The Sacred *Ruach*

In Scriptures, it is amply demonstrated that the Hebrew term רוח (*ruach*; spirit) refers to an unseen animating force, anything from a wind, to movement in a machine, to a life force. Basically, the term means "to *blow,* i.e., *breathe*" forth.[1] Its definition proves to be very important in that it helps explain Yahweh's sacred *ruach* (holy spirit).

The sacred *ruach* is an incorporeal substance that comes directly from the *ruach* substance of father Yahweh. It is used in different ways for creating and enabling. For instance, it provided the substance breathed into Adam, which made him a living *nephesh* (person), thereby creating a person, a child of Yahweh.

Yet it is also separately used to further the creation of the species of Adam—enhancing human capabilities (gifts), resurrecting humans from the dead, destroying the wicked, quickening the just into eternal life, and even perfecting those quickened.

With this study, we will deal with the fact that the sacred *ruach* is not a person but a "substance," defined as the breath of father Yahweh. This divine substance was the power used by our creator to bring our world and all its life forms into existence.

> With this study, we will deal with the fact that the sacred *ruach* is not a person but a "substance," defined as the breath of father Yahweh.

"It" not "He"

The first important thing we must clarify is that the sacred *ruach* is not a person but rather a substance that proceeds from father Yahweh. Unfortunately, the neo-Christians have glossed over this fact due to their adherence to the Trinitarian doctrine. Athanasius first advocated this view at the Council of Nicaea in the early 4th century C.E., when the Roman Church adopted it.

Under Augustine, a century later, it was enshrined in the so-called *Athanasian Creed*. Athanasius defined the deity as one substance and three co-equal persons, although "person" is an imperfect expression because they do not consider these persons as separate and distinct individuals.[2]

In this arrangement, the sacred *ruach* is the third person in a single triad deity with three manifestations of a single divine essence. To support this view, in the KJV of Scriptures, the term sacred *ruach* is at times deceptively translated as "Holy Ghost,"[3] implying a spirit being.

A Fraudulent Verse

To further bolster this view, a well-recognized fraudulent verse was added in one late Vulgate manuscript, placed much later in the NT (New Testament) of Erasmus, and subsequently found its way into the KJV at 1 John 5:7-8. It states, "in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth."[4]

The problem derives from the fact that the neo-Christians have allowed personal interpretation to overwhelm the evidence. Finding themselves without scriptural support, they have resorted to falsifying Scriptures and offering unsubstantiated "interpretations" to words and verses to obtain an illusion of proof.

Trinity Inferred?

Even more disconcerting, the neo-Christians advance that there must be a belief in the Trinitarian doctrine before one can determine whether or not they are a true Christian—this despite the fact that such a doctrine is never

---

[1]   SEC, Heb. #7306, 7307, 7308; HEL, p. 242; CHAL, pp. 335-336.
[2]   E.g., NCE, 13, pp. 574-576, 14, pp. 295-306; ODCC, pp. 783-784, 1640ff; ISBE, 5, pp. 3012–3021; NBD, pp. 1299-1300.
[3]   For a list of references, see YAC, p. 488, s.v. HOLY GHOST.
[4]   SRB, loc. cit., n. o, "It is generally agreed that v. 7 has no real authority, and has been inserted." Also see NJB, loc. cit., n. 5 d; NIV, loc. cit., n. k7, 8, "Not found in any Greek manuscript before the sixteenth century"; ILT, p. 616, n. z. This fraudulent verse has been removed in the REB, NTB, RSV, and other versions, and italicized as spurious by the AB, IB, and others.

directly stated in Scriptures, and they openly admit it cannot be proven by reason. For them, it is inferred.

To begin with, as Benjamin Warfield comments:

> The term 'Trinity' is not a Bib. term, and we are not using Bib. language when we define what is expressed by it as the doctrine that there is one only and true God, but in the unity of the Godhead there are three coeternal and coequal Persons, the same in substance but distinct in subsistence.[5]

One way of expressing this concept is to use the analogy of the three different states of water. It is one substance, but it can manifest itself in three ways: solid (ice), liquid, and gaseous (steam). How the messiah, as one of a single deity's manifestations, prayed to the father and sent the sacred *ruach*, representing two other manifestations of the same single deity, or how the father was able to raise his son from the dead, each entity representing different manifestations, is left to the realm of mystery.

The concept is so extra-biblical that its underlying premise is based upon a doctrine proclaiming that the Trinity "embodies a truth which has never been discovered, and is indiscoverable, by natural reason," and "is indiscoverable by reason, so it is incapable of proof from reason."[6]

Indeed, the Trinitarians openly admit that their concept is nowhere found in the OT Hebrew, although they claim that the Hebrew word *eloahim* can accomodate three persons.

Such a premise is diametrically opposed to the instructions pronounced in Scriptures, which demand that (1) we "prove all things,"[7] which would include whether or not the Trinity concept is valid; (2) "In the mouth of two or three witnesses will every matter be established";[8] and (3) heed the request from Yahweh, "come now, let us reason together."[9]

Trinity Not in OT or NT

Indeed, the Trinitarians openly admit that their concept is nowhere found in the OT (Old Testament) Hebrew,[10] although they claim that the Hebrew word *eloahim* can accommodate three persons. Instead, they speak of it as "Prepared for in the OT."[11] Neither is the concept actually found in the NT (New Testament).

