

“G O D”

A LESSON ON THE SUBJECT OF THE GOD OF THE BIBLE, INCLUDING HIS BEING (WHETHER ONE, TWO OR THREE), HIS ATTRIBUTES, HIS NAME AND THE REVELATION OF HIMSELF, etc.

THIS LESSON PREPARED BY:

TOMMY BLANTON

5030 WILLARD RD.

WILLARD, N.C. 28478

910-285-3802

st.blanton79@gmail.com

Prepared: 5-8-13

TABLE OF CONTENTS

•	PREFACE.	Page	3.
I.	INTRODUCTION.		4.
II.	HOW DOES GOD REVEAL HIMSELF?		9.
	a. God is Revealed in His Creation.		9.
	b. God is Revealed by Divine Theophany.		13.
	c. God is Revealed Through His Church.		14.
	d. God is Revealed Through The Bible.		16
	e. God is Revealed Through The "Man" Christ Jesus.		17.
III.	THERE IS ONLY ONE GOD		19.
IV.	GOD OF THE OLD TESTAMENT		24.
V.	THE NAME OF GOD.		31.
	a. The Difference in a Title of Position And a Name of Identification.		31.
	b. The Name of God in The Old Testament.		32.
	c. Various Hebrew Words For God or god, Translated Into Lord.		37.
	d. The Name of God In The New Testament.		42.
VI.	THE RELATIONSHIP OF FATHER AND SON.		49.
	a. Father And Son.		49.
	b. Christ Our Mediator.		50.
	c. God "Sent" The Son.		54.
	d. The Right Hand of God.		56.
	e. Let Us Make Man In Our Image.		57
	f. Two Natures In Us.		61.
VII.	GOD AS MAN.		62.
	a. Was He God – or – Was He Man?		62.
	b. Recognizing Both The Divine And Human Natures In Christ.		65.
	c. Divine Condescension.		72
VIII.	A PERSONAL RELATIONSHIP WITH GOD.		78.
IX.	SUMMARY.		85.
	a. II. How Does God Reveal Himself?		85.
	b. III. There Is Only One God.		86.
	c. IV. The God Of The Old Testament.		86.
	d. V. The Name Of God.		86.
	e. VI. The Relationship of The Father And Son.		87.
	f. VII. God As Man.		88.
	g. VIII. A Personal Relationship With God.		88.
X.	THE TRINITARIAN TESTIMONY OF GOD.		90.
	a. Various Quotes And Comments.		90.
XI.	CONCLUSION.		102.
XII.	ADDENDUM.		105.

PREFACE

- (1) In the study of God there has always been controversy. I do not expect this treatise of the subject to change that, even though it would be desirable for unity to be the result. Within the Christian community, God has been, and still is divided into different theological viewpoints.
- (2) **THE ONENESS VIEW** that says there is but one being, person or entity in the Godhead. This one being (God) took upon himself the form of a man by the virgin birth and dwelt among us to redeem us unto himself by his own sacrifice of his humanity at calvary. Under this view Jesus was both God and man; the only deity who also was a man and the only deity that could assume a human form and still remain God. There was, and is, no God besides him; he reigns absolute, alone and sovereign in the capacity of God. God, who created the world in the beginning, came himself into this world; being both God and man while he was here and in every degree manifested the full characteristics of both God and man. His name is Jesus.
- (3) **THE TRINITARIAN** view which says that there are three persons in the Godhead; coequal, coeternal, each wholly God with equal power, divinity and being. This view teaches that each “person” of the godhead (Father, Son and Holy Ghost) functions with complete individual God-capacity, yet they function with constant harmony in their actions. Under this view, God the Son, the second person of the godhead, came to the earth as a human being and gave his life for the world. While this was being accomplished, God the Father, the first person of the godhead, remained some place in the heavens on his throne. The Holy Spirit, the third person of this triune God, essentially was inactive until after the founding of the church. This view of the godhead was determined to be the “orthodox” teaching about God by the Council of Nicea, which convened in 325 A.D. Then, in 529 A.D., Justinian, emperor of Rome, revised all Roman law and in the process, made the Trinitarian doctrine of the godhead the law of the land, with severe punishment for its violation.
- (4) (3) **The Dual** view of the godhead, which essentially says that there is God who created the world. Then he begat the Son, as a separate and subordinate being to “God the Father”. Thus you have therein a “father – son” relationship, with the son having no inherent, eternal, divine power of his own, deriving all power and authority from the “Father”. Under this view the Son is not a coequal with the Father but is subservient to and distinct from the Father, both in being and function.

