

ANSWERING THE ARGUMENTS OFFERED BY TRINITARIANS

Response Letters 1-3

Julio B. Scaramastro



www.antipas.org

Letter 1

This will be a brief analysis of the information you provided me with in your presentation and defense of your beliefs about The Doctrine of The Trinity. Hopefully, you will remember all the things which we have discussed together prior to this. Now lets get started with this project!

The first section you entitle "The deity of Jesus Christ." Under this section the first passage you introduce to our attention is Isaiah 7:14 with no real explanation of it other than, " Immanuel is Hebrew for 'God with us.'" Now, since no explanation is given, are we to assume you feel that none is needed because your teaching is patently clear here? If this is so, then it is necessary to start by saying that it is not clearly taught here. Your view would have to be read into it, or a more detailed explanation given on how it is found here. May it also be said at this point that the word Trinity does not occur in The Scriptures (Which fact alone should cause you to question it!), nor is there any passage which clearly teaches this doctrine without someone first reading it into it. Any objective and unbiased reading of The Scriptures would never bring anyone to such an illogical, and unscientific view as The Doctrine of The Trinity. Let us look at this first passage you offer us in such an unbiased and objective fashion, and see what the Hebrews who received this prophecy at the hands of Isaiah would see:

Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.

Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good.

For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land shall be forsaken of both her kings. (Isaiah 7:14-16)

The very first thing we are told is that this is a sign for the Jews from Yahweh. Does the Jewish Scriptures, which are able to make us wise unto salvation (2 Tim. 3:16), teach anything but The Oneness of Yahweh? Obviously not! For the Jews never came up with such an idea as The Trinity. You can search their writings and never find it. In fact, The Scriptures teach just the opposite. For example: "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD." Deut. 6:4. To the Jew (and for that matter the Moslems) people who believe in The Trinity are pagans! In the writings of the pagans, you will clearly find the concept of the Trinity taught as demonstrated in the booklet you were given. Therefore, whatever conclusions the Jews in Isaiah' days would come to about this sign, it would not include anything close to The Trinity.

The next thing we are invited to do is "Behold" This term is a demonstrative interjection which is "usually expressive of readiness to hear and to obey ... " Benjamin Davidson, ANALYTICAL HEBREW AND CHALDEE LEXICON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, page 199. What kind of a wonder are we excitedly asked to look at? A virgin shall conceive and bear a son! How can a woman conceive and still be called a virgin? This was humanly speaking not possible. For, in order to become pregnant, a women would have to loose her status as a virgin. Thus, the Jew is being told that the conception would be outside the normal human channel. There is only one way this could be possible. How? By miraculous intervention so that the normal method would not be necessary. All miraculous occurrences require a manifestation of the power of El (pronounced Ail). The Deity's title as the power of the universe. Thus, the son that would be born would be a result of this power of El, and, as a consequence, would be a son of El even as Adam had been before (Lk. 3:38). He would be a manifestation of the power (El) dwelling in their midst, or Immanuel, El with us.

Note, also, that this son did not exist at the time the prophet was giving the message for the future tense is talked about. Note, also, that this son is talked about as having to be conceived and born in order to exist. Note that this special son is not talked about as already existing and taking on a new form as The Trinitarian Doctrine would require it. In fact, how can a son be co-equal and co-existent with his father? The Doctrine of The Trinity defies the universally accepted and historically always held meaning of the words for father and son. Not only does it defy the meaning of these words, it destroys their meaning! This fact is important to realize for God gave us language. It was not invented by man as the evolutionist

tries to say. Thus, we are not destroying man made terms, but God-given terms! These terms, as given to us by God, require that the father exists before the son, and for the son to be brought into existence by the father. This universally accepted and recognized definition is what these terms have meant from the beginning of this creation. Therefore, who has given anyone the authority to change these God-given terms now? In fact, The Lord Jesus Christ verifies the meaning of these terms when he says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him." John 13:16 "Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I." John 14:28. Here, he establishes that God is his lord, that he was sent by his lord, that God is his Father, and that his Father is greater than he himself. How could any of these declarations be true if the Doctrine of The Trinity is true? It is clearly impossible for these declarations of The Lord Jesus Christ to be true and the Doctrine of The Trinity to be True! It is easy to see that these words of the Lord Jesus Christ and the Doctrine of the Trinity are mutually exclusive and opposing views!

Now notice that verses fifteen and sixteen require that this special son has to learn the difference between good and evil. If he was God, then how could such a statement apply? Isn't God omniscient? Isn't this passage teaching us that this special son would have to go through a learning process like every other normal natural human being? Isn't it telling us that he at one time did not know the difference between good and evil? Isn't it teaching us that he would have to learn to refuse the evil and choose the good? The answer to these questions is obviously yes! It doesn't take someone with a doctorate degree to answer them. In fact, the only too obvious answer to all of these questions destroys The Trinitarian concept of this special son. Furthermore, this conclusion from this passage is verified by what is said about The Lord Jesus Christ in The New Testament. Consider the following passages:

And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him. Luke 2:40.

And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man. Luke 2:52.

But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only. Matt. 24:36.

But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. Mark 13:32.

For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel. John 5:20.

And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. Acts 1:7

The revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John. Rev. 1:1.

At this point, let us briefly look at the implications of the above listed passages. We will take them in the order in which we quoted them.

In Luke 2:40, we have the natural process of growth in any descendant of Adam clearly set out and applied to the Lord Jesus Christ. If the Lord Jesus Christ is God, then how can he be said to increase in strength? Does this mean that he became a weak human child? How can God lose His strength and still be called God? In this weakened state couldn't the God of the Universe have been wiped out? Next, how could Jesus, if he was God, need to increase in spirit? Does this mean God decreased His normal quantity of spirit? If so, then how did He refill Himself with it once again? Again, wouldn't this have exposed the God of the universe to the potential of being destroyed? Now notice that the grace of God was upon him. If he was God, then why was the grace of God upon him? Doesn't this show that God is God and separate from Jesus? How can any other meaning be obtained from this statement?

