

## Dichotomy or Trichotomy

Three articles below:

By Matt Slick at <http://www.carm.org/man>

“Are we made of two parts (body and soul) or three parts (body, soul, and spirit)? Theologians have debated the issue for centuries and there has never been a decisive orthodox declaration of which is true.

Dichotomy is a term which signifies a division into two parts: Body and Soul. The words "spirit" and "soul" are often used interchangeably; therefore, the dichotomous position holds that man is comprised of two parts. Note the following verses used to support this position:

- "Mary said: My soul glorifies the Lord and my spirit rejoices in God my Savior," ([Luke 1:46-47](#)).
- "My soul yearns for you in the night; in the morning my spirit longs for you....," ([Isaiah 26:9](#)).
- For the term "Body and Soul" see [Matt. 6:25](#); [10:28](#).
- For the term "Body and Spirit" see [1 Cor. 5:3](#), [5](#).

Trichotomy is a term which signifies a division into 3 parts: Body, Soul, and Spirit. With the following verses, "spirit" and "soul" seem to be different.

- "May God himself, the God of peace, sanctify you through and through. May your whole spirit, soul and body be kept blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," ([1 Thess. 5:23](#)).
- "For the word of God is living and active. Sharper than any double-edged sword, it penetrates even to dividing soul and spirit, joints and marrow; it judges the thoughts and attitudes of the heart," ([Heb. 4:12](#)).

Does it matter if you believe in dichotomy or trichotomy? No. However, a word of caution. There are churches that teach it is possible for Christians to be demon possessed. These groups hold the trichotomous position. They maintain that it is possible for one part of a person to be possessed but not the other. For example, they might claim that the spirit of a person can be possessed but the soul cannot. Others reverse it and state that the soul of a person can be possessed but not the spirit. This is problematic because there are no accounts in Scripture of Christians having demons cast out of them. Besides, how can a person indwelt by the Holy Spirit also be indwelt by a demon?

Nevertheless, this does not mean that the trichotomous position is wrong. There are many great scholars on both sides of the issue in spite of the error of Christian demon possession.

In conclusion, it is a wondrous thing that God would create a universe, populate it with people, and then love us so much that He would die to save us and bring us to Himself. But that is the great God we serve and love.

## **Gilbert Sanchez**

### **The Nature of Man**

<http://www.chalcedon.edu/articles/0303/030326sanchez.php>

Three views have dominated the history of scriptural study regarding the nature of man. They are Trichotomy, Dichotomy, and Psychosomatic Unity. Here is a short summary and Biblical evaluation of each position.

The Bible teaches that the Lord took the dust of the ground and created man. The Lord imposed breath within man, and man as a unit became a living soul.

Ancient Greek philosophy insisted upon a distinction between the physical and the spiritual. The physical world, they claimed, was inferior and the physical body was the prison of the soul. The spiritual realm was the reality, and the physical world was a shadow of that reality. Juxtaposed against this, the Bible teaches that the physical world, body included, was created good. Instead of establishing an antithesis between the physical and the spiritual realms, the Bible describes the harmony of the two.

An examination of the words utilized by Biblical writers demonstrates that man is a unitary being. The four primary words used in this context are soul, spirit, heart, and body. A Biblical lexicon reveals that the words used to describe the constitution of man overlap in meaning. Each of these four important terms is used in a way that can only be described as referring to the whole person. These terms refer to the unity of the individual with an emphasis on a particular perspective.

#### **Trichotomy**

Trichotomy is the view that says the constitution of man consists in three

parts or components. Historically, these have been presented as body, soul, and spirit. The body is said to be the external or the physical/material component of man. The Trichotomists believe that Scripture describes two additional components of man's constitution. They say this three-fold idea is presented in both 1 Thessalonians 4:23 and Hebrews 4:12. They argue that both of these verses use "soul" and "spirit" in the same context, thus demonstrating that they are seen as different components of man. They say if this were not the case, there would be no need to employ both terms. The soul is the component of man that includes the life and the will. This is the vitalizing or the "animal life" within the person of man. The spirit, on the other hand, is the organ of God-consciousness in man. The nature of man was created with all three components, but the fall of man resulted in the death of the spirit in man. With the God-consciousness part of man no longer functioning, unregenerate man is seriously lacking in his person. However, the other components, the physical and the soul, which includes the will, continue.