I. INTRODUCTION.

There probably is no greater presumption on the part of any human being, than trying to write about God or the Godhead. This is true, regardless as to the educational background, theological training, personal convictions and beliefs, or any other possession, talent or experience. God, whose ways are past finding out, who is from everlasting to everlasting, and of whom there is no searching of his understanding, is not a subject which can be readily and easily written about in a manner commensurate with all the attributes of his infinite and eternal being.

We know and agree that the Bible teaches us that God is a Spirit, but how to describe or explain this, the human mind cannot tell. We also know that God is from everlasting to everlasting, who alone inhabits eternity (Is 57:15), but how do we with our finite mind, so very limited to time and space, comprehend such vastness? The Bible tells us that God is invisible (I Tim. 1:17), and we fail to understand how God who has made the visible universe is, himself, invisible. We would readily agree that God alone is sovereign, that he has all power; that he alone is the creator of all of the vast universe, and that with the simple act of his spoken word. We look at the mystery, the marvel and the majesty of all he has created, and we see the evidence of his miraculous work, but we are left in wonder and awe at it all. Is. 40:12, tells us that he hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out the heavens with a span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance. How do you mentally calibrate such magnitude? To whom will you liken God, or what likeness will you compare unto him? Further this 40th chapter of Isaiah declares, "He sitteth upon the circle of the earth and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers. And, the creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not, neither is weary, there is no searching of his understanding. In Ps. 108:9, there is an almost novel description of God's greatness, when he says: "Moab is my wash pot; over Edom will I cast out my shoe; over Philistia will I triumph". To what then can we liken God, and with what words shall we presume to describe or explain him. God, all wise, all powerful, all present and eternal, is beyond the realm of human ability, whether naturally possessed or acquired, to comprehend.

Notwithstanding this dilemma of man's innate inability to fathom and explain God, yet it is abundantly true that God wants everyone to know him in all his glory and majesty. In addition, our inability to comprehend God by the resources of our own reason and intellect, however much enlightened in all sciences we might be, should not be a deterrent to us from seeking to know the creator and sovereign of the universe. It is eternal life to know God and Jesus Christ whom he has sent. Indeed, while we should not presume to know God within our own minds, enlightenment and studies, we should submissively petition God to reveal himself, not for selfish purposes nor for mental enlightenment, but for his glory and for our devotion and saving relationship with him. There are multitudes of books, tracts and lessons written on this subject. It would not be fair or proper to simply accept or reject them outright. Each of them, when compared to God's own revelation of himself, will rise or fall accordingly. Tradition, no matter how ingrained and prevalent, is not a compelling or reliable source for knowing God. Church councils and even theological seminary training are not an irrefutable source for knowing God. The only reliable, unchanging, infallible and

hands-on resource for knowing God is his word, inspired and revealed by the power of the Holy Spirit. Apart from God's ability to directly reveal himself by whatever method he chooses, the Bible is, in and of its own instructions, commands and teachings, the ultimate resource for knowing God, knowing about God and (intimately) "knowing" God. Since it is the sacred right and opportunity for anyone to read and study the pages of the Bible and since our own conclusions and determinations are virtually certain to be marked with many human errors and shortcomings, it becomes absolutely essential that we seek and obtain God's own revelation of himself through the Bible. In this manner God is glorified, and our hearts and minds can thrill at his marvel and wonder, as he makes known to our finite being Himself. It would be our prayer that we may all approach this study of God, with all of our limitations in mind, while at the same time refraining completely from yielding to the easy temptation of assuming that tradition, books and learned minds are automatically correct. The study of God and the Godhead is so vital to our individual relationship with him, that we should challenge by divinely revealed scripture, every tradition, theology, concept and teaching, including our own, until the name of God is glorified, all scriptures harmonize and we are left with only one possible revelation of Him. And I should openly declare that I do include myself under the obligation of seeking God for the revelation of Himself, apart from any other source or method of knowing Him.

Notwithstanding our limitations and inability to comprehend God apart from the divine revelation of himself through the word of the Lord, we should not be deterred or discouraged from a passionate study of the scriptures that we might know him. Instead it should challenge and inspire us to passionately, studiously and prayerfully seek God that we may know him, as much as he will reveal himself to us. We make friends in this life and the ones who are nearest and dearest to us are the ones we know the best and the most intimately, along with who and what they are. That is also true of knowing God. It would be grossly uncharacteristic and certainly not a "close friendship" to say that we know God but yet did not "know him" but only knew about him.