Furthermore, why was God in need of grace? Doesn't it seem strange that He would be extending grace to Himself? In that case, shouldn't the grace be found in and not upon Himself? Also, remember that grace is unmerited divine favor. Was God placing favor that He did not earn upon Himself? Doesn't this reveal how fundamentally wrong The Doctrine of The Trinity is? Now let us proceed to the next passage which will further reveal how wrong this doctrine is. In Luke 2:52 we are told that "Jesus ... increased in wisdom ... increased in stature ... increased in favour with God and man.

If Jesus is God, how can he increase in wisdom? Did God empty Himself of wisdom and have to be refilled with it all over again? How could He regain this wisdom once He had let go of it? How is it possible for Him to remove His wisdom and still be considered God? Is there such a thing as an unwise God? It would seem to me that to ask such a question is to answer it! Furthermore, it seems to me that He would be exposing Himself to any crafty individual by doing such an obviously absurd thing. It definitely seems that He was opened up to being outsmarted by almost anyone wiser than He at the time. Also, who was maintaining His universe when he was in such a weakened and unwise state? Now notice that he had to increase in favor with God. Does this mean that He had to increase in favor with Himself? How can it be said that he increased in favor with God unless he wasn't God? Obviously, God is viewed as God in this passage and Jesus as separate from and in need of God's favor like every other human being. In fact, these passages are emphasizing how identical to us Jesus was at that time! This fact is important when we come to look at the atonement and what was accomplished in Jesus' death. We will leave that for a future discussion. Notice, also, that it says Jesus increased in favor with man as well as with God. If Jesus is God, and, therefore, the Creator of man, then, why is it important for him to increase in favor with man who is His creation? None of this makes any sense if The Doctrine of The Trinity is true. If Jesus was really a man and had just come into existence at that time, then all of these passages make perfect sense. If you feel all of this creates insurmountable problems for this doctrine, then wait and see what is coming next!

In Matt. 24:36 and Mark 13:32, we are informed that there is knowledge which no one, man, or angel, or he, Jesus, possesses but only The Father! If Jesus is God, coequal with the Father, then, how is it that he acknowledges that the Father possesses knowledge that he himself, just like other men, does not possess?

How can one part of The Trinity be said to know something that the other part does not know? Isn't this nonsensical to say the least? Notice Jesus puts himself in the same category with the rest of Adam's race with respect to this knowledge. How can he still be God if he knows no more than other men on this subject? Doesn't this show that God is separate and distinct from the son and superior to and not co-equal with him? Obviously, it does!

We now arrive at John 5:20 where we are informed that the Father loves the son. Does this really mean that He is in love with Himself? Isn't this conceit? We are also informed that the Father was educating His son: "and sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel." If Jesus is God, then why is it necessary to shew himself all things that he himself is doing? If he is omniscient, then, why does he have to be shown all things?

Doesn't the Doctrine of The Trinity make a farce out of this very beautiful passage of The Father loving and educating His son? Again, doesn't this passage demonstrate that The Father is separate from and superior to the son and not co-equal with him? It seems to me that it does if considered objectively and logically. By the way, being logical is being appealed to for this is the way The Creator made us so that He can reason with us in a very objective and sensible manner. Notice what He says in Isaiah 1:18, "Come now, and let us reason together, saith Yahweh" Also, in Rom. 12:1, "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable [LOGIKOS, pertaining to the reason, rational, (English, logical) ...]" E.W. Bullinger, A CRITICAL LEXICON AND CONCORDANCE TO THE ENGLISH AND GREEK NEW TESTAMENT, page 625.] service." Thus, The Doctrine of The Trinity defies the very fundamental way The Creator has made us. It is a totally illogical and irrational doctrine. It is a doctrine that must be offered without explanation because it can not be logically explained. In addition, Faith involves our capacity

to reason logically on the evidence that God has offered to us so that we can be persuaded that He exists and is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. (Hebrews 11:6) Paul also informs us that we are saved by grace through faith in Ephesians 2:8. Grace is the means and faith is the channel. Thus, logically being persuaded of God's provisions is the channel through which God's grace proceeds! We will now proceed to the next passage.

In Acts 1:7, we are again confronted with a declaration that there is knowledge that is solely in the control of The Father. Remember, this declaration is being made after his resurrection and matches exactly what he had said before. He is no longer checked by mortality. He is immortal and incorruptible. He has been glorified. In spite of these facts, he clearly declares that there are things which are only in the power of the Father! How can this possibly be if he is co-equal with the Father and is the second person of The Trinity?

We have now arrived at the final passage in this series which is Rev. 1:1. Here again we are hit with a paradox if the Doctrine of The Trinity is true! Why? Well, consider carefully the full implications of what Jesus is saying in this passage. He says, "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him,..." Here, we have Jesus Christ glorified and in heaven and quite a few years after he left the earth. Yet, in spite of these facts, he is still telling us that God had to give him this book called by us The Revelation. He himself did not know this information about God's future plan, as expressed previously in the passages already looked at, until God gave it to him! How can this be possible if he is the second person of the Trinity? Doesn't this, once again, show us that God is the only God separate and distinct and superior to His son who is not God? Logically, how can we come to any other conclusion? Isn't it obvious by now that the Doctrine of The Trinity destroys the correct understanding of "... the ONLY true God, AND Jesus Christ, WHOM THOU (God) hast sent." John 17:3. Notice, that, in this verse, John tells us that the correct knowledge concerning this only true God and Jesus Christ is life eternal! Therefore, if we want life eternal, then we have to have a correct understanding on this subject. May it be said at this point that The Doctrine of The Trinity can not be that correct understanding? I feel that if you put all emotion aside, then you will have to agree with The Scriptural point of view which has been presented to you so far in these pages of discussion.

The next item on your list is a passage which we have discussed at length. At that time, it was obvious that it was not concluded that "The deity of Jesus is clearly and irrefutably laid down by John." Therefore, it is rather surprising to find it being placed on this list of passages. May it also be said that nowhere in John's Gospel, let alone in the first chapter, does John ever teach The Trinity. Again, this term is not found any place in The Scriptures! May it also be added that the phrases God the Son and God the Holy Ghost are never found anywhere in The Scriptures! May it also be pointed out that the phrase the Son of God is found in The Scriptures and that it can be applied to every true believer who has been adopted into His family by belief of The Gospel and baptism into Christ. (John 1:12; Rom. 8:14-21; Gal. 4:26-29; Mark 16:16.) Thus, the phrase "son of God" does not equate with the Trinitarian concept of "God the Son" which is not a Scriptural term. Consequently, it can not be used in an attempt to prove that Jesus is the second person of an imaginary trinity. Now, let us look at John 1:1-18 in some detail in order to establish what it does and does not teach.

Letter 2

JOHN 1

In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God, the same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not. (John 1:1-5)

Here we have a grand opening introducing us to the work of the spirit in laying the foundation for the new creation or spiritual creation. It is as grand an opening as that contained in Genesis where we are introduced to Elohim's plan and purpose being executed in those opening acts of creation. There we see Elohim speaking the word and the creative act immediately following. The record repeatedly states "And Elohim said ... It (Gen. 1:3,6,9, 11,14,20,24,26.) Of course, the Psalmist picks this point up and emphasizes it when he says, "By the word (Hebrew "dabar" and Septuagint translation "logos".) of the LORD (Yahweh) were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth ... For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast...The counsel of the LORD (Yahweh) standeth for ever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations." Ps. 33:6,9,11. That word of command was expressive of the mind, purpose, design, and plan of the Creator. The creation therefore is the express result of the mind, purpose, design, and plan of the Creator and carried out by the Elohim, even His angels, also referred to as His ministering spirits.

Bless the LORD (Yahweh), ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments (Hebrew DABAR and translated by LOGOS in the Septuagint.), hearkening unto the voice of his word, (Hebrew DABAR and translated by LOGOS in the Septuagint.) Bless ye the LORD (Yahweh), all ye his hosts; ye ministers of his, that do his pleasure, (Ps. 103:20-21.)

Who maketh his angels spirits; his ministers a flaming fire: Who laid the foundations of the earth, that it should not be removed for ever. (Ps. 104:4-5.)

Everywhere we look we see purpose and design in creation which requires a purposer and a designer. This fact absolutely destroys the arguments of the evolutionist.

Exactly these same points are being made when John comes to look at the new or spiritual creation in his gospel. It is for this reason that we find such similar language being used. To try and understand these opening verses in any other way is to truly miss what is meant by them. To try to impose on them something that is not being said is error of the highest degree. The Scriptures place a curse on anyone who attempts to add to or take away from what Yahweh has placed on record therein. (See Deut. 4:2; 12:32; Prov. 30:6; Rev. 22:18-19.) This warning is worth taking note of in the current context for such terms as "Triune God", "God the Son," "God the Holy Ghost," and "The Trinity" are nowhere to be found in The Scriptures! Nowhere does it use such terms as co-equal and co-eternal to describe Christ's relationship with The Father. Building one's faith on a doctrine whose basic terms explaining it are foreign to the Scriptures should definitely cause one to stop and take notice. There must be something wrong with it! Now, let us look at John 1 in some detail in order to understand the real reasons for such introductory language.

"In the beginning" leads us to such passages as:

In the beginning God (Elohim) created the heavens (The Hebrew word is plural.) and the earth. (Gen. 1:1.)

The LORD (Yahweh) possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. (Prov. 8:22.)

And thou Lord (El - Obtained from the passage in Psalms that is being cited here.), in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:" (Heb. 1:10.)

Even by a quick comparison of these passages with that of John 1:1,2, we readily notice a parallel of thought. This parallel is important to realize for Genesis chapter one is dealing with more than the Deity's literal six day creation of the heavens and the earth. In fact, since we know:

All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect throughly furnished unto all good works. (2 Tim. 3:16-17.)

... the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. 2 Tim. 3:15.)

For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope. (Rom. 15:4.)

Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come. (1 Cor. 10:11.)

We can conclude from the above passages that there is a spiritual lesson contained in Genesis chapter one beyond the fact of the six day literal creation. The Apostle Paul furthers this thought by the discussion that is contained in Hebrews 4:1-11 where he compares the seventh day rest of Gen. 2:1-3 with the millennial rest. Thus, if the seventh day rest or the Jewish Sabbath represented the Aion of the Aions, or the Olam, or the Kingdom Age, which is a cycle of one thousand years (Rev. 20:2,3,4,5,6,7), then the previous six days of literal creation represent six periods of a thousand years each, and represent the development of the Deity's spiritual creation until it is brought to fruition in the Millennium. (Such passages as Ps. 84:10; 90:4; 2 Pet. 3:8 seem to indicate that this time principle is logical as well as symmetrical.) Therefore, we constantly find reference to this spiritual creation throughout the Scriptures. In proof of this last point, consider the following passages (These passages are all of the Old Testament passages containing the same Hebrew word, BARAH, as that which is translated "created" in Gen. 1:1,21,27; 2:3,4; 5:122; 6:7; Deut. 4:32; Ps. 89:12; Is. 40:26; 42:5; 45:12,18; 54:16; Mal. 2:10 which passages refer, at least, to the literal creation.):

I. Ezekiel 21:30; 28:13,15 where BARAH is used in a symbolical sense of the creation of a nation. These passages do not apply to the Deity's spiritual creation, but are cited just to show that the term can be used of something other than the literal events of Genesis chapter one.

II. Ps. 102:18; 104:30; 148:5; Is. 41:20; 43:1,7; 45:8; 48:7; Is. 65:17,18 ("create" three times); Jer. 31:22 where BARAH definitely refers to the spiritual new creation.

Now, in the New Testament, we have numerous references to this spiritual creation. In connection with this point consider the following passages:

Eph. 2:10 "created", 15 "make"; 3:9 "who created"; 4:24 "which ... is created"; Col. 1:16 "were ... created ... were created"; 3:10 "that created"; 2 Cor. 5:17 "creature"; Gal. 6:15 "creature"; Col. 1:15,23 "creature"; Rev. 3:14 "creation"; James 1:18 "creatures".

Now, the last passage we will consider at this time which clearly establishes the Genesis chapter one account as more than a literal history of the creation of "the heavens and the earth" by the Deity is that which is found in 2 Cor. 4:1-6. Here the Apostle Paul clearly connects the Elohim's commandment for the appearance of light on the first day in Gen. 1:3-5 with the symbolical "light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." (2 Cor. 4:6.) Thus we are informed that the knowledge (or, "the truth," 2 Cor. 4:2; or, "our - meaning the Apostles' - gospel," 2 Cor. 4:3; or, "the glorious gospel of Christ," 2 Cor. 4:4.) which comes from the Deity and is found in His Word dispels the darkness of the natural mind enabling a person to be removed from the ranks of the lost.

Now that we have established the fact that Genesis One is more than the literal history of a literal six

day creation, and, in fact, points forward to Yahweh's development of a spiritual creation. Also, since we have indicated that there is a parallel of thought between Genesis chapter one and John chapter one, let us see the logical development between the thoughts of these two chapters.

In verse one of both chapters under consideration, the Eternal Spirit carries us back to a time when the creation we are a part of did not exist. Here it is made clear that, even though the creation we are a part of did not exist, the Deity and Elohim did! We are then informed that the Deity created-demonstrating wisdom, design, purpose, an outward expression of an inward thought. (See Prov. 3:19.) In Gen. 1:2, we see that, "the Spirit of Elohim moved (or brooded) upon the face of the waters ... " Thus indicating the thought processes in action, which, after surveying the scene, led to the expression of that thought in a word of command, "Let there be light ... " The immediate result was that the word of Elohim produced light, "and there was light," which was declared to be "good" and made a distinction between day and night. We will return to this idea later, but the important point to remember now is the connection between the spoken word and the thought behind those words and the necessary fact that the thought and the spoken word are one, and an expression of the mind and wisdom of the One Creator. Thus the Deity expresses the thought of His mind in words which produce results repeatedly.

NOTE: Gen. 1:3,6,9,11,14,20,24,26.

John expresses the same idea in chapter one verses 1-5. Using three simple statements of fact, one fact the logical deduction of the other, John establishes the same principle. He first says, "In the beginning was the word," which is a postulate or statement which requires no proof, but is accepted as fact. Everyone who is open-minded will readily agree that when he looks around at the material world that purpose and design, and, thus, reason is found associated with it. Once that is accepted, the next step follows, namely, "and the word was with God," or in other words, purpose requires a purposer, design a designer, and reason a reasoner. Thus, along with the obvious expression of a logical mind which is found throughout the creation we are a part of, there must be the one who is the thinker behind it, and that thinker is God. Well, once we accept that, we are ready for the final peg in this logical sequence of thought which is, "and the word was God." In other words, the thought could not exist apart from the thinker and the word spoken apart from the speaker, therefore, the word, and thought behind the word, are nothing more than the speaker or thinker himself. In fact, the use of LOGOS here requires this as a result of its own meaning. Consider the following definitions for this term:

The word the spoken word; the word, not in its outward form, but as connected with the inward thought; the word, not written, but spoken; the word, not as a part of speech, but as part of what is uttered ... LOGOS is the embodiment and outward expression of the invisible thought. Bullinger, E. W. A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament, Page 896.

The word spoken (not written); the word or speech as a means or instrument, and not as a product; the word as that which is spoken; the expression, both of single expressions and of longer speeches. Hence, the word of the Gospel denotes all that God says or has caused to be said to men. And as the word manifests the inward and invisible thought, so this manifests God's will, and makes it known to man. Bullinger, E. W. A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament, Page 597.

Something said (including the thought); by implication a topic (subject of discourse), also reasoning (the mental faculty) or motive; by extension a computation; specifically (with the article in John) the Divine Expression (that is Christ). Strong's Exhaustive Concordance, #3056.

I. computation, reckoning ...

II. relation, correspondence, proportion ...

III. explanation, 1. plea, pretext, ground ... 2. statement of a theory, argument ... d. rule, principle, law, as embodying the result of LOGISMOS ... 3. law, rule of conduct ... 4. thesis, hypothesis,

provisional ground ... 5. reason, ground ... 6. formula (wider than definition, but frequently equivalent thereto), term expressing reason ... 7. reason, law exhibited in the world-process ...

IV. inward debate of the soul...1. thinking, reasoning; reflection, deliberation...in idea, in thought ... theory, abstract reasoning with outward experience ... explanation, opposite perception, discursive reasoning, opposite intuition...2. reason as a faculty ... b. creative reason,...

V. continuous statement, narrative ...

VI. verbal expression or utterance ...

VII. a particular utterance, saying ...

VIII. thing spoken of, subject matter ...

IX. expression, utterance, speech regarded formally... Liddell and Scott. Greek-English Lexicon, Pages 1057-1059.

Properly a collecting, collection, (see LEGO),- and that, as well of those things which are put together in thought, as of those which, having been thought that is gathered together in the mind, are expressed in words. Accordingly, a twofold use of the term is to be distinguished: one which relates to speaking, and one which relates to thinking.

I. As respects speech: 1. a word, yet not in the grammatical sense (the same as VOCABULUM, the mere name of an object), but language, VOX, that is a word which, uttered by the living voice, embodies a conception or idea; (hence it differs from REMA and EPOS ... 4. in an objective sense, what is communicated by instruction, doctrine ... II. Its use as respects the MIND alone, Latin RATIO; that is, 1. reason, the mental faculty of thinking, meditating, reasoning, calculating, etc ... Grimm Thayer. Greek-English Lexicon Of The New Testament, Pages 380-382.

I. Of that by which the inward thought is expressed,..

II. Of the inward thought itself... Abbott-Smith. Manual Greek Lexicon Of The New Testament. Pages 270-271.

Now, consider some of the passages where LOGOS occurs:

Matt. 8:8,16; 24:35.

Mk. 7:13 “the word of God”; 13:31.

Lk. 4:32 “word was with power”; 5:1 “the word of God”; 7:7; 8:11 “the word of God,” 21 “the word of God”; 11:28 “the word of God”; 21:33; 24:19.

John 1:1,14; 10:35 “the word of God”; 12:48.

Acts 4:31 “the word of God”; 6:2 “the word of God,” 7 “the word of God”; 7:22; 8:14 “the word of God,” 25 “the word of the Lord”; 10:36 “the word which God sent”; 12:24 “the word of God”; 13:5 “the word of God,” 7 “the word of God,” 44 “the word of God,” 48 “the word of the Lord,” 49 “the word of the Lord”; 15:35 “the word of the Lord,” 36 “the word of the Lord”; 16:32 “the word of the Lord”; 17:13 “the word of God”; 18:11 “the word of God”; 19:10 “the word of the Lord,” 20 “the word of God.”

Rom. 9:6 “the word of God,” 28 “work” (both occurrences).

1 Cor. 1:18 “preaching”; 14:36 “the word of God.”

2 Cor. 2:17 “the word of God”; 4:2 “the word of God.”

Col. 1:25 “the word of God”; 3:16 “the word of Christ.”

1 Thess. 1:8 “the word of the Lord”; 2:13 “the word of God”; 4:15 “the word of the Lord.”

2 Thess. 3:1 “the word of the Lord.”

1 Tim. 4:5 “the word of God.”

2 Tim. 2:9 “the word of God.”

Titus 2:5 “the word of God.”

Heb. 2:2; 4:12 “the word of God”; 6:1 “the doctrine of Christ”; 11:3 “the word of God”; 13:7 “the word of God.”

1 Pet. 1:23 “the word of God.”

2 Pet. 3:5 “the word of God.”

1 John 2:14 “the word of God.”

Rev. 1:2 “the word of God,” 9 “the word of God”; 6:9 “the word of God”; 19:9 “the true sayings of God,” 13 “the word of God”; 20:4 “the word of God”; 21:5; 22:6 “sayings.”

From the above definitions and Scriptural usage of the term LOGOS, we can see the clear connection between the message John is driving home and the meaning of the very word he uses as his vehicle of logic to develop that message.

Similar language is found in Proverbs chapter eight where wisdom is personified as a woman. In fact, wisdom is personified as a woman throughout the opening chapters of Proverbs. However, in this particular place there is a definite parallel expression of idea with that contained in Genesis one and John one for in verse 22 we have the following: “Yahweh possessed (or created as the Hebrew word primarily means - see Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance #7069.) me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old.” Note the phrase “in the beginning!” Now read verses 23-36 noting verse 30 and comparing this with John 1:1-2. Throughout these verses wisdom is talking as a woman existing separately from and throughout the same time period as Yahweh. However, it is quite obvious that this must be figurative language representing Yahweh’s wisdom itself and not really a separate being. Of course, maybe we should adopt the theory that there are really four persons in the Godhead instead of three and that the fourth one is a woman named Wisdom! By the way, did you pay particular attention to verse 30 as was directed above? It says,

Then I was by him, as one brought up with him: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before Him;

Allow me to restructure Prov. 8:22 and 30 in parallel with John 1:1 so that the very remarkable exactness can be seen.

The LORD (Yahweh) possessed me
in the beginning of His way
Then I was by Him, as one
brought up with Him

In the beginning was the word,

and the word was with God,

Isn't it obvious that the only conclusion that can be realized from this is that both wisdom and LOGOS are representative of exactly the same thing? Doesn't it follow that "the word was God" means no more than what is being said in Proverbs by the wise man Solomon? Obviously, it does! Thus, both the word and wisdom must be God for they can not exist apart from Him for they are an outward expression of His mind.

John then goes on to point out in verses three and four exactly what Genesis and Proverbs and numerous other places in the Scriptures tell us, namely, that the Deity is the Creator of "all things." But, it is at this point that he really begins to parallel the symbolical and spiritual along side the literal creation of the Genesis account.

In verse four, John makes another one of those logical statements which requires no proof, namely, "In him (that is the Deity) was life." This naturally follows from the previous reasoning because being the Creator He is the source of the life of His creation, and, therefore, all life must originate from Him, and, thus, the life-giving force must be innately a part of Him. However, this statement exists independent of the previous statements because it really requires no proof. It is an absolute fact that life of its highest form is a natural characteristic of the infinite being referred to by John. (At this point, note John 5:26, which says,

For as the Father hath life (Greek ZOE) in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life (Greek ZOE) in himself;

Besides verifying what we have just been saying, this passage must be very disturbing to all Trinitarians for Jesus quite clearly teaches that life was an inherent part of His Father and it is a gift to him, His Son, which clearly means that he was in need of it. Why else would he make such a statement if he already had it? How could he be God if God had to give him life? It seems to me that there can only be one conclusion. God had it and he didn't and so God gave it to him, therefore, he can't be God!) In fact, the Greek word for life in both places in this verse is ZOE which is the term that is always associated with passages containing the phrases "everlasting life," "eternal life," "the crown of life," "life eternal," "life everlasting," "bread of life," "resurrection of life," "the light of life," "Prince of life," "justification of life," "newness of life," "life of God," "the word of life," "the book of life," "life and immortality," "endless life," "the grace of life," "unto life and godliness," "tree of life," "Spirit of life," and, "water of life." In the New Testament, if we want to talk about the quality of life revealed at present in our mortal body, we would use the word PSUCHE. Thus, it is the fact that the Deity is a "living God" (Deut. 5:26; Josh. 3:10; 1 Sam. 17:26,36; 2 Kgs. 19:4,16; Ps. 42:2; 84:2; Is. 37:4,17; Jer. 10:10;23:36; Dan. 6:20,26; Hos. 1:10; Matt. 16:16; 26:63; John 6:57,69; Acts 14:15; Rom. 9:26; 2 Cor. 3:3; 6:16; 1 Thess. 1:9; 1 Tim. 3:15; 4:10; 6:17; Heb. 3:12; 9:14; 10:31; 12:22; Rev. 7:2. In all the Old Testament passages just listed, the Hebrew word translated "living" is CHAY in the phrase "living God" and corresponds to the Greek word ZOE. The Greek word ZAO is the word which is translated "living" in the New Testament passages just listed. It is the cognate verb form of ZOE.) which is the equivalent of saying "In him was life," and because of that principal He is the source of light (James 1:17.), and light being an essential characteristic of the Deity (1 John 1:5.) it then follows that that source of life and light becomes the basis of light to men. This parallels the first chapter of Genesis because the living God spoke the living word and light dispelled the darkness upon the face of the waters which are a symbol of humanity. (Rev. 17:15.) It then follows that the living God and light became the basis of the rest of creation. Thus, by a figure of metonymy, where the cause is put for the effect, or the effect for the cause, and the part for the whole, or the whole for the part, or the container for the thing contained, or the thing contained for the container, etc., the word of God is symbolized by light, and light by the word of God, and the living God is said to be light (1 John 1:5), and, thus, light becomes the basis of life. (John 8:12.) (See a book entitled The Test Of True Love by H.P. Mansfield pages 23-25. It is available through Christadelphians only.) Note that the light which flows forth from the Deity, or His spoken word, is the basis of His literal creation of Genesis one and of

His new creation of John one. (Particularly note verses 4, 12-13 of John one and the full embodiment of that light in Christ Jesus in verse 14.) Next, consider the following analysis of light:

1. The Deity is the source of light: Gen. 1:14-16; Ps. 27:1; 36:9; 118:27; 136:7; 139:11-12; Is. 45:7; Dan. 2:22; John 1:4; I Tim. 6:16; James 1:17; 1 Pet. 2:9; I John 1:5.
2. The light enlightened the earth: Gen. 1:15,17; Jer. 31:35; Matt. 5:14-16; Lk. 8:16.
3. The light separates from darkness: Gen. 1:18; Is. 9:2; Jer. 31:35; Matt. 4:16; Lk. 1:79; 2:32; 11:33; John 1:5; 3:19-21; Acts 26:18; 2 Cor. 6:14.
4. God declared that light to be good: Gen. 1:4; 2 Cor. 4:6.
5. The Deity enlightens: Ps. 18:28; Is. 42:16; 60:19, 20; Micah 7:8; 2 Cor. 4:6; 1 Pet. 2:9.
6. Light produces true life: Job 33:28, 30; Ps. 18:28; 27:1; 36:9; Ps. 49:19; 56:13; John 8:12.
7. Light symbolizing life: Jer. 25:10; Lam. 3:2; Amos 5:18, 20; Rom. 13:12; Eph. 5:14; Col. 1:12; Rev. 18:23; 21:11.
8. True life symbolized by light: Ps. 18:28; Is. 58:8,10; 60:1; Micah 7:9; Matt. 17:2; Acts 26:23.
9. The light (meaning life) of the righteous: Prov. 13:9.
10. The effect of light is sweet: Ecc. 11:7.
11. Light is equated to knowledge: Dan. 5:11,14; Rom. 2:19.
12. Light is equated to truth: Ps. 43:3; John 1:7-9; 3:21.
13. Light is equated to the word of Deity: Ps. 119:105,130; Prov. 6:23; Is. 8:30; Lk. 11:35-36; John 3:19-21; 11:9-10; 12:35-36; 2 Cor. 4:4,6; 11:14; 1 Pet. 2:9; 2 Pet. 1:19.
14. Led by the Deity's light: Job 29:3; Is. 2:5.
15. The way of light: Job 38:19; Prov. 4:18; 1 Pet. 2:9; 1 John 1:7; 2:9,10.
16. The light of the eyes: Prov. 15:30; Matt. 6:22,23; Lk. 11:34-36.
17. Children of light: Lk. 12:32;16:8; John 12:36; 2 Cor. 6:14; Eph. 5:8; Phil. 2:15; Col. 1:12; 1 Thess. 5:5.
18. Light benefits the righteous: Ps. 97:11; 112:4; John 11:9-10.
19. Righteousness compared to light: Ps. 37:6; Matt. 17:2.
20. Light is used of Divine favor: Ps. 4:6; 44:3; 89:15.
21. The Deity is called "the light of Israel": Is. 10:17.
22. Israel had light in their dwelling: Ex. 10:23.
23. Led by light of pillar of fire: Ex. 13:21; 14:20; Neh. 9:12,19; Ps. 78:14; 105:39.
24. Jesus as a source of light: Is. 9:2; 42:6; 49:6; Matt. 4:16; Lk. 1:79; 2:32; John 1:7,8,9; 3:19-21;

8:12; 9:5; 11:9-10; 12:35- 36,56; Acts 26:23; Eph. 5:14.

25. Preaching of John the Baptist: John 5:35.

26. Paul is symbolized as a light to Gentiles: Acts 13:47.

27. The failure to distinguish between light and darkness: Is. 5:20; 59:9; Jer. 13:16.

28. Rebellion against light: Job 24:13.

29. The Deity's judgments enlighten: Is. 51:4.

30. The light manifests: Matt. 10:27; Lk. 12:3; 2 Tim. 1:10.

31. Light reveals that which is secret: Ps. 90:8; John 3:21; 1 Cor. 4:5; Eph. 5:13.

32. The judgments upon Ephraim and Judah compared to light: Hosea 6:5.

33. Light is that which emanates from Christ and his immortalized followers: Gen. 1:14-16; Ps. 136:7; Is. 30:26;60:3; Heb. 3:4; Rev. 21:23,24; 22:5.

34. The Immortal Saints symbolized by stars of light: Gen. 1:16; Ps. 148:3; (See Dan. 12:2-3; 1 Cor. 15:40-41.).

35. Light represents a king's favor: Prov. 16:15.

36. Light represents that which flows forth from rulers and potentates, secular or religious: Is. 13:10; 60:19; Jer. 4:23; Ezek. 32:7,8; Matt. 24:29; Mk. 13:24; Rev. 7:16; 22:5.

From the above analysis it can be readily seen that light is a characteristic of the Deity and that He is the source and origin of all light and that light symbolizes life (immortal, or that led by the saints now), knowledge, the word of the Deity, truth, righteousness, that which results from Divine judgment, that which revealeth, the preaching of the faithful, etc. etc.. It is therefore appropriate that the Son of God is described as a light in the Gospel of John for he completely fulfilled the symbol as set out above. Jesus was a perfect manifestation of the character of the Deity. He was the fulfillment, or, the basis of the fulfillment, of all the covenants of promise. He was the center of the plan and purpose of the Deity with the earth. The Old Testament Scriptures all looked forward to his coming and his work. He completely manifested the principles of holiness and righteousness as set down in Scripture. When one described the character of Jesus, or his words and deeds, one would be paraphrasing the word of the Deity. He was the fleshy embodiment of the word of the Deity and is therefore appropriately referred to as, "the word was made flesh." That is the word which John opened his discussion with at the beginning of the chapter, and it is that word he became an expression of. The word which was the expression of the mind of the Deity and which was suppose to be reflected in man when he was created was finally reflected in the Lord Jesus Christ. (See Heb. 1:1-3 and compare to Gen. 1:26-27 and see Doctor John Thomas' discussion of this passage in his book entitled Elpis Israel on pages 27-55. This book is available through Christadelphians only.) Thus we can readily see the appropriateness of the terms used by John in his Gospel message and the logical development of his argument. John 1:1-14 can be briefly stated in the following manner: We have the plan and purpose of the Deity as developed in His mind and expressed in word and deed in His moving to realize it by His creative acts in Genesis one being focalized in Jesus as the incipient fulfillment of His plan and purpose and the basis upon which His new creation will be developed and the fulfillment of His mind's desire will finally be accomplished.

Letter 3

I was somewhat shocked when you stated that you and your friend agreed that I did not believe the Bible. I can assure you that I do believe it, but believe it to teach something other than what you feel it contains. So far, none of the material that has been submitted to you has been refuted. In fact, nothing offered to this point does anything but try to convey your continuing belief in The Trinity in spite of all Scripturally logical arguments to the contrary. At this point, I would like to address the reasons provided this morning for your continuing commitment to The Trinity.

In our discussion, you stated that since The Scriptures teach that no man has seen God, then the person who presented himself to Abraham had to be Jesus since he referred to himself as Yahweh. Such reasoning refutes The Trinity! Why? You ask. Well, since according to The Doctrine of The Trinity Jesus is God, and since this was not during the period of his incarnation, then no man could at this time see Jesus either. Therefore, if this being was Jesus, then he could not be God! Now let us see what is really being taught in the record.

As was stated in our conversation, Yahweh means "He will be." It is the Deity's memorial name in which He revealed Himself to Israel in Egypt in order to secure their belief in Him and their deliverance from slavery. It expresses the promise of a future manifestation of Himself whereby their deliverance from spiritual Egypt would be made possible. However, the future manifestation would be made possible by what He would be doing to bring about their deliverance from Egypt at that time. If there was no deliverance from Egypt, then the promises to Abraham would have been nullified. This would mean that the Deity was powerless to save and unable to keep or live up to His Word. Such a development was impossible! Hence the Yahweh name is the guarantee that He has a purpose to fulfill with this earth which will be accomplished.

In regards to that will, we are first confronted with it in Gen. 1:26, which says:

And Elohim said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

Note that there are three things stated about Elohim's purpose in creating man. They are:

1. He would be a being in their image (The Hebrew term indicates physically resembling the Elohim.)
2. He would be a being in their likeness (The Hebrew term indicates that he would have a mental capacity similar to the Elohim.)
3. He was created to have dominion or rulership over Elohim's creation. Has this purpose ever changed? No! In spite of man's sinning in the garden, it has not been changed. All of history since that time is working towards the day when this purpose will be fulfilled here on earth. As is stated in the following passages:

But as truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the LORD (Yahweh). Num. 14:21.

They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the LORD (Yahweh), as the waters cover the sea. Isaiah 11:9.

For thus saith the LORD (Yahweh) that created the heavens; God (Elohim) himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I am the LORD (Yahweh); and there is none else. Is. 45:18.

For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the LORD (Yahweh), as the waters cover the sea. Hab. 2:14.

Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Matt. 6:10.

And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever. Rev. 11:15.

And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth. Rev. 5:9-10.

Now, it can be asked, who are the Elohim referred to in Gen. 1:26? It is obvious that this term is a plural word, and, therefore, requires that more than one is involved. Needless to say, it does not state how many! Therefore, to try and place a specific number, such as three, upon it is going beyond what the record says and must be wrong unless it is specified somewhere else in The Scriptures. It is not specified anywhere else in all of The Scriptures! Thus, this is not a correct conclusion. To pursue something that is not revealed is foolish! Paul comments on this type of inquiring as follows:

But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain. Titus 3:9.

Following his advice, we will not try to determine how many were involved in the term Elohim here since it is not revealed. However, let us establish some of the facts revealed in The Scriptures about the use of this term.

Elohim is a plural term which means mighty ones. It is the plural of the word Eloah or mighty one. It has been translated various ways such as “gods” in Gen. 3:5; “mighty” in Gen. 23:6; “great” in Gen. 30:8; “judges” in Ex. 21:6; 22:8-9, 28 margin; “judge” in 1 Sam. 2:25; “goddess” in 1 Kings 11:5; “exceeding” in Jonah 3:3; and “godly” in Malachi 2:15. It is also used to refer to Idols in such places as Gen. 31:30, 32; 35:2, 4 etc. In Ex. 7:1 Yahweh tells Moses that he was made Elohim unto Pharaoh. Jesus in John 10:34-36 interprets the use of the term in Psalm 82 to apply to those unto whom the Word of God came, that is, the Jewish nation. (By the way, he was using this to disprove the Jew’s charge of blasphemy against himself! In other words, he could rightly use it on the basis that the term was used by God of the Jewish nation in Psalms 82. If it is used of other Jewish men, then he could rightly use it without being guilty of Blasphemy. This type of reasoning would be strange if he was the second person of The Trinity. For, justifying the use of the term in this manner would not be necessary since he would really have been God. It follows that since he used this argument, then he did not view himself as the second member of a Triune Deity.) Thus it can be clearly seen that the use of this term does not establish the existence of a trinity or even that we are talking about God at all! Next, let us see what else the term Elohim can relate to.

Since the term clearly applies to mortal man, and false gods, then how does it relate to the true God? It is our firm conviction that the term applies collectively to El the power of the universe and all of the angels who are mighty ones or Elohim because they are made by and continue in existence because of El. They are each an extension of Him as we hope to be which is exactly the purpose for our creation as recorded in Genesis. Let us consider some Scriptures that establish that the term Elohim can and does refer to angels.

1. Paul in quoting Psalm 97:7 in Hebrews 1:6 replaces the word Elohim with the Greek word for angels. Thus, under divine inspiration Paul provides us with a correct understanding of the word Elohim.

2. Again, Paul, under divine inspiration, provides us with a correct translation of the Hebrew word Elohim in Hebrews 2:7,9. Here he quotes Psalm 8 and uses the Greek word for angel to translate the Hebrew word Elohim.

3. "But the angel of the LORD (Yahweh) did no more appear to Manoah and to his wife. Then Manoah knew that he was an angel of the LORD (Yahweh). And Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die, because we have seen God (Elohim). Judges 13:21-22. From this passage, it is obvious that the children of Israel understood the term Elohim to refer to the angels.

4. In Gen. 32:24-30, Jacob wrestles with a man who is referred to as Elohim in Hosea 12:3-4 as well as an angel. Jacob himself refers to him as Elohim in verse 30, which says, "And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel: for I have seen God (Elohim) face to face, and my life is preserved." It is quite obvious that Jacob did not believe he was wrestling with the second person of the trinity. It is also quite obvious that it was not just a man that he was wrestling with, but an angel of Yahweh, an Elohim.

The next item that I would like to define is that of the case you refer to in Genesis 18 where three men appear to Abraham one of whom is referred to as Yahweh later on and two of whom are referred to as angels as the narrative continues in Genesis 19. Thus, it seems rather clear that all three were angels and one specifically was speaking in the name of Yahweh. Let us look at some evidence to support this contention.

1. Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared.
Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him.
Thus this angel bore the Yahweh name and acted on behalf of Yahweh with respect to Israel by Yahweh's appointment. Ex. 23:20-21.

2. With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the LORD (Yahweh) shall he behold: wherefore then were ye not afraid to speak against my servant Moses? Num. 12:8 In Acts 7:38 we have an explanation of this and many other passages that refer to Yahweh speaking to Moses. It says, "This is he, that was in the church (ecclesia) in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sinai, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us. Thus, it is clear that an angel speaking for Yahweh, by appointment by Yahweh, bears that name.

3. In Ex. 3:2,4,6,7,14,15,16,18,19, we have the record of the burning bush unconsumed. Here we are told that it is an angel of Yahweh that was present. However, the record refers to him both as Elohim and Yahweh. Again, the divine comment in Acts 7:30-33 verifies that it was an angel speaking with the voice of Yahweh and identifies him as Elohim and Yahweh.

At this point, there is no point in multiplying more passages to prove our point for this clearly and unquestionably accomplishes our objective! Thus, in Genesis 18, we have an angel speaking on behalf of Yahweh, and, thus, represented as Yahweh speaking to Abraham. Again, we find that not only is this no proof in support of the Doctrine of The Trinity, but it is destructive to it. Furthermore, we are beginning to see the beautiful significance of these terms. Before closing, I would like to make one more point and that is in regards to Gen. 3:22 which says,

"And the LORD God (Yahweh Elohim) said, Behold the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and, now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: ". Man had just sinned and thus had a personal experience with evil and good for that is exactly what the Hebrew word translated know really means. It carries with it an intimate acquaintance of the knower with the thing known. In fact, it is used to describe the most intimate of all relationships between a husband and his wife. Here we have those addressed as Yahweh Elohim saying that man through this sinful act had intimately become associated with evil as they had. Thus Yahweh Elohim could not be referring to a divine being who never had sinned. It can only properly be understood if they like Adam and all his descendants were once mortal living in a state of evil and had to overcome even as we have to overcome through the Deity's provision. Like the angels before us we hope to become the mighty ones

or Elohim of the future and bear the Yahweh name like they. Of course, this is exactly what Jesus taught in Luke 20:35-36, when he says, "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: Neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Amen!

Respectfully yours,
Julio B. Scaramastro



www.antipas.org

All Books / Booklets, Editorials, and Articles are FREE and can be downloaded without permission.