An integral aspect of Trichotomist view is that of components within the nature of man. In order for this view to stand up against scrutiny, it must be able to defend the proposition that the constitution of man is a composite of three separate parts. Scripture does not support the view of man as a three component being. This denies the fundamental presentation of man as a unitary whole and, in many respects, bears resemblance to Greek mythology.

Scripture does not support the Trichotomist emphasis upon the separation of soul and spirit. The insistence that the soul is referred to as the life in man while the spirit is the organ of God-consciousness is pure conjecture that is refuted by objective exegetical and analytical examination. The terms "soul" and "spirit" are virtually synonymous in Biblical theology.

Regarding the fall of man, Biblical theology stands in contrast to the Trichotomist view. Whereas the Trichotomist believe that particular parts of man escape untouched by the fall into sin and the curse of God, Scripture clearly teaches that after the fall, man retained the image of God yet was totally depraved in all his capacities.

The Trichotomist interpretation of 1Thessalonians and Hebrews must be rejected for the following reasons: a.) Systematic study of Biblical theology. The Scriptures should be viewed as a whole and in harmony with all of its

individual parts and without contradictions. b.) Context of the verses in question. A basic rule of Biblical hermeneutics is an examination of the context in which any verse is found. To ignore the context is to ignore the intention of the original author. Neither of these texts deal with the constitution of man. The author of Hebrews is emphasizing that the word of the Lord cuts into the very core of our person revealing even the motives behind our actions. The author of 1Thessalonians is emphasizing the sanctification of the entire person. c.) Linguistic study. An understanding of how the key terms are used is vital to proper exegesis. An objective study of the words in question can only lead to the conclusion that, at most, a reference is being made to a particular aspect of the entire person. However, in no way can the words be forced into a proof for a three-component view of the constitution of man. d.) If these verses were to be interpreted in this manner, it would not prove a Trichotomist position. This type of interpretation, if consistent, would lead to many other components of man. For example, Christ taught His followers that they should love the Lord with all their soul, strength, and mind. How many parts would the composite human have when this type of exegesis was consistently performed?

### **Dichotomy**

The second position is Dichotomy, the view that the constitution of man consists of two separate components. Historically these have been presented as body and soul. Dichotomists correctly reject the view that the spirit and the soul are separate components of man. They interpret the Scriptures as teaching that man is a composite of both the physical and the spiritual. The dichotomist position is in error in assuming that man is made of two separate components and is subject to the same criticism presented above.

### **Psychosomatic Unity**

The third position is that of Psychosomatic Unity, the view that the constitution of man consists of a single or unitary constitution that cannot be separated into components. This single unity consists of two inseparable aspects, namely body and spirit, which eternally coincide in the nature of man. The strength of this argument is its faithfulness to systematic theology, linguistic analysis, and overall adherence to both the description and limitation of the Biblical position. The Scriptures describe the constitution of man as being a unit, however, no mechanical explanation is offered or viewed as necessary.

The most significant objection suggested against psychosomatic unity is that of the intermediate state. It is argued that since the Bible describes a period of time in which the spirit exists independent of the physical body, the spirit is properly viewed as a separate component. In response the following can be said: a.) Separation is the exception, not the rule. The constitution of man was created as a unity, in this life continues as a unity, and then after the resurrection will be a unity again. The general principle regarding the nature of man is unity. b.) Separation is a consequence of sin, not the normative for the human constitution. The reason for the separation is the result of the curse of God. Had mankind lived in harmonious obedience to the Lord, the constitution of man would never have experienced the consequence of separation either of the body or the various other results of the fall. This separation should be viewed as a deformity resulting from sin but not as the God given nature of man. c.) Separation will eternally cease. Although, a temporary separation does occur, it will come to a definite end on the day of resurrection when every individual great and small will stand before the throne of the risen Christ to be judged for every thought, word, and deed that has been done in the unity of their person. Then all notions of separation will cease for eternity. After millions of billion years on to infinity have passed away, the constitution of man can hardly be based upon a short deformation of the human nature.