I cannot over-emphasize the necessity of God revealing himself to us as the individual he is and in such fullness of his eternal power and godhead as he deems proper. While I heartily endorse and believe in the absolute necessity of seeking to know God through the study of his word, I see with that also the absolute necessity of God, by his own power and Spirit, revealing to our finite minds the glory and being of he that is infinite. God, who is eternal, invisible, without beginning of days or ending of years, cannot be fathomed, searched out or understood by any degree of human mental faculties or development. God is not an explanation! God is a revelation! God that created the universe and all that is in it; who knows the end from the beginning; and whose ways are past finding out, cannot be likened to or equated with or compared to any human intellectual or developmental or scientific study or the results thereof. God who is omniscient, omnipresent and omnipotent, is so far above and beyond the grasp of all that we can know innately or by acquired knowledge that we cannot begin to unravel his eternal power, godhead and mysteries.

God, whose power, knowledge, creativity and being is such that he could simply speak the universe into existence; put the sun, moon and stars in their place with eternal perfection; create man so fearfully and wonderfully with all of the unbelievable marvels of human life; and then command the seas not to overflow the earth; give the grunion fish a built in tide table, the humming bird its flight

and migrations and the ant a wisdom beyond description, while the honey bee makes honey and the cow gives milk and the vultures devours unwanted flesh – is certainly a God too far beyond human comprehension to even attempt unraveling the mystery and majesty of who he is by our own minds.

There is no wonder there are atheists who loudly proclaim there is no God. They have depended on human intellect, knowledge and science (so-called) to attempt to discover him and to know him. Having utterly failed by such resources to find out God, they conclude on the basis of their own pompous, finite research that there is no God. And all the while they breathe his air and enjoy his world. Do they not know or can they not understand that God does not reveal his existence, power and being to skeptics, agnostics, atheists and others who choose to live their lives in complete contradiction to his will and pleasure? Is it any wonder that great philosophers of all times, wise men, astrologers and writers have never discovered in all of their meanderings, meditations, and mysticisms, who the God who sitteth upon the circle of the earth, who meted out the heavens with a span, measured the waters in the hollow of his hand and comprehends the dust of the earth in a measure – who he is and what his name is?

Do not marvel either that great religions of the world with their gods made of gold, who may cut themselves with knives, while calling on their god, or who may even erect an altar to the “unknown God”, through their divinations, incantations and whose worship is of the creation and not the creator, and yet do not know GOD.

Finally, all of the foregoing disclaimers about “knowing” God, who he is and what his godhead consists of, along with the absolute necessity of “divine revelation” being required in order to “know” him applies also to every church, every theologian and every individual who professes Christ and would know God. Books, commentaries, seminaries, preachers, priests, Pope nor any other can know God without God revealing himself. Church councils, attended by hundreds, deliberating and discerning God, without divine revelation, are helpless, as are denominational by laws, traditions and teachings. God alone can reveal who he is. What, I would ask, is wrong or so bad or unacceptable about reserving unto God himself, who he is and what his godhead consists of and that it can be known only by his own revelation of himself to the individual? No doubt but what God uses witnesses, the ministry and surely the Bible to reveal himself, but God alone can open up the understanding and make himself known. And only God knows the heart that is truly hungry and seeking to “know” him.

THE WONDERFUL TRUTH IS THAT GOD CAN AND WILL REVEAL HIMSELF TO THE HUNGRY, BROKEN HEART. He does not withhold it from the one who seeks him with all their heart; that soul shall find him. Unto “babes”, does God reveal himself; not to the wise and prudent. God is not trying to simply increase our I. Q. level. He is seeking to reveal himself in a loving relationship. While Christ was on the earth, he was not revealed to the religious hierarchy or the pagan priests. To “ignorant and unlearned” men, Jesus revealed himself and his will. He took David from the sheepcote and anointed him king. He took Amos from the shepherd’s flock. All through the Bible, God came to some very unlikely prospects to reveal himself and his will. That is how God works. God does not withhold

revelation from the unlearned or from the scholar. He is able to take the untutored in this life and reveal the mysteries of eternity and of himself to them. God is not opposed to much learning in natural intellect; he can and does use it. But he is not dependent upon it either.