The Trinitarians sidestep this problem by saying it is "presupposed in the NT."[12] Instead of proof, they argue that the NT provides "a vague and shadowy"[13] preparation for its later "revelation" (i.e., being first conceptualized by Athanasius over two centuries after the last NT book was written).

On the one hand, the messiah argued, "If I tell earthly things to you and you do not trust, how if I tell you heavenly things will you trust?"[14] Yet the Trinitarians argue, "There are no analogies to it ⟦the Trinity⟧ in Nature, not even in the spiritual nature of man, who is made in the image of God."[15]

Gender - Greek

The primary "inference" of a Trinity which is offered comes from the 14th - 16th chapters of

---

[5]   ISBE, 5, p. 3012.
[6]   ISBE, 5, pp. 3012, 3013.
[7]   1 Thess. 5:21.
[8]   2 Cor. 13:1; cf., Deut. 17:6, 19:15; Matt. 18:16; 1 Tim. 5:19; Heb. 10:28.
[9]   Isa. 1:18.
[10]   E.g., NCE, 14, p. 306, "The doctrine of the Holy Trinity is not taught in the OT."
[11]   ISBE, 5, p. 3014.
[12]   Ibid.
[13]   E.g., NBD, p. 1298.
[14]   John 3:12.
[15]   ISBE, 5, p. 3013.

John, where the personal pronoun "he" is used when the sacred *ruach* is called a "παράκλητος (*parakletos*; comforter)." Since the sacred *ruach* is called "he," the Trinitarians contend that it demonstrates that "he" is a person.

For anyone familiar with Greek, this argument has no merit. As one finds in the Romance languages (French, Spanish, Italian, etc.) and Greek, every noun has a gender; it is either masculine, feminine, or neuter. This fact stands regardless of whether or not the object is a person, place, or thing.

For example, "the cup" in Spanish would be *la taza*, and in French, *la tasse*. In each case, the cup is feminine in gender. In Greek, it is το ποτηριον (to *poterion*; the cup) and is neuter. If we were to ask to sit at "the table" in Spanish, it would be a request to sit at *la mesa* and in French at *la table*. The article *la* and the *a* ending in mesa, and the article *la* in *la table*, make a table feminine in gender. In Greek, "the table" is τῆς τραπέζης (*tes trapezes*) and is also feminine.

At the same time, the pronoun must always agree with its antecedent and adjectives, whether the gender is masculine, feminine, or neuter. Therefore, when a "cup," "table," or other object are referred to by their pronouns, they become "he" and "she" (Spanish "*el*" and "*la*"; French "*il*" and "*elle*"), much the same as in English when we refer to a ship or car as "she." Yet no one would be so audacious as to claim that a table, cup, or ship are actual persons.

Gender - Ancient Greek

Ancient Greek follows the same rules as we find in the Romance languages. "Things," like swords, rocks, buildings, and other inanimate objects, are made to have either a masculine, feminine, or neuter gender, and the pronouns agree with their antecedents.

> *As one finds in the Romance languages (French, Spanish, Italian, etc.) and Greek, every noun has a gender; it is either masculine, feminine, or neuter.*

To demonstrate, in the Greek text of Matthew 26:52, Keph is told, "Return your sword to αὐτῆς (*autes*; her) place." The sword is feminine in gender. Therefore, the feminine pronoun αὐτῆς (*autes*) is used. But the gender of Greek nouns and pronouns has absolutely nothing to do with whether the "thing" being designated is a masculine or feminine "person." It would be ludicrous, for example, to imagine that because a "table"—Greek τῆς τραπέζης (*tes trapezes*) or ἡ τραπέζα (*e trapeza*), Spanish *la mesa*; French *la table*—is considered feminine in gender that we should consider it a female "person."

Gender - Hebrew

As with the Romance languages and Greek, Hebrew gives gender to its nouns and pronouns. It differs in the fact that it has only masculine and feminine gender and no neuter ("it"). Hebrew can only express a pronoun as "he" or "she."

For this reason, as R. L. Harris notes:

> For abstract ideas, names of organs of the body, names of cities and countries, etc. the fem. is usually chosen.[16]

It is of no little significance that parts of the human anatomy, such as the יד (*yad*; hand) and the רגל (*ragal*; leg, foot), and even the נפש (*nephesh*) itself, regardless of whether it belongs to a male or a female, is rendered in the feminine gender.

One's ראש (*rosh*; head), on the other hand, whether it belongs to a man or a woman, is masculine. A גבר (*gabor*; valiant warrior) is masculine, but his חרב (*khoreb*; sword) is feminine. In the case of רוח (*ruach*), whether a man's or Yahweh's, it is usually rendered feminine in gender, although on occasion, it is also found in the masculine.[17] A man's *ruach*, then, like his hand, foot, or *nephesh*, is usually

---

16 IHG, pp. 12-13.
17 CHAL, pp. 334-335

feminine in gender even though the man himself is a masculine "person."