Viewing man as a psychosomatic unity results in a Biblically balanced perspective regarding the nature of man and the work of God in and through him. Seen as a unit, it must be concluded that all aspects of man have been equally created good, affected by the fall, and are currently being sanctified. Furthermore, the relationship between psychosomatic man and his God cannot be reduced to an inward spiritual experience exclusively, but rather must extend to every facet of man's existence. Consequently, any view of man that leads to the conclusion that the body is the prison house of the soul, that man's responsibility toward God is confined to spiritual piety only, or that the sanctification of men and the outworking of the Kingdom of God on earth extends to the spiritual realm exclusively have misrepresented the Biblical view and reveal extra-scriptural influences. The scriptural doctrine of the nature of man is that of psychosomatic unity which necessarily includes the influence of the exterior world in the process of the sanctification of individuals. Such a process will inevitably have significant impact upon every sphere of existence throughout the world as the Kingdom of our Lord goes victoriously forward.

---

*Gilbert Sanchez is happily married and is the father of two children. He is working on a masters of divinity through Bahnsen Theological Seminary and serves as Ruling Elder at Providence Presbyterian Church in Albuquerque NM. He can be contacted a [gillinsan@msn.com](mailto:gillinsan@msn.com).*

The following article has some worthwhile exegesis of the 1 Corinthians 14 and other passages used by trichotomists.

## **Trichotomists, Charismatics and 1 Corinthians 14**

**[http://www.the-highway.com/tricho-charis\\_Brown.html](http://www.the-highway.com/tricho-charis_Brown.html)**  
**by Daniel M. Brown**

1 Corinthians 14 is one of the most popular chapters in the Bible for Charismatics. Practically every Charismatic author that writes anything on the gifts of the Holy Spirit will refer to this chapter. Ironically, 1 Corinthians 14 is one of the strongest rebuttals against the modern Charismatic teaching on tongues, but Charismatics are completely oblivious to this fact because they read the chapter with a trichotomous mindset. In a nutshell, this argument against Charismatic tongues goes as follows:

1. No Charismatic claims to understand the tongues-language that he speaks.
2. 1 Corinthians 14 plainly teaches that the Biblical tongues-speaker understood the words uttered from his own lips.
3. Therefore, the modern Charismatic phenomenon of tongues has nothing to do with Biblical tongues.

When a Charismatic reads 1 Cor 14:14, “my spirit prays, but my understanding is unfruitful,” he reads this to mean that his spirit utters words which his own mind does not understand. Based on a trichotomy or tri-partite view of man, he claims that his spirit speaks a heavenly language that bypasses the mental understanding of his soul. However, a careful study of the scriptures concerning spirit and soul reveals that the Bible does not teach such a concept. This concept of trichotomy is rooted in Greek philosophy, not Biblical doctrine. Although common to Gnosticism and other mystery religions, the Bible knows no such Charismatic concept of edification apart from understanding. Indeed the Bible often uses spirit and soul interchangeably. Scriptures showing thought and cognitive understanding in one’s spirit are inescapable. See Matt 26:41, Mk 2:8, Lk 1:46-47, Acts 17:16, 1 Cor 2:11, 1 Pet 3:3-5.