There is a great and rich blessing upon the heart and life to which God reveals himself. It is far above and beyond the acquisition of knowledge. More than anything, the revelation of God also reveals the depth and majesty of his character and attributes. I believe there is no blessing any greater than the revelation of who God is. This is not only about the doctrine of the godhead; far from that. When you “know” God, you get a glimpse into the depth of his love and mercy. To know who God is magnifies calvary, the resurrection and the return of Christ again. Moreover, the Old Testament comes alive with beauty when you know who God is. And to know God gives a far greater understanding of life and the nature and destiny of man. The blessing of knowing God is the blessing of a personal relationship with him. When God rolls back the clouds of our darkened minds and imparts divine revelation about himself we are not only enhancing our intellect, we are experiencing eternity. Nevertheless, even Paul with all of his revelation, saw through a glass darkly; how much more do we. What a thrill it would be, if during the process of this study, God would reveal himself again, that we might rejoice in his glory.

I will conclude these extended thoughts about the necessity of divine revelation with a warning about it. **ANY PRESUMED REVELATION FROM GOD MUST BE VERIFIABLE BY AND HARMONIOUS WITH THE BIBLE.** Many have claimed divine revelation on an agenda item they are proposing with no biblical proof that such “revelation” is true or even possible. This is usually done to enshroud a message in an aura of divine authority, without a biblical foundation for such message. The thoughtful, genuine seeker of God, must exercise extreme caution when preachers using phrases such as: “God spoke to my heart”; “God revealed something to me”; “I had a vision from the Lord”; “God revealed to me that there is someone who has cancer”. Always remember that divine revelation is not a one-way street. When God revealed to Cornelius to send for Peter (Acts 10), he also revealed to Peter that he should go. You must reserve unto God the power and prerogative to reveal whatever he desires to whomever he sees fit; but you must also reserve unto yourself the duty to verify every claim to revelation. Revelation from God is not a money gimmick or physical miracle deception. Never forget that “divine revelation” is and should be verifiable by any prudent test and is never a party to self-elevation, self- aggrandizement, superior-posturing or self-gain. In fact, divine revelation may bring upon you serious suffering and hardship. Let the Bible speak last.

My last thought on the necessity of divine revelation as the only channel by which to know God is this: **“REVELATION IS NOT EXCLUSIVE WITH MAN BUT WITH GOD”.** It is a very poor characteristic to “blow your horn” about what you say God has revealed to you, even if, indeed, he has. The person to whom God reveals himself will be humbled and self-deprecating regarding it. If God can reveal himself to “babes in Christ”, then more spiritually mature Christians should abase themselves in view of the least revelation as well as unto God’s power to reveal.

At the same time, however, we should seek every opportunity to glorify God for his revealing power, while we fear the idea of self-elevation and attention, no matter how much God reveals to us. This is a thin line to walk: one that discounts the personal acquisition and possession of revelation, while glorifying God for his ability for such revelation. It is, nonetheless, the line we must walk.

I include myself completely in all of the limitations, requirements, personal in-competencies and need, as it regards the revelation of God to man. I defer every single truth about God and who he is to the authority of his word and the power of the Holy Spirit to reveal it. I uphold the Bible as the sole judge as to whether I, or anyone, has any revelation from God and defer all glory to him for it, while rejoicing witness

II. HOW DOES GOD REVEAL HIMSELF?

God has revealed himself through more than one channel. These include creation, divine theophany, the church, Jesus Christ and the Bible. While each of these are important and each offers a harmonious revelation of God and who and what he is, our greatest emphasis will be on the last three: the church, Jesus Christ and the Bible. I will add one other channel, which in reality is at work in all the rest. That is the direct power of the Holy Spirit, imparting to our hearts and minds what we should know. Mentioning the Holy Spirit in this manner is not an afterthought but is, instead, the only power by which the other channels can open up unto us the truth of the godhead. In other words, it would surely be recognized that the Bible is a major source and defining authority on this subject. But neither the written pages of the Bible or our own intellectual conclusions therefrom, have the power to reveal God. The Holy Spirit of God alone can open our understanding of what is written in the Bible, thereby revealing God to us. Let us consider each of these sources of revelation and how they are reliable channels of the greatest subject on earth: "GOD AND HIS SOVEREIGN WILL AND HIS HOLY AND PERFECT BEING".

