does not necessarily imply <u>two</u> distinct nonmaterial entitles in man (in fact, if the plural is pressed, it could refer to three or four such entitles!)

b. With respect to the threefold classification of human beings in I Corinthians 2:14-15, 3:1. (ψυχικὸς, πνευματικος, σαρκίνος), it should be pointed out that refers to natural, unregenerate men, and that πνευματικος, and σαρκίνος refer to two categories of believers, namely mature spiritual believers and childish fleshly believers (or at least, those who are behaving in this way). However, it is contended by Trichotomists that the use of ψυχικὸς for the unregenerate and πνευματικος for the spiritual regenerate Indicates a clear contrast between the terms, and with this contention it would be difficult to find fault. However, when it is further contended that this contrast provides a basis for the Inference that ψυχὴ and πνεῦμα refer to two distinct nonmaterial entities, thus proving Trichotomy, that Is quite another matter!

Of course, it is understandable as to how this idea could have arisen. Some lexicons have contributed to its acceptance.

For example, Joseph Henry Thayer's *Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament* defines ψυχικὸς as follows:

- a. having the nature and characteristics of the $\psi u \chi \dot{\eta}$ i.e., of the principle of animal life which men have in common with brutes . . .
- b. governed by the ψυχὴ, i.e., the sensuous nature with its subjection to appetite and passion (as though made up of nothing but ψυχὴ).

However, Sauer, Arndt, and Gingrich's *Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament* gives us a different definition:

Besides referring to all six uses of ψυχικός, Arndt and Gingrich (BAG) give us meanings which arise from usage in context, rather than meanings that arise from Inferences from the word ψυχὴ, together with a considerable amount of theological baggage!