It is also interesting that the sacred *ruach* of Yahweh is often symbolized in Scriptures as the "hand" or "sword" of Yahweh, both in the Hebrew language being feminine in gender. Why, then, is the *ruach* sometimes found in the masculine gender? This determination is based on how the term is used.

A thing is masculine when it stands in the dominant position and feminine when it is in the subjective role. For example, in normal circumstances, the *ruach* is feminine because it is controlled by the whole, as the hand (feminine) is controlled by the head (masculine), and the sword is controlled by the warrior. But when that thing takes on a creative role or shows an exceptionally dynamic power or control, it becomes masculine.

Such facts prove that gender in these languages is, in reality, nothing more than a convenient grammatical tool, not a determination as to whether a thing is a male or female person. The fact that the sacred *ruach* is found as both feminine and masculine in Hebrew proves that it is a "thing" and not a person, for if it were a male person, it would always be placed in the same gender.

Many Hebrew concepts of gender are identical to the Greek ones. For example, like Hebrew, Greek makes certain parts of the body, such as the χείρ (*kheir*; hand) and ψυχή (*psukhe*; *nephesh*), feminine regardless of whether or not that feature belongs to a male or a female. A στρατιώτης (*stratiotes*; soldier) is masculine, but his μάχαιρα (*makhaira*; sword) and ἀσπίς (*aspis*; shield) are feminine, under the control of the soldier.

> A man's ruach, then, like his hand, foot, or *nephesh*, is usually feminine in gender even though the man himself is a masculine person.

However, when the ancient scribes translated the Hebrew word *ruach* into Greek, they used neither the predominantly feminine gender nor the masculine gender found in Hebrew; rather, they used the Greek word πνεῦμα (*pneuma*) and its cognate forms. Although *pneuma* has an identical meaning with its Hebrew counterpart, it is neuter in gender (i.e., "it").

Yahushua and his disciples spoke the Aramaic-Hebrew language. If the ancient scribes who first translated the words and thoughts of Yahushua and his disciples into Greek understood that the sacred *ruach* was a person, they had ample opportunity to express it with numerous specific references to the "sacred *pneuma* (*ruach*)."

Yet when we examine these verses, we find that they continued to use neuter forms of the definite article (i.e., "the") at these points: e.g., Mark 3:29, 13:11; Luke 3:22, 12:10, 12; John 14:26; Acts 1:16, etc.[18] Even Yahushua the messiah's *ruach*, is made to be neuter, true to Greek grammatical rules.[19]

Since pronouns must agree with their antecedents, we next find that the pronoun for the sacred *pneuma* of Yahweh is also neuter. For example, in Romans 8:16, we read that "the *ruach* αὐτὸ (*auto*; itself) bears witness with our *ruach* that we are children of Yahweh."

Also, in Romans, regarding the sacred *ruach*, Saul reports:

> And in like manner the *ruach* jointly helps our weakness; for that which we should pray for according as it behooves, we know not, but the *ruach* αὐτὸ (*auto*; itself) makes intercession for us with inexpressible groanings. (Romans 8:26)

---

[18]   The following is a chart for the Greek definite articles (masculine, feminine, and neuter):

	Singular			Plural		
	M	F	N	M	F	N
Nominative	ὁ	ἡ	τό	οἱ	αἱ	τά
Genitive	τοῦ	τῆς	τοῦ	τῶν	τῶν	τῶν
Dative	τῷ	τῇ	τδῷ	τοῖς	ταῖς	τοῖς
Accusative	τόν	τήν	τό	τούς	τάς	τά

[19]   Luke 23:46, where it is reported that at his death, Yahushua gave up "τὸ πνεῦμά (the *ruach*)."

The Parakletos

Neo-Christians ignore this grammatical evidence mentioned above and instead primarily isolate their entire case to one description of the sacred *ruach* when it was referred to as the παράκλητος (*parakletos*; comforter),[20] the "*ruach* of truth."[21] It is argued that the personal pronouns ἐκεῖνος (*ekeinos*) and αὐτὸν (*auton*), both translated as "he," are used in the 14th through 16th chapters of John in reference to the *parakletos*, and that the use of "he" means that the sacred *ruach* is a person.

To begin with, the term παράκλητος (*parakletos*; comforter) is used to translate the Hebrew term מנחם (*menakham*; comforter)[22] and its cognate forms. Attached to the term is the idea of "repentance,"[23] to "rue" one's past mistakes and be consoled, pitied, and comforted because of that repentance.[24] The sacred *ruach*, therefore, was to assume this role of comforting those being repentant. In Hebrew, both מנחם (*menakham*) and its root נחם (*nakham*) are masculine in gender and stand as such regardless of who, male or female, or what acts in this capacity.

When he comes to the verses dealing with the *parakletos*, the apostle John is citing the words of Yahushua the messiah to his disciples. Obviously, Yahushua had originally spoken these words in Aramaic-Hebrew. Therefore he used the term *manakham*, which is itself masculine and has no regard for whether a *manakham* is a person, place, or thing.