A. GOD IS REVEALED IN HIS CREATION.

Ps. 19:1. "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament sheweth his handiwork. Rom. 1:20. For the invisible things of him from the creation are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead; so that they are without excuse.

These two scriptures are very clear in their declaration that God can be seen through the world which we look at every day, which has the stamp of his power and even his godhead revealed throughout his marvelous work of creation. To be sure, the magnitude and marvel of all creation is not to be worshipped as so much of the history of mankind testifies has been done. Paul says in Rom. 1:23 & 25, (man) changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four footed beasts, and creeping things". "Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the creator, who is blessed forever". From the fall of Adam in the garden until the present time, mankind, being sinful and having lost the revelation of God through his sin, has constructed unto himself some object of the natural world into an idol of his intellectual perception of God and has worshipped gods of wood and gold and stone. Perhaps nothing else in all the history of man and the history of his idolatry in every era and culture of time, serves to so emphatically verify that man, of his own intellectual reasoning and philosophies cannot know and understand the God that made the world.

On the other hand, if we will seek him and his mercies and the revelation of himself to our hearts, God can use the created world to show himself to us that we may worship and exalt his majesty and not a stone or a tree. It is abundantly true that the heavens do declare the glory of God and it is also true that the invisible things of his eternal power and godhead can clearly be seen from the things which he has made.

When you consider the intricate marvels of the universe, from the panorama of the stars at night to the ant that crawls on the ground, there is a glory, majesty, synchronism and an unbelievable greatness to it all that the heart and mind of man should bow in total submission and reverence to the God that made it. “HOW GREAT THOU ART”, should be the chorus from every human heart. God that is sovereign, alone, all powerful, whose knowledge and greatness defies the meager reasoning of man and whose works declare his eternal majesty from the foundation of the world, stands in total solitude over the vast expanse of the entire universe. He has no equal! There are no intelligent grounds by which his sovereignty, power and glory can be reasonably questioned nor can any science or evidence known to man explain him away or truthfully question that he alone is God, the creator of the world.

To think that the entire universe, with its expanse beyond the reach of man’s discovery or his understanding, is, after all, one universe, gives evidence to its origin as being that of one God. There is One indescribably, vast dominion in its dimensions which are as limitless as eternity itself, and its far reaches as unfathomable as God that made it. Yet it functions as one unit, where the activities of that same “ant” we have mentioned, are so correlated and guided that they form an integral part in their finite realm, with the vast infinity of the entire universe. Thus, every speck of dust, and every gigantic planet of the universe, takes their respective place in the singular universe, so that they all join in one song from the beginning. There is one God who has made it all, and he gives order, function and purpose to the ant as well as the planet. And the universe sends its message to the far reaches of its unknown boundaries, shouting from the eternities: “I am the creation of one God, the sovereign ruler and creator of it all.

As I write this, I can see out of the window a large pine tree. Like many other parts of the universe, that pine tree is made up of more than one property. There is the bark, the sap and the trunk. Three very identifiable properties, yet without any one of these elements you don’t have a pine tree. If you peel away its skin it will bleed to death. If you drain away its sap, it would be dead. If there was no trunk, it would be no tree. This may be an early glimpse at the controversy over the godhead that has raged since the early years of the church. Some believe the godhead is comprised of three distinct persons or personages, each fully and completely God alone in their own right, yet all three functioning harmoniously as the godhead. They would describe God the father as being totally and completely God in his solitary, sovereign existence. They would use the pine tree to illustrate and support that explanation. While the pine tree has more than one property, neither of them can subsist alone. In addition, without any one of the three there is no pine tree. Likewise, God fills many offices, positions and titles with father, son and Holy Ghost being only three of them. The point to be made is that, without sap, there is no pine tree and without the office or title of “father” there is no God. In short, the godhead (and God himself) is not divisible. God cannot be God, if his authority, dominion, and being are divided. We will have much more on this later. For now, remember that, while the world is made of many components, it is but one world; numerically one.

Before we leave the thought of the revelation of God as manifested through the creation which he has made, it is important that we consider one further item in this regard. That item is about the specific creation of man. Gen. 1:26-27 provides the following account of this creation: “And God 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. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them”.

This passage of scripture is used to describe and prove that God is a plurality of “persons”. The thought derives from the statement where God said “let us make man in OUR image, after OUR likeness”. Because the plural words “us” and “our” are used here it is concluded that there must be a plurality of persons contemplating the creation of man. To extend this thinking further, the component parts of man’s created substance is said to also be plural, in fact, that man is a three-fold being, thus demonstrating, it is reasoned, that God also has to be three-fold. To “explain” this line of thinking, we are told that man is made up of “body, soul and spirit”, thus demonstrating a three-fold being. This three-fold structure of man is then applied to God as an explanation of his plural or three-fold godhead. Further, inasmuch as it is specifically stated (V26) that man was to be made in the image and likeness of God, orthodoxy teaches that man in his (presumed) three-fold being is, by divine creation, a replication of God and the fullness of the godhead itself.

Let us look at all that this says about God and then look back at the specific scriptures to see if, in fact, that is what they are saying to us. First, this theology implies that man is a replication of God. Does anyone believe that man, created of the dust of the ground, is, indeed, a replication of God? When you look at man, before or after his fall, is that what God is and what he looks like. He that is invisible, has he been reduced to the construct of visible man? If man is a three-fold being and if this is supposedly an image of the God which made the world, Is God, in one of his three-fold components, made of a body of dirt? Someone is sure to answer yes to this question and explain their answer by applying it to the Lord Jesus Christ. If that is someone’s answer then they do not believe in the virgin birth of Christ by Mary, in Bethlehem, about 4000 years after the creation. There was no earthly body of Christ until God became man by this virgin birth. In addition, by what reasoning and scripture can we take the terms “soul and spirit” as they are applied to man and make them out to be an express image of God? If man in all of his created being is a picture of what God is, then we have, indeed, reduced God to a frail, fallen, dependent and powerless being. It is impossible to take all of the attributes of God; his power, eternity, holiness, graces, wisdom, majesty, wonder and marvel, and then teach that man was made in “this image”. Never has man possessed these eternal attributes. Therefore it is imperative that we look elsewhere to gain an understanding as to what is meant by the statement that man is created in the image and likeness of God. It positively is not in physical structure, mental prowess, eternity, power or created components of any kind.

Before we offer a possible explanation for this “created imagery”, let us look back at the full statements of the scripture. The question that is raised by the statement, “let us create man in our image, after our likeness” is, who is referenced by “us” and “our”. To make this a definition of the makeup of the godhead is really stretching the scripture and, frankly, ignores an entire Bible full of verses declaring emphatically that God is “one”. Further, it does not take into account passages of scripture where “we” is used when specifically applicable to one person. The apostle Paul uses it thus on more than one occasion which we will note later in this study. Gen. 1:27 clarifies this question

when it says: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; "male and female created he them". If verse 26 gives a plural connotation to the godhead, then verse 27 takes it away. The plurality of verse 27 is specifically defined as "male and female". Are we to conclude that in the plural makeup of the godhead there is male and female?

The question we are considering here is clearly answered in the New Testament in Col. 1:13-16. These verses tell us that Jesus Christ is the "image" of the invisible God. They further explain that it was by (because of or on behalf of) him that all things were created. Thus we can conclude that the image God had in mind in Gen. 1:26-27, was that of Jesus Christ as the Son of God. It should satisfy the thoughtful student that the image (express representation) of God for mankind is Jesus Christ. It is our conviction that God, looking ahead to the wonderful act of redemption in Christ, had our likeness unto him, through his salvation by calvary, in view. The New Testament abundantly testifies to the fact that we are to be "made in the likeness of Christ our Savior". Simply stated, God was not talking about the construction of the godhead in Gen. 1;26-27; he was talking about his plan that man would be in the likeness of God in Christ. Thus, God in us is his great scheme and plan for salvation.

I see no problem in using the expressions "US" and "OUR" in the declaration that God was making man in his image and likeness, if we include in these expressions that God had in view the day in which he would become a man in Christ. It is an undeniable truth that God surely had in view that man would be made (again) after the likeness of God in Christ. Stated another way, it is true that God's intent in our salvation is that we be made in the likeness of Christ and that this is accomplished by the process of "Christ in us, the hope of glory". There is no other scriptural way to describe man as being made in the image and likeness of God except through our "re-creation" in Christ Jesus. That is exactly what God had in view in Genesis.