Further, the Charismatic interprets the word “mysteries” in 1 Cor 14:2 to mean unintelligible utterances, or tongues, from his own lips. However, the Bible never uses the word “mysterion” in such a manner. The entire New Testament defines “mystery” as the revelation of the gospel of Christ which was hidden in ages past but is now revealed to His saints. See Matt 13:10, Mk 4:11, Lk 8:10, Rom 11:25, Rom 16:25-27, 1 Cor 2:7, 1 Cor 15:51, Eph 3:2-6, Col 1:25-27. Jesus and

Paul clearly use the word “mystery” in a completely different sense than the way Charismatics use it today. Mystery was revelational truth, hidden in the past, but now revealed and understood. Victor Budgen writes in his excellent book,<sup>1</sup> “Far from being something hidden or concealed, a ‘mystery’ is a gloriously ‘open secret’ which we ourselves would never have discovered had not God revealed it.” Clearly, if one does not understand the mysteries of which Paul speaks, he cannot be called a Christian!

## **Dichotomy versus Trichotomy**

Brian Onken astutely observes, in his excellent paper on the dangers of trichotomy,<sup>2</sup> that the trichotomous mindset leads to a denigration of the intellect and of rigorous doctrinal study. In fact, one of most commonly heard complaints of ex-charismatics is that their Charismatic church had become so anti-intellectual and anti-doctrine that they could no longer in good conscience subject their children to such mindlessness. I personally had a Charismatic pastor up in Connecticut that would tell me, “Dan, your problem is that you worship the Father, Son, and Holy Scriptures! You need to spend less time reading and more time learning to operate in the Spirit.” Anti-intellectualism runs rampant in Charismaticism and is a direct result of trichotomy. Some of the strongest proponents of trichotomy, including Watchman Nee and Andrew Murray, are widely read by Charismatics. Trichotomist authors quite blatantly claim that “soul power,” meaning the power of the intellect, hinders true spirituality. And the only way to live a holy spiritual life is to crucify the flesh and the soul life. Such views are more akin to Gnosticism than they are to a Biblical, Calvinistic, optimistic, postmillennial world view. Reformed folk understand that sin has affected all parts of man, not just his flesh and mind, and that Christ’s resurrection life applies to the total man, not just his spirit. Louis Berkhof observes that, for most of history, the church held to a dichotomy view of man, particularly from Augustine on.<sup>3</sup> The trichotomy view saw a revival in the nineteenth century and, not surprisingly, the Pentecostal/Charismatic revival fell right on the heels of it.

Trichotomy also has a strong effect in evangelical denominations who would not normally call themselves Charismatic, particularly the more liberal denominations who have little to no emphasis on the historic creeds and confessions. Southern Baptists come to mind here. Although not calling themselves Charismatic, there is no doubt a strong Charismatic influence in the SBC and many Southern Baptists look like Charismatics without the speaking in tongues. When trying to correct some doctrinal error with such folks, we’ve often heard statements like, “Well, I hear what you’re saying but I’ll just go home and pray and see what the Holy Spirit says to me about these scriptures.” In spite of an often outward display of humility when saying such things, trichotomy has given them an excuse to reject God-ordained church authority and the historic creeds of the church fathers. Trichotomy breeds a hyper-independence and individualistic mindset that is blind to the covenantal and corporate aspects of the Holy Spirit.

In contradistinction to trichotomy, it is Christ Himself, not the Trinitarian Godhead, that shows us what the ideal spiritual man looks like. Christ was the perfect sinless Israelite fulfilling all the requirements of the Law, the true Seed of Abraham through whom all nations are blessed, the eternal heir of David’s throne, who has a fully resurrected body that eats and drinks with His saints. It is this, “One Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being

of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made; who for us and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Spirit of the virgin Mary, and was made man;”<sup>4</sup> it is this Christ, who is both God and Man, who was raised from the dead to be seated on His throne at the right hand of God. And just as the Son submitted His entire dichotomous Being to the Father and His entire dichotomous Being was raised from the dead, so we submit our entire beings to Christ in the hope of our mortal bodies being resurrected at His second coming, 1 Cor 15:20-28, 1 Th 4:13-17. We avoid the error of the Apollinarians, yet we also avoid the error of the Nestorians by neither denying nor confusing Christ’s Divinity and His Humanity.<sup>5</sup>

Numerous reformed authors have dealt with the arguments for dichotomy and trichotomy (as well as monism). So, we’ll only briefly review the arguments here. Dichotomy, or the view that man is a unity of body and soul, or body and spirit, sees material and immaterial parts joined together in man. Spirit and soul are used interchangeably for the same immaterial element in man but from different points of view. A few scriptures supporting dichotomy include; Gen 2:7, Job 32:8, Job 33:4, Eccl 12:7, Is 10:18, and Matt 10:28. Sometimes the scriptures speak of a dichotomy of body and soul, as in Matt 6:25 and Matt 10:28, and other times of a dichotomy of body and spirit, as in Eccl 12:7, 1 Cor 5:3-5, 1 Cor 7:34. Death is referred to as giving up the soul, as in Gen 35:18, 1 Kg 17:21, Acts 15:26, and as giving up the spirit, as in Ps 31:5, Lk 23:46, Acts 7:59. The immaterial part that survives death is referred to as the soul, as in Rev 6:9, Rev 20:4 and as the spirit, as in Heb 12:23, 1 Pet 3:19. The soul communes with God in Jam 1:21 and Heb 6:19 and the spirit communes with God in Rom 8:16 and 1 Cor 6:20. 2 Cor 7:1 speaks of sin affecting flesh and spirit and Eph 2:3 speaks of sin affecting flesh and mind. The dichotomy present in the scriptures is obvious, but so is the interchangeable use of soul and spirit. John Calvin clearly demonstrates the dichotomous view when he writes:

Moreover, there can be no question that man consists of a body and a soul; meaning by soul, an immortal though created essence, which is his nobler part. Sometimes he is called a spirit. But though the two terms, while they are used together, differ in their meaning, still when spirit is used by itself it is equivalent to soul.<sup>6</sup>

Likewise, Charles Hodge defends the traditional dichotomy view in his second volume:

This doctrine of a threefold constitution of man being adopted by Plato, was introduced partially into the early Church, but soon came to be regarded as dangerous, if not heretical. Its being held by the Gnostics that the pneuma in man was a part of the divine essence, and incapable of sin; and by the Apollinarians that Christ had only a human soma and psuche, but not a human pneuma, the Church rejected the doctrine that the psuche and pneuma were distinct substances, since upon it those heresies were founded. In later times the Semi-Pelagians taught that the soul and body, but not the spirit in man were the subjects of original sin. All Protestants, Lutherans and Reformed, were, therefore, the more zealous in maintaining that the soul and spirit, psuche and pneuma, are one and the same substance and essence. And this, as before remarked, has been the common doctrine of the Church.<sup>7</sup>

The two primary scriptures used to support trichotomy (the view that man consists of three parts; spirit, soul, and body) are 1 Thess 5:23 and Heb 4:12. But the first cannot be used to support



trichotomy any more than Mk 12:30 can be used to support tetrachotomy. The second passage does not say “dividing between” but “to division of.” It is talking of the power of God’s word to pierce to the deepest and remotest parts of man, both his immaterial and material parts. It speaks of “soul and spirit” in the same manner that it speaks of “thoughts and intents of the heart,” two views of the same thing. So neither of these passages provide clear support for trichotomy, and of course these must be interpreted in light of the rest of scripture which gives overwhelming evidence for dichotomy.

## 1 Corinthians 14:1-33

Approaching 1 Cor 14 with a dichotomous view and understanding the Biblical definition of “mystery” results in an understanding of this passage that is completely opposed to the modern charismatic teaching on tongues. Verses 2-4 says that the tongues-speaker “speaks mysteries” (understandable gospel revelation) and is himself edified, thus he understands the words from his own mouth. But the others in the church do not understand him and are not edified. Paul’s entire argument in this chapter is that there can be no edification for anyone in the church if understanding is absent. Significantly, 1 Cor 14 was used by the Reformers to demonstrate the evil of conducting worship services in Latin, a language that the common people did not understand. The Bible knows no concept whatsoever of edification apart from understanding. On these verses, Victor Budgen writes,<sup>8</sup>

We are not interpreting Scripture properly if we suddenly turn to Buddhist or mystic categories of thought when we think of the edification that the gift of other languages brought. Obviously it came to the individual with precisely the same effect as public prophecy to the congregation. The speaker understood and was strengthened, encouraged or comforted.

The Charismatic finds no support for his views in Matthew Henry’s commentary. Commenting on 1 Cor 14:4, Matthew Henry writes, “He that speaks with tongues may edify himself, v. 4. He may understand and be affected with what he speaks; . . . but he that speaks with tongues, or language unknown, can only edify himself; others can reap no benefit from his speech.”<sup>9</sup> O. Palmer Robertson also skillfully deals with the Charismatic error in his book and writes on these key verses,<sup>10</sup>

If one who spoke in a tongue could be edified even while not understanding what he was saying, could not the congregation expect to be edified in the same way? If the sensations associated with uttering a sound like *quesrylespoyou* have the capacity for edifying the speaker, why could not those same sensations vibrating in the ears of the hearer have the effect of edifying? But an audience is not edified one whit, no matter how zealous the speaker may be, if the message is unintelligible. Paul makes this very point. No one is edified when no one understands (1 Cor 14:2). Edification through a verbal gift is linked intrinsically to understanding the utterance.

Verse 5 demonstrates the equivalence of tongues to prophecy when coupled with interpretation. The importance of this is seen in verse 28 where Paul forbids tongues without interpretation to be spoken in the assembly. Paul clearly understood the symbolic meaning of tongues without interpretation in the congregation as evidenced by his quoting Is 28:11, 12 in verse 21. The Biblical Jew understood from this passage, as well as many other OT scriptures such as Deut

28:49, Jer 5:15, and Gen 11:7, that unintelligible foreign languages in the congregation was a sign of imminent judgment upon that congregation of people. This is why the Jews in Acts 2 responded with the accusation of drunkenness or being out of their minds. Speaking foreign languages in the holy temple area on a high holy day, when Hebrew should only have been spoken, was either sacrilege or a sign from God of imminent judgment. The latter was proved to be the case 40 years later.

Verses 6-13 demonstrate that the problem of tongues by itself is that the other person doesn't understand what is spoken. Paul is not concerned about the understanding of the speaker because the speaker obviously understands what comes from his own lips, as shown by earlier verses. Paul wants the tongues-speaker to pray that he might interpret also, so that the congregation is edified along with the speaker. One might ask why the tongues-speaker needed the gift of interpretation if he understood the words uttered from his own mouth. Have you ever tried to recite from memory an entire Psalm or chapter of scripture after hearing it only one time? Making an inerrant translation of the revelation into another language would no doubt require the supernatural gift of the Holy Spirit.

We come now to verse 14, the key verse in this passage for Charismatics. The dichotomist understands that one's spirit cannot pray without conscious understanding. Such a concept is completely foreign to the scriptures. Thus, when Paul says, "but my understanding is unfruitful," in the context of what he's been talking about all along, which is the edification of the assembly, Paul is obviously saying here that the tongues-speaker's understanding does not produce fruit in the assembly. "My understanding" implies that the tongues-speaker understands. How can one have understanding without understanding! But that understanding is not fruitful, and in Paul's mind fruitfulness means edification of the congregation. This interpretation is also reinforced by verse 17 where Paul says, "you indeed give thanks well, but the other is not edified." So, taking these verses in context, the praying and singing "with the spirit" in verses 15-16 imply that the speaker understands and is edified himself. "With the understanding" implies that the congregation also understands and is edified.

We see Paul's incredible humility and others-orientation in verse 19. Although he thanks God that he speaks in tongues, he would rather speak five words that edify the congregation than receive 10,000 words of direct revelation from God that only edifies himself. Contrast this with the typical self-centered Charismatic, who goes about always seeking "a personal word from God!"

As mentioned previously, the Jew understood the symbolic meaning of unintelligible languages in his home country. Thus, Paul says tongues are a sign to these unbelieving Jews in verse 22. So if this Jew came into a congregation where uninterpreted tongues were uttered, he would naturally say, "are you out of your mind?" But Paul again says that prophecy (or interpreted tongues) edifies the congregation by bringing about repentance and worship of God (verses 24,25). He commands them to do all things for the edification of the entire congregation (verse 26) and forbids tongues without interpretation (verses 27-28). Paul's use of the phrase, "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets" in verse 32 also shows conscious understanding and speaking by the spirit in man, which contradicts the trichotomous view of Charismatics.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, a trichotomous interpretation of 1 Cor 14 is necessary to support Charismatic doctrine, but this leads to all kinds of inconsistencies and problems within the chapter and with the rest of the Bible. A dichotomous interpretation of 1 Cor 14 is consistent with the context of the chapter and the rest of the scriptures, but leads to a conclusion completely opposite to Charismatic teaching on this chapter. The trichotomist Charismatic calls unintelligible speech in the congregation a good thing whereas the dichotomist sees it as a bad thing. The trichotomist necessarily lead towards introspection and individualistic thinking (just me and God) as he attempts to distinguish what is spirit and what is soul, whereas the dichotomist sees this passage teaching us to be others-oriented. The trichotomist sees this passage as validating modern Charismatic tongues, whereas the dichotomist sees it as clearly refuting Charismatic tongues. Yet the dichotomist who understands these things is also commanded by this chapter to seek and work towards his Charismatic brother's understanding of these things as well, in order that "all may learn and all may be encouraged."

---


## Notes

1. Victor Budgen, *The Charismatics and the word of God*, p. 48, Evangelical Press, 2001. ISBN 0-85234-264-0.
2. Brian Onken, "Dangers of the 'Trinity' in Man", Statement DT170 of Christian Research Institute, P.O. Box 7000, Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688. Paper can be found at: <http://www.equip.org/free/DT170.htm>
3. Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, p. 192, Eerdmans Publishing, reprinted 1984.
4. *Nicene Creed*, originating at the Council of Nicea in AD 325 and adopted by the Council of Chalcedon in AD 451 to refute heresies on the Trinity and dual nature of Christ.
5. R. J. Rushdoony, *The Foundations of Social Order*, pp. 24, 56, Thoburn Press, 1978.
6. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Book I, Chap XV, Sec 2.
7. Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, Vol II, p. 51, Hendrickson Publishers, 2003. ISBN 1-56563-459-4.
8. Victor Budgen, *The Charismatics and the word of God*, p. 49, Evangelical Press, 2001. ISBN 0-85234-264-0.
9. Matthew Henry's Commentary, *Acts to Revelation*, Vol VI, p. 578, MacDonald Publishing, ISBN 0-917006-21-6.
10. O. Palmer Robertson, *The Final Word*, p. 29, Banner of Truth, 1997. ISBN 0-85151-659-9

---

## Author

Dan Brown was a Charismatic for 27 years until God mercifully delivered him and his entire family from that deception. He now serves as a ruling elder in Redeemer Presbyterian (PCA) in Madison, AL and also helps moderate [ExCharisma@yahoogroups.com](mailto:ExCharisma@yahoogroups.com), one of the many Internet recovery groups helping ex-charismatics get integrated back into orthodox churches. The fact that  $27=3^3$  is not to be construed as meaning anything whatsoever, except that he's a little slow of learning. But thankfully Charismatics cannot find a series of three sixes in that number! Dan can often be found under a shade tree in a bluegrass/gospel jam, belting out mindless tunes.

Otherwise, you can probably get hold of him by clicking here:  .