The scribes who translated Yahushua's words into Greek applied the most equivalent term in the Greek language, *parakletos*, which derives from the roots "*para* (near) and "*kletos*

> When he comes to the verses dealing with the parakletos, the apostle John is citing the words of Yahushua the messiah to his disciples.

(to call"); that is, something "called to one's aid" or assistance, as an advocate, an "intercessor, consoler" or "comforter."[25] In English the term is usually translated as "comforter."

The word *parakletos*, like its Hebrew counterpart *manakham*, has a masculine gender; hence the translator's use of the personal pronoun "he." Yet "he," as we have already proven, does not make a parakletos a person. It only makes it masculine in gender, i.e., the comforter is dominant over the one being comforted.

Therefore, the entire premise of the neo-Christian argument is groundless. In fact, their view actually contradicts Scriptures. Within the same passages at issue, John 14:26 uses the definition "παράκλητος τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (*parakletos to pneuma to agion*; the comforter, the sacred *ruach*)," equating the *parakletos* with the sacred *ruach*. In this verse, the neuter definite article is used for the sacred *pneuma* (*ruach*).

If the sacred *ruach* was a person, not only would the neuter definite article not have been used, as it is throughout the NT, but the neuter pronoun would never have been applied, as it is, for example, in Romans 8:16 & 26.

As a result, the Trinitarian concept not only contradicts the entire OT but the NT as well. In the case of the Greek pronouns for *parakletos*,[26] for an accurate rendering of the sense of the term in English, they should be translated as "it," as is the practice with other translations of these same pronouns.

For example, the term αυτο (*auto*; him), which is used for the *parakletos* in John 14:17, is translated "it" in the KJV and other versions for such things as wine,[27] seed,[28] boat,[29]

---

[20] John 14:26; cf., Acts 9:31.
[21] John 15:26.
[22] SEC, Heb. #4505; See the LXX at Eccles. 4:1; Lam. 1:9, 16. In Hebrew it comes from the root נחם (*nakham*), meaning, "to *sigh*, i.e. *breathe* strongly; by impl. to be *sorry*, i.e. (in a favorable sense) to *pity, console* or (reflex.) *rue*" (SEC, #5162, 5163, 5164).
[23] HEL, p. 164.
[24] See above n. 22.
[25] GEL, p. 597; SEC, Gk., #3874-3875.
[26] E.g., John 14:16-17, 26, 15:26, 16:7-8.
[27] Matt. 26:29, 42; Mark 14:35.
[28] Mark 4:4, 7; Luke 8:5, 7.
[29] Mark 4:37.

salt,[30] money,[31] darkness,[32] ointment,[33] and so forth. The term ἐκεῖνος (*ekeinos*), also used in reference to the *parakletos*, is translated as "he" in John 14:26, but this term actually designates "that person or thing,"[34] "that one (or [neut.] thing) often intensified by the art. prefixed:— he, it, the other (same)."[35]

In Matthew 27:8 for example, this pronoun refers to a field. These terms have been left in the English translations as "he" only because of the neo-Christian bias, not because of proper grammar rules for translating from one language into another.

The fact remains that the sacred *ruach* is a dynamic creative force that builds up the Assembly.[36] When sitting in the position of a *manakham* or *parakletos*, it becomes a masculine "thing" in gender, but not in itself a masculine "person."

Accordingly, although the pronouns and definite articles for *parakletos* are in the Greek language grammatically correct as "he" or "him," it is disingenuous to translate them into English in that same way or to leave the false impression that the sacred *ruach* is a person.

In this regard, we should not forget that the term "sacred *ruach*," found in Hebrew using feminine and sometimes masculine gender, was translated into Greek as πνεῦμα (*pneuma*), which uses both neuter pronouns and definite articles. Therefore, one must translate such terms according to their proper usage in the language into which they are being converted. Otherwise, confusion will follow.

First Tripartite Formula

Another argument offered comes from the so-called tripartite formulas. First among these is the well-recognized and previously mentioned fraudulent verse found in the KJV at 1 John 5:7-8, which derives from one late 4th century C.E. Vulgate manuscript and was much later placed in the Greek NT of Erasmus (16th century C.E.).

The verse states:

> . . . in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth.

This spurious phrase is not only lacking in the earliest Greek texts but is not found in the Syriac, the Arabic, Ethiopic, the Coptic, Sahidic, Armenian, Slavonian, and many other texts as well.