If you try to make this creation of man in the image and likeness of God to be a metaphor or type of the construction of the godhead, then the problems are un-surmountable. Exactly which part of man represents the respective "persons" of the godhead? Which part represents the "Father"? Is it the soul or the spirit or the body of man? Which part of God is represented in the GOD/MAN? Until we acknowledge that the New Testament deals abundantly with both the human and divine nature of Christ, undivided, then you will never be able to answer the countless scriptures which make expressions on the one hand that refer to the "divine" nature, and on the other hand to the "human" nature. This is a fact that must be dealt with and reconciled, no matter what you believe about the godhead. In fact, if you believe the Trinitarian concept of the godhead, then your problems are "three-fold" more than they are with the oneness concept.

There are so many marvelous examples of God's creation as a description of his power, wisdom and greatness that it is impossible to think of or describe all of them. The order of the sun, moon and stars; the tides of the seas; the amazing multi-colors throughout all species of plant and animal life; the ability of the sparrow to look for and find its food; the zebra with its stripes; the whale and the minnow; the eagle and the vulture; the mountains and the valleys and plains; summer, winter, spring and fall and more. Then there is man that, indeed, is fearfully and wonderfully made. With 100,000 miles of blood vessels; a heart that beats continually for decades; eyes that see and ears that hear; a

nervous system that is mind boggling and a brain which medical science is still trying to determine its far reaches of function. Indeed, if we only seek to honor the God who created it all, it is not hard to see his wonderful handiwork written all over the universe.

B.GOD AS REVEALED BY DIVINE THEOPHANY.

THEOPHANY = The appearance of God (sometimes referred to as the angel of the Lord) in a form similar to man. The Bible often speaks of the “Lord appearing to someone”. Simultaneously, it often uses the expression, “the word of the Lord or the angel of the Lord appeared unto me. There are times when the “appearance of the Lord” is so distinct and set apart from anything that is ordinary or routine. Let us consider some examples.

Daniel 3:24-25 is a compelling example of a divine theophany (an appearance of God to man). The story of the three Hebrew children is known to everyone who has attended church and Sunday School. The reason it is so well known is not because they were thrown into a furnace of fire for failing to bow in worship to the king. The reason is because of their amazing deliverance. The king asked of his servants if it was not only three men which they threw into the fire? They answered that it was. Then the king answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire and they have no hurt; and the fourth is like unto the son of God.

Without creating an unnecessary dialogue over theological opinions, let us just observe the obvious facts: (1) they were thrown into a furnace of fire; (2) they stood there in the fire unharmed by the searing heat; (3) standing with them was a “fourth” man in the fire; (4) Others saw this fourth man; (5) they were delivered without even the smell of smoke on them. Who is going to argue against these facts? Regardless as to how you may explain this “fourth man in the fire”, you will surely agree that God came to their rescue. In our attempts to rationalize, or even try to explain away this unexplainable appearance, we overlook a very simple but profound truth: God can, if he chooses, appear anywhere, at any time, for any reason and in any form which he decides to. Otherwise he would not be the all-powerful God. In this example, that is what he chose to do and the best thing we can do is leave it just as we found it, without putting our own props and descriptions on it.

Another example is found in Genesis chapter 18. Here the Bible says that the Lord appeared unto him (Abraham) in the plains of Mamre. Then it says (18:2), that he lift up his head and three men stood by him. Abraham engages in a conversation with them and then sets a meal before them. These (3) men were on their way to Sodom to look into the wickedness there. Then in verse 22, we are told that they went toward Sodom, but Abraham stood yet before the Lord. These 3 men have now gone on to Sodom and the Lord is still standing before Abraham. First, this tells us that these three which appeared unto Abraham in no way represent the godhead. God is still standing before Abraham while the 3 are on their way to Sodom.

Another example is when God appeared to Moses in the burning bush. What else can you say about it or how better can you describe it. You simply leave it as it is stated. To add more could have the effect of distorting the picture. The fact is that God appeared unto Moses out of the midst of the bush. The expression “the angel of the Lord” does not necessarily separate the “angel” from the

“Lord”. Ex. 3:2. “And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him out of a flame of the fire out of the midst of a bush”. Then verse 4 says, “God called unto him out of the midst of the bush”. A strange theophany, perhaps, but nevertheless that is what God said and did. And he could!

In Judges, chapter 13, the Lord appears as the “angel of the Lord” to Manoah’s wife to announce the birth of Samson. In verse 6 where she tells her husband of this heavenly visitation, she said that a “man of God” came unto her. Then Manoah besought the Lord to let the “man of God” come again unto them. So God answered his prayer and he appeared unto her again. She ran and told Monoah and he came and held conversation with this “man of God”

In Genesis chapter 28, Jacob gets a vision of God standing at the top of a ladder and Jacob knew that the Lord was in that place.

And there are others. Our point is not to stir the realm of visions, angels, burning bushes or other phenomenal occurrences by which God has appeared to his people, announced his will to them, delivered them or otherwise communicated to them. Our point is that God can and has revealed himself by means of these “divine theophanies”. We do not think that these theophanies are the substance or the full being or description of God and the godhead. They show us that God cannot be limited in how he chooses to reveal himself to the world.

C. GOD AS REVEALED THROUGH HIS CHURCH.

In the case of the two previous examples of the revelation of God, one (the creation) is a mirrored revelation where God is reflected in things we see, while the other example is a “temporary” manifestation of a “power and form” which only God could exhibit. Neither are to be construed as being God, but are “revelations” of God.

We now come to the third form of the revelation of God: “THE CHURCH”. It cannot be said of the church that “it is God, yet its form of revelation is far greater than the first two examples. That is to say, we get a larger, much clearer revelation of God through the church than we do through the creation or through theophanies. Further, the revelation of God manifested through the church is not limited by a temporary appearance or non-communicable object such as the creation. Instead, the revelation of God through the church is “relational”, which adds an entirely different dimension to it. You don’t just “look” at the church and see a revelation of God, though this should be. You join in a relationship with God through the church and this adds a more dynamic dimension to the revelation.

The question we need to consider is this: “In what manner can the church reveal God to us”? As we have noted, it is not like looking at the vastness of the universe and thereby know that there is a God; or like a temporary appearance in the furnace of fire and seeing there the fourth man in the fire, who appears as one who is like unto the Son of God and then is gone. In the church we are introduced to God and are drawn to him. We can experience his touch upon our life in the church and know that it is God. In the church we are invited to approach the Lord, call upon his name and seek his power upon our lives. In the church we share in a special provision of his mercy, grace and redemption. In the church we can become the children of God. In this relationship God becomes our (spiritual) father

and the church becomes our (spiritual) mother, because the church is the bride of Christ. These relational qualities which are predicated upon faith in God are available only in the church.

NOTE: I should carefully point out that the use of the phrase “in the church” does not refer to a building or for that matter a congregation of people who may call themselves a church. The phrase “in the church” refers to the church as God knows and recognizes it, wherever or whoever that might be.

In the church therefore, God is revealed to us, not just as a “creator or theophany”, but as our heavenly Father, savior and king, through the process of redemption. Therefore we “know him” through the pardon and forgiveness of our sins and through adoption into his own kingdom and family. By this means of revealing God, we come to “know him” personally and we can see God, not as some distant power who can create worlds, but as a loving father who redeems us to ultimately be with him in all eternity.

Another dimension of this revelation of God by and through the church is from the standpoint of the church being the dwelling place, the throne and even the seat of administration of his spiritual kingdom. The church alone contains the ordinances and covenant of God for man, specifically those who, by God’s own divine begetting, are born into it. Therefore the church is the institutionalized representation, revelation, manifestation of God in the world. Please note that I have not said or implied that the church “is” God; only that the church represents God in the world. To contrast and understand this, compare it to any other institution on earth, religious, civil or governmental, and none will be found that is the authorized embodiment of God in all the world except the church. An illustration of this can be seen in Acts, chapter seventeen, where Paul, a representative of the church, and as such an ambassador or representative of Jesus Christ, preached to the epicurians and stoics in Athens. While they bowed in devotion to countless gods, and to one which they labeled the “unknown God”, Paul said, him declare I unto you. So in a very real sense, Paul, a child of God through the church, revealed the one true God to the heathen worshippers of Athens.

The church is also a revelation of God by way of its possession and exemplification of various attributes such as love, goodness, grace, mercy, forgiveness, longsuffering and more, all of which are of God and by which the church is (at least should be) endowed with. Man in his sinful, unconverted nature does not have available the resources and the strength to live by them. To be sure, everyone, at some time, will demonstrate (albeit temporarily) one or more of these attributes. But man in his fallen, sinful state is not “good”, no not one. “Goodness” is of God, and that goodness he has not only shown to the church, he has endowed her with it and ordained that the church should walk in it. Other religions apart from the church may have principals that are good, but they are sustained by human abilities, which inevitably will fail. “The church”, however, as God intended, designed and empowered it, is endowed with that “goodness” which is of God. Put another way, the “fruit” of the church is supposed to be divine fruit (love, