even of this version many of the most ancient and correct MSS. have it not. It is wanting also in all the ancient Greek fathers; and in most even of the Latin.

The words, as they exist in all the Greek MSS. with the exception of the Codex Montfortii, are the following: -

“1Jo\_5:6. This is he that came by water and blood, Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness because the Spirit is truth.

1Jo\_5:7. For there are three that bear witness, the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one.

1Jo\_5:9. If we receive the witness of man, the witness of God is greater, etc.”

The words that are omitted by all the MSS., the above excepted, and all the versions, the Vulgate excepted, are these: -

[In heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one, and there are three which bear witness in earth].

To make the whole more clear, that every reader may see what has been added, I shall set down these verses, with the inserted words in brackets.

“1Jo\_5:6. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth.

1Jo\_5:7. For there are three that bear record [in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. 1Jo\_5:8. And there are three that bear witness in earth], the Spirit, and the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one.

1Jo\_5:9. If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater, etc.”

Any man may see, on examining the words, that if those included in brackets, which are wanting in the MSS. and versions, be omitted, there is no want of connection; and as to the sense, it is complete and perfect without them; and, indeed much more so than with them. I shall conclude this part of the note by observing, with Dr. Dodd, “that there are some internal and accidental marks which may render the passage suspected; for the sense is complete, and indeed more clear and better preserved, without it. Besides, the Spirit is mentioned, both as a witness in heaven and on earth; so that the six witnesses are thereby reduced to five, and the equality of number, or antithesis between the witnesses in heaven and on earth, is quite taken away. Besides, what need of witnesses in heaven? No one there doubts that Jesus is the Messiah; and if it be said that Father, Son, and Spirit are witnesses on earth, then there are five witnesses on earth, and none in heaven; not to say that there is a little difficulty in interpreting how the Word or the Son can be a witness to himself.”

It may be necessary to inquire how this verse stood in our earliest English Bibles. In Coverdale’s Bible, printed about 1535, for it bears no date, the seventh verse is put in brackets thus: -

And it is the Sprete that beareth wytnes; for the Sprete is the truth. (For

there are there which beare recorde in heaven: the Father, the Woorde, and the Holy Ghost, and these thre are one.) And there are thre which beare record in earth: the Sprete, water, and bloude and these three are one. If we receyve, etc.

Tindal was as critical as he was conscientious; and though he admitted the words into the text of the first edition of his New Testament printed in 1526, yet he distinguished them by a different letter, and put them in brackets, as Coverdale has done; and also the words in earth, which stand in 1Jo\_5:8, without proper authority, and which being excluded make the text the same as in the MSS., etc.

Two editions of this version are now before me; one printed in English and Latin, quarto, with the following title: -

The New Testament, both in Englyshe and Laten, of Master Erasmus translation - and imprinted by William Powell - the yere of our Lorde M.CCCCLXVII. And the fyrste yere of the kynges (Edw. VI.) moste gracious reygne.

In this edition the text stands thus: "And it is the Spirite that beareth wytnes, because the Spirite is truth (for there are thre whiche beare recorde in heaven, the Father, the Worde, and the Holy Ghost, and these thre are one.) For there are thre which beare recorde, (in earth), the Spirite, water, and blode, and these thre are one. If we receyve, etc."

The other printed in London "by William Tylle, 4to; without the Latin of Erasmus in M.CCCCLXIX. the thyrde yere of the reigne of our moost dreade Soverayne Lorde Kyng Edwarde the Syxte," has, with a small variety of spelling, the text in the same order, and the same words included in brackets as above.

The English Bible, with the book of Common Prayer, printed by Richard Cardmarden, at Rouen in Normandy, fol. 1566, exhibits the text faithfully, but in the following singular manner: -

And it is the Spyrte that beareth witnesse, because the Spyrte is truthe. (for there are three which beare recorde in heaven, the Father, the Woorde, and the Holy Ghost; and these Three are One) And three which beare recorde\* (in earth) the Spirite, and water, and bloode; and these three are one.

The first English Bible which I have seen, where these distinctions were omitted, is that called The Bishops' Bible, printed by Jugge, fol. 1568. Since that time, all such distinctions have been generally disregarded.

Though a conscientious believer in the doctrine of the ever blessed, holy, and undivided Trinity, and in the proper and essential Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, which doctrines I have defended by many, and even new, arguments in the course of this work, I cannot help doubting the authenticity of the text in question; and, for farther particulars, refer to the observations at the end of this chapter.

#### Vincent's Word Studies:

There are three that bear record (τρῆϊς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες).

Lit., three are the witnessing ones.

The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.

These words are rejected by the general verdict of critical authorities. For the details of the memorable controversy on the passage, the student may consult Frederick Henry Scrivener, "Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament;" Samuel P. Tregelles, "An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament;" John Selby Watson, "The Life of Richard Porson, M.A.;" Professor Ezra Abbot, "Orme's Memoir of the Controversy on 1Jo\_5:7;" Charles Foster, "A New Plea for the Authenticity of the Text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses," or "Porson's Letters to Travis Eclectically Examined," Cambridge, 1867. On the last-named work, Scrivener remarks, "I would fain call it a success if I could with truth. To rebut much of Porson's insolent sophistry was easy, to maintain the genuineness of this passage is simply impossible." Tregelles gives a list of more than fifty volumes, pamphlets, or critical notices on this question. Porson, in the conclusion of his letters to Travis, says: "In short, if this verse be really genuine, notwithstanding its absence from all the visible Greek manuscripts except two (that of Dublin and the forged one found at Berlin), one of which awkwardly translates the verse from the Latin, and the other transcribes it from a printed book; notwithstanding its absence from all the versions except the Vulgate, even from many of the best and oldest manuscripts of the Vulgate; notwithstanding the deep and dead silence of all the Greek writers down to the thirteenth, and of most of the Latins down to the middle of the



eighth century; if, in spite of all these objections, it be still genuine, no part of Scripture whatsoever can be proved either spurious or genuine; and Satan has been permitted for many centuries miraculously to banish the 'finest passage in the New Testament,' as Martin calls it, from the eyes and memories of almost all the Christian authors, translators, and transcribers."

#### Scofield's Reference Notes:

It is generally agreed that (1Jo\_5:7) has no real authority, and has been inserted.

#### Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown Commentary:

1 John 5:7: three — Two or three witnesses were required by law to constitute adequate testimony. The only Greek manuscripts in any form which support the words, "in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one; and there are three that bear witness in earth," are the Montfortianus of Dublin, copied evidently from the modern Latin Vulgate; the Ravianus, copied from the Complutensian Polyglot; a manuscript at Naples, with the words added in the Margin by a recent hand; Ottobonianus, 298, of the fifteenth century, the Greek of which is a mere translation of the accompanying Latin. All the old versions omit the words. The oldest manuscripts of the Vulgate omit them: the earliest Vulgate manuscript which has them being Wizanburgensis, 99, of the eighth century.

#### Misquoting Jesus — The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why, Pages 80-83, by Bart D. Ehrman:

There was one key passage of scripture that Erasmus's source manuscripts did not contain, however. This is the account of i John 5:7-8, which scholars have called the Johannine Comma, found in the manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate but not in the vast majority of Greek manuscripts, a passage that had long been a favorite among Christian theologians, since it is the only passage in the entire Bible that explicitly delineates the doctrine of the Trinity, that there are three persons in the godhead, but that the three all constitute just one God. In the Vulgate, the passage reads:

There are three that bear witness in heaven: the Father, the Word, and

the Spirit, and these three are one; and there are three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three are one.

It is a mysterious passage, but unequivocal in its support of the traditional teachings of the church on the "triune God who is one." Without this verse, the doctrine of the Trinity must be inferred from a range of passages combined to show that Christ is God, as is the Spirit and the Father, and that there is, nonetheless, only one God. This passage, in contrast, states the doctrine directly and succinctly.

But Erasmus did not find it in his Greek manuscripts, which instead simply read: "There are three that bear witness : the Spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three are one." Where did the "Father, the Word, and the Spirit" go? They were not in Erasmus's primary manuscript, or in any of the others that he consulted, and so, naturally, he left them out of his first edition of the Greek text.

More than anything else, it was this that outraged the theologians of his day, who accused Erasmus of tampering with the text in an attempt to eliminate the doctrine of the Trinity and to devalue its corollary, the doctrine of the full divinity of Christ. In particular, Stunica, one of the chief editors of the Complutensian Polyglot, went public with his defamation of Erasmus and insisted that in future editions he return the verse to its rightful place.

As the story goes, Erasmus — possibly in an unguarded moment — agreed that he would insert the verse in a future edition of his Greek New Testament on one condition: that his opponents produce a Greek manuscript in which the verse could be found (finding it in Latin manuscripts was not enough). And so a Greek manuscript was produced. In fact, it was produced for the occasion. It appears that someone copied out the Greek text of the Epistles, and when he came to the passage in question, he translated the Latin text into Greek, giving the Johannine Comma in its familiar, theologically useful form. The manuscript provided to Erasmus, in other words, was a sixteenth-century production, made to order.

Despite his misgivings, Erasmus was true to his word and included the Johannine Comma in his next edition, and in all his subsequent editions. These editions, as I have already noted, became the basis for the

editions of the Greek New Testament that were then reproduced time and again by the likes of Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs. These editions provided the form of the text that the translators of the King James Bible eventually used. And so familiar passages to readers of the English Bible — from the King James in 1611 onward, up until modern editions of the twentieth century — include the woman taken in adultery, the last twelve verses of Mark, and the Johannine Comma, even though none of these passages can be found in the oldest and superior manuscripts of the Greek New Testament. They entered into the English stream of consciousness merely by a chance of history, based on manuscripts that Erasmus just happened to have handy to him, and one that was manufactured for his benefit.

The various Greek editions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were so much alike that eventually printers could claim that they were the text that was universally accepted by all scholars and readers of the Greek New Testament — as indeed they were, since there were no competitors! The most-quoted claim is found in an edition produced in 1633 by Abraham and Bonaventure Elzevir (who were uncle and nephew), in which they told their readers, in words that have since become famous among scholars, that "You now have the text that is received by all, in which we have given nothing changed or corrupted." The phrasing of this line, especially the words "text that is received by all," provides us with the common phrase *Textus Receptus* (abbreviated T.R.), a term used by textual critics to refer to that form of the Greek text that is based, not on the oldest and best manuscripts, but on the form of text originally published by Erasmus and handed down to printers for more than three hundred years, until textual scholars began insisting that the Greek New Testament should be established on scientific principles based on our oldest and best manuscripts, not simply reprinted according to custom. It was the inferior textual form of the *Textus Receptus* that stood at the base of the earliest English translations, including the King James Bible, and other editions until near the end of the nineteenth century.

~~~~~

## Information About This Book

Author

D. A. Taylor

PUBLISHED BY

D. A. Taylor

Copyright 2016 by D. A. Taylor

ISBN 9781311017093

Prepared on 10/18/20 at 10:14:18 AM

Thank you for downloading this E-Book. This material remains the copyrighted property of the author. You may not alter the content. You may not reproduce, copy or distribute this material for commercial purposes.

Available through Apple iBooks, Barnes & Noble, Smashwords, Scribd, Kobo, Blio, OverDrive, Baker & Taylor Axis 360, Tolino, Gardners, Bibliotheca CloudLibrary, Odilo and the World Wide Web.

Website: <https://www.christsreligion.com>

Author's E-Mail: [dataylor@christsreligion.com](mailto:dataylor@christsreligion.com)

(comments and suggestions are appreciated)

~~~~~

## **How to Use This Book**

This book contains many Scripture references within the text. Those that are not included may be accessed by touching or clicking on the underlined scripture number. You may return to your current reading location by clicking on the verse number to the left of the Scripture. Footnotes operate in the same manner.

Scripture quotations from the New American Standard Bible (NASB), unless otherwise noted.

Textual emphasis by the author.

# Table of Contents

Introduction

1 — The Holy Spirit and the Old Covenant

2 — A Biblical Contradiction?

3 — Unraveling the Mystery of the Holy Spirit

4 — Identifying the Holy Spirits

5 — The Oneness of God

7 — God's Dwelling Place

7 — The New Covenant: Access to a New Spirit

8 — Churches Are Hiding Something from You

9 — The Real Christian Calling

10 — Conclusion

11 — Scripture References

12 — Scholarly Views About Scriptures Supporting the Trinity

Matthew 28:18-20

I John 5:7 (KJV)

Information About This Book

How to Use This Book