The *New Bible Commentary Revised*, for example, states:

> The words are clearly a gloss and are rightly excluded by RSV even from its margin.[37]

Peake's Commentary on the Bible similarly concludes:

> The famous interpolation after 'three witnesses' is not printed even in RSV, and rightly . . . No respectable Greek MS contains it.[38]

The noted expert F. F. Bruce writes:

> A footnote rightly points out that the passage is 'not in any of the early Greek mss, or any of the early translations, or in the best mss of the Vulgate itself' and suggests that it is probably a gloss that has crept into the text."[39]

Even Scofield points out:

> It is generally agreed that v. 7 has no real authority, and has been inserted.[40]

Second Tripartite Formula

The second of these tripartite formulas is found in the baptismal rite seen in the present

---

30 Mark 9:50; Luke 14:34-35.
31 Luke 19:23.
32 John 1:5.
33 John 12:7.
34 GEL, p. 238.
35 SEC, Gk. #1565.
36 Acts 9:31.
37 NBCR, p. 1269.
38 PCB, p. 1038.
39 History of the Bible in English, p. 217.
40 SRB, loc. cit., n. o.

text of Matthew 28:19. Trinitarians claim that this is the only place in Scriptures where the "Trinity is found explicitly."[41]

Here, Yahushua commands his apostles:

> Go, therefore disciple all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the father and of the son and of the sacred *ruach*. (Matthew 28:19)

Nevertheless, this claim of at least one explicit statement is interpretative and without substance. To begin with, scholars admit that this verse is a comparatively late and "suspected part of the Gospel."[42] The ancient Hebrew text found in the Shem Tob edition, for example, coming from a 3rd or 4th century C.E. translation of the Greek text,[43] only has the word "Go" at this verse.

Eusebius, writing in the early 4th century C.E., renders it as, "Go and make disciples of all the heathen in my name,"[44] again leaving out the tripartite formula. Yet, in the *Creed of Eusebius*, although it too may be a later scribal addition, this author is made to quote Matthew 28:19, as we find it in our present texts.[45]

This evidence indicates that there were at least two versions of Matthew 28:19, known to Eusebius.

Yet this baptismal formula does not demonstrate the Trinitarian doctrine. No place in Scriptures, for example, is the sacred *ruach* ever referred to as a "deity." Rather, the formula conforms with the ante-Nicaean Christian beliefs, whose views were actually opposed by the Trinitarians.

> No place in Scriptures, for example, is the sacred *ruach* ever referred to as a "deity."

The line from Matthew 28:19, for instance, appears to have been added during the 2nd century C.E. as part of the increased popularity of the ante-Nicaean *triados* doctrine (two persons and a mode of operation), each composed of the divine by substance.

The idea appears for the first time between the middle of the 2nd century C.E. and the beginning of the 3rd century C.E. in the works of the Christian apologists Justin Martyr (c.160 C.E.),[46] and Tertullian (c.200–230 C.E.),[47] and by those who wrote the *Didache* (late 2nd or early 3rd century C.E.),[48] men who inform us that a Christian of their time was baptized into the threefold name.

As another point, although the Trinitarians argue that the formula implies equality of the three persons in the deity, it actually demonstrates the *triados* of power utilized by the ante-Nicaean Christians.

In the first place of importance is the mentioning of the father, from whom the *ruach* proceeds; in the second place of importance is the messiah, who sends the *ruach* to us; and finally, the *ruach* itself, which is poured out as a substance upon Christian converts. Baptism with the *ruach* was an act of placing divine power upon a trusting recipient. It was directly connected with the authority given in the sacred name, thus the emphasis in the formula upon the sacred name.

Further, because the sacred *ruach* belonged to father Yahweh, it was also called the *ruach* of Yahweh,[49] just as the city of Jerusalem, the

---

[41] NCE, 14, p. 306.

[42] ADB, 2, p. 213.

[43] George Howard believes that this text of Matthew descends from an original Hebrew manuscript (ST, pp. 155–234). Yet references to Greek names, such as to Peter and using יש"ו (Ye-sh-"-u) as a substitute for Yahushua clearly show a Hebrew translation of an early Greek text. For example, verse 4:18 of the Shem Tob text uses the phrase, "Simon, also called Petros" as does the Greek, whereas the Syriac Curetonian text uses his original Hebrew-Aramaic name, saying, "Simon who is called Kepha" (compare the Curetonian text with the Shem Tob of Matt., 8:14, 10:2, 14:28-29, 15:15, 16:16, 22, 17:1, 4, and so forth). In Munster's text of the book of Hebrews, on the other hand, the original Hebrew form יהושע (Yahushua) is used for the name of the messiah, indicating that this text would be a much better candidate as an original Hebrew NT work.

[44] Eusebius, H.E., 3:5:2.

[45] HCC, pp. 288-289.

[46] Justin Mart., 1 Apol., 1:61.

[47] Tertullian, Prax., 26.

[48] Didache, 7:1, 3.

[49] E.g., Judg. 3:10, 6:34, 11:29, 14:6, 19, 15:14; 1 Sam. 10:6, 16:13-14; 2 Sam. 23:3; 1 Kings 18:12, 22:24; 2 Kings 2:16; 2 Chron. 18:23, 20:14; Isa. 11:2, 40:7, 13, 59:19, 61:1 (cf., Luke 4:17-18), 63:14; Ezek. 11:5, 37:1; Mic. 2:7, 3:8.

Temple of Yahweh, the Ark of the Covenant, and the Mountain of Yahweh are also called by the name Yahweh.[50]

Therefore, the power of the *ruach* was given in the name of the father, and the son, and the sacred *ruach*. Nothing in this baptismal formula of the 2nd century C.E. even implies that the sacred *ruach* is a person.

Third Tripartite Formula

A third formula is believed to be indicated in 2 Corinthians where Saul ends his epistle with the words:

> The grace of the sovereign Yahushua the messiah, and the love of the deity, and the κοινωνία (*koinonia*; sharing of, participation in) the sacred *ruach* be with all of you. (2 Corinthians 13:14)

Here again, one does not find evidence that the sacred *ruach* is a person. Just the opposite is true. The emphasis is not upon three persons but upon three things, (1) grace, which is given to us by Yahushua the messiah, (2) love, i.e., the divine nature of father Yahweh, and (3) the κοινωνία (*koinonia*; participation) of the sacred *ruach*. Grace and love are things that are given to us, while participation is an act.

The Greek term κοινωνία (*koinonia*) is a form of κοινωνός (*koinonos*), meaning, "a *sharer*; i.e., an associate,"[51] "*a sharer with.*"[52] From this same root also comes the word κοινονέο (*koinoneo*), "*to have common share in, to partake in*" something.[53] Likewise, the term κοινωνία (*koinonia*) means to "participate," "contribute," or "share in" a task.[54]

> **Nothing in this baptismal formula of the 2nd century C.E. even implies that the sacred *ruach* is a person.**

The one *ruach* proceeding out from father Yahweh is poured out upon many different people simultaneously, giving gifts of power and mental enhancement. So all that Saul was doing in his epistle to the Corinthians was blessing the assembly members with the hope that they would all be participants in the gifts of the sacred *ruach*.

Fourth Tripartite Formula

Finally, a Trinity of three coequal persons but of one essence is claimed to be reflected in the praise given to father Yahweh by the seraph in Isaiah, who said, "sacred, sacred, sacred is Yahweh of hosts,"[55] and by the metaphoric heavenly beasts in Revelation, who said, "sacred, sacred, sacred, Yahweh the almighty deity."[56]

The Trinitarians reason that, since the word "sacred" is repeated three times, it infers there are three coequal persons in the deity. The problem with this view is that the reference is only to father Yahweh in both instances.

For example, Scriptures always use the expression "Yahweh of hosts" to separate him from the angel Yahweh (Yahu Yahweh), who later became Yahushua the messiah.[57] Furthermore, in both citations, only the person sitting upon the throne is being praised.

Yet, in the vision given in Isaiah, the angel Yahu Yahweh is not mentioned as being on the throne. In the account given in Revelation, at the very time that this praise was addressed to the one sitting upon the throne, Yahushua the messiah is clearly described as first standing inside the throne seat box and then coming out from the "μέσῳ (*meso*; middle) of the throne"

---

[50]   Jer. 25:29, 32:34; Dan. 9:18-19; 2 Sam. 6:2; Gen. 22:14.
[51]   SEC, Gk. #2844.
[52]   ILT, p. 56.
[53]   Ibid.
[54]   The Greek term κοινωνία (*koinonia*) means, "*participation, communion, fellowship . . . contribution*"; (ILT, p. 56) "*partnership,* i.e. (lit.) *participation,* or (social) *intercourse,* or (pecuniary) *benefaction*"; (SEC, Gk. #2842) "*have or do in common with, share, take part in a thing with another . . . communion, association, partnership . . . sexual intercourse . . . charitable contribution, alms*" (GEL, 1996, pp. 969-970).
[55]   Isa. 6:3.
[56]   Rev. 4:8.
[57]   E.g., notice the separation made between Yahweh (Yahu Yahweh, the *debar* or word of Yahweh, being Yahushua the messiah) and Yahweh of hosts in Zech. 1:3-4, 12-17, 2:5-13, 3:1-10, 4:1-14, 6:4-14, 7:4-14, and so forth, where Yahweh of hosts is said to have sent the angel Yahweh (Zech. 2:11, 4:1-9, esp. v. 9, 6:9-15, esp. v. 15). The separation is also made in Malachi and other books as well.

chair box to take a scroll from the right hand of father Yahweh who was sitting "ἐπὶ (*epi*; upon) the throne."[58]

Only father Yahweh is expressly stated as sitting upon the throne the entire time. Furthermore, he is described in this passage and elsewhere separately from the messiah as the one "who was, who is, and who is to come."[59]

Teaching and Testifying

Another argument advanced to support the idea that the sacred *ruach* is a person and not a substance from father Yahweh are the statements that the sacred *ruach* "will teach you,"[60] "instruct them,"[61] and "bears witness."[62] It is concluded that the sacred *ruach* must be a person because only a person could be said to teach or bear witness. But, again, this interpretation is wholly unscriptural and ignores other comparable scriptural statements.

First, the statement that the *ruach* bears witness is modified by the additional words, "because the *ruach* is ἀλήθεια (*aletheia*; reality, true, truth)";[63] that is, its witness comes from the fact that it is a real or true thing.[64] Second, Scriptures provide many examples of inanimate objects as well as animals and other nonpersons teaching and witnessing to us.

For example, read in Job:

> Yet now ask the beasts, and they will teach you; and the fowls of the air, and they will tell you; or speak to the LAND, and it will teach you; and the fishes of the sea will declare to you. Who does not know in all these things that the hand of Yahweh has wrought this? (Job 12:7-9)

In Psalms, it is the heavens (i.e., the sun, moon, and stars) that utter speech:

> The heavens declare the glory of el; and the OPEN EXPANSE SHOWS his handiwork. Day unto day utters speech, and night unto night shows knowledge. There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the land, and their words to the end of the world. In them he has set a tabernacle for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoices like a strong man to run a race. His (the sun's) going forth is from the end of the heavens, and his circuit unto the ends of it: and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof. (Ps. 19:1-6)

Another psalm similarly states that, "the heavens declare his righteousness,"[65] while the apostle Saul advises, "Does not even nature itself teach us."[66] Even a wicked man can

> **Second, Scriptures provide many examples of inanimate objects as well as animals and other nonpersons teaching and witnessing to us.**

---

[58] Rev. 5:5-7.

[59] Rev. 1:4-18, names the one "who is and who was and who is to come" and "his throne" separate from both the seven *ruach* beings before his throne and Yahushua the messiah, who stood between the "seven golden candlesticks." It is the one who is on the throne who first speaks to John the divine (Rev. 1:8) and later calls John in the *ruach* to see him sitting on his throne in the heavens (Rev. 4:1-11). At that time John also saw 24 elders and surrounding the throne, seven *ruach* beings standing before the throne, and in the midst of the throne forming its sides were four living creatures (Rev. 4:4-7). It was these four living creatures who praised the one on the throne by saying, "sacred, sacred, sacred, Yahweh *el shaddai*" (Rev. 4:8). When the one sitting on the throne was asked who was worthy to open the book he held in his right hand, we are told that it was "the lamb," defined as Yahushua the messiah, who was stationed "in the inside of the throne," not upon it (Rev. 5:1-6). The lamb then "came and took the book out of the right hand of him who sat UPON the throne" (Rev. 5:7).

[60] Luke 12:12; John 14:26.

[61] Neh. 9:20.

[62] Rom. 8:16; 1 John 5:6.

[63] The Greek term ἀλήθεια (*aletheia*) means, "*truth:*—true" (SEC, Gk. #225); *"truth . . . truth, reality . . . true"* (GEL, p. 34); *"truth . . . espec.,* (1) *freedom from error, exactness"* (ILT, p. 5).

[64] 1 John 5:6.

[65] Ps. 97:6.

[66] 1 Cor. 11:14.

"speak with his feet" and teach "with his fingers."[67] Indeed, the Torah (Law) of the Old Covenant, which is a book, can "teach when it is unclean and when it is clean," regarding such things as the law of leprosy.[68]

These data mean that there are numerous ways that something can bear witness and teach. For example, the earth, heavens, and animals do so because they have design and purpose, which bears witness and teaches us that Yahweh created them. Accordingly, it is clearly within the language of Scriptures that an inanimate object, substance, or animal life form can be a witness or has the ability to teach.

> Accordingly, it is clearly within the language of Scriptures that an inanimate object, substance, or animal life form can be a witness or has the ability to teach.

Even today, many are taught by computers, but no one defines a computer as a person. The sacred *ruach*, being a substance that provides gifts of ability, is pre-programmed like a computer. It can influence and teach us regarding the things of father Yahweh. Its primary witness is that by its power and use, it proves itself to be a real thing, thereby testifying that the one sending it to mankind is real.

Pentecost Day

The early Assembly members could not only visually see it, as they did on Pentecost day in 30 C.E.,[69] but also felt its effects (e.g., healing power, casting out demons, and so forth).

Even the Trinitarians recognize the flaw in their argument. The Catholic scholars of the *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, for example, make the following comments:

> The OT clearly does not envisage God's spirit as a person, neither in the strictly philosophical sense, nor

in the Semitic sense. God's spirit is simply God's power. If it is sometimes represented as being distinct from God, it is because the breath of Yahweh acts exteriorly (Isa. 48:16; 63:11; 32:15).[70]

This text then adds:

> Very rarely do the OT writers attribute to God's spirit emotions or intellectual activity (Isa. 63:10; Wis. 1:3–7). When such expressions are used, they are mere figures of speech that are explained by the fact that the rüah 〚*ruach*〛 as regarded also as the seat of intellectual acts and feelings (Gen. 41:8). Neither is there found in the OT or in rabbinical literature the notion that God's spirit is an intermediary being between God and the world. This activity is proper to the angels, although to them is ascribed some of the activity that elsewhere is ascribed to the spirit of God.[71]

These scholars go on to describe the evidence from the NT, stating:

> The majority of NT texts reveal God's spirit as something, not someone; this is especially seen in the parallelism between the spirit and the power of God.[72]

They then continue by saying:

> When a quasi-personal activity is ascribed to God's spirit, e.g., speaking, hindering, desiring, dwelling (Acts 8:29; 16:7; Rom. 8:9), one is not

---

67 Prov. 6:12-13.
68 Lev. 14:57.
69 Acts, 2:1–3.
70 NCE, 13, p. 574.
71 NCE, 13, p. 575.
72 Ibid.

justified in concluding immediately that in these passages God's spirit is regarded as a Person; the same expressions are used in regard to rhetorically personified things or abstract ideas (see Rom. 6:6, 7:17). Thus the context of the phrase 'blasphemy against the spirit' (Mt. 12:31; cf. Mt. 12:28; Luke, 11:20) shows the reference is being made to the power of God.[73]

Conclusion

These same theologians also admit that the NT concepts of the sacred *ruach* are essentially a continuation of those found in the OT. Yet regardless of these admissions, the Trinitarians still cling to the notion that the sacred *ruach* is a person, not based on scriptural evidence, but on the belief that there was "a gradual revelation that the Spirit of God is a person."[74]

> These same theologians also admit that the NT concepts of the sacred *ruach* are essentially a continuation of those found in the OT.

When pressed, they are forced to admit that the entire idea is really a mystery and a matter of late, extra-biblical revelation.

Yet a close examination of the few scriptures held up as examples implying that the sacred *ruach* is a person, as we have already demonstrated above, proves that such interpretations could only be true if you were armed with a preconceived idea that *eloahim* is a Trinity.

The evidence also demonstrates that the sacred *ruach* is a divine substance defined as the breath coming from out of the mouth of father Yahweh, a power and mode of operation by which Yahweh can create and give life. By coming out of his mouth, it demonstrates that the *ruach* is an expression of Yahweh's spoken word, for as Saul states, "the sword of the pneumatos (*ruach*), which is the word of the deity."[75]

---

[73]   Ibid.
[74]   Ibid.
[75]   Eph., 6:17.

Bibliography

ADB = *A Dictionary of the Bible, Comprising its Antiquities, Biography, Geography and Natural History*, ed. William Smith, 3 vols., London, John Murray, 1863.

CHAL = *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. William L. Holladay. Based upon the Lexical Work of Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1971.

CS = *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books)*. Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath. 3 vols. Vols. 1 & 2 are reprod.of the 1897 ed. pub. by the Clarendon Press (Oxford). Vol. 3 is a reprod. of the 1906 ed. pub. by the Clarendon Press (Oxford); reprinted by Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1991.

Didache = *Didache* or The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (mid-second century C.E.) (LCL)

GEL = *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon*. Founded upon the seventh ed. of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon. At the Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1961.

HCC = Hefele, Charles Joseph. *A History of the Christian Councils, from the Original Documents, to the Close of the council of Nicaea, A.D. 325*; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1894.

HEL = *Hebrew-English Lexicon*. Zondervan Edition, 1970. Catalog #6264. Samuel Bagster & Sons, LTD., London. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

IHG = Harris, R. Laird. *Introductory Hebrew Grammar*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Michigan. 4th ed., 1955.

ILT = Lex. *Greek–English Lexicon to the New Testament*. This lexicon is located in the back of The Interlinear Literal Translation of the Greek New Testament. George Ricker Berry. Zondervan Publishing House, Michigan, 1958.

ISBE = *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, gen. ed., James Orr, 5 vols., Lakeside Press, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, The Howard-Severance Company, 1915.

Justin Mart. = Justin Martyr (mid-2nd century) (PG, 6)
   1 Apol.   First Apology for the Christians

NBCR = *The New Bible Commentary: Revised*. Ed. by Donald Gunthrie, J.A. Motyer. Inter-Varsity Press, Westmont, IL, 1970.

NBD = *The New Bible Dictionary*. Ed. by J. D. Doublas. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1971.

NCE = *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 16 vols. The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1967.

NJB = Wansbrough, Henry, gen. ed. *The New Jerusalem Bible*. Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York, 1985.

NTB = Moffatt, James. *A New Translation of the Bible*. Harper & Row, New York, 1954.

ODCC = *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Chuch*. Edited by F. L. Cross. Oxford University Press, London, 1966.

PCB = *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. by Matthew Black & H. H. Rowley, Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, New York, 1962.

REB = Rotherham, Joseph Bryant. *Rotherham's Emphasized Bible*. Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1959.

RSV = Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States. *The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version*. Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York, 1952.

SEC = Strong, James. *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible, together with Dictionaries of the Hebrew and Greek Words*. Riverside Book and Bible House, Iowa.
   Heb. = A Concise Dictionary of the Words in the Hebrew Bible.
   Gk. = A Concise Dictionary of the Words in the Greek Testament.

SRB = Scofield, C. I. *The Scofield Reference Bible*. Oxford Press, New York, 1945.

ST = Howard, George. *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew*. Mercer University Press, 1995. (Shem Tob)

Tertullian = Quinti Septimii Florentis Tertulliani (c.160–c.230 C.E.)
   Prax.   *Against Praxeas*

YAC = *Analytical Concordance to the Bible*. Robert Young. 22nd American Edition, rev. Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, reprint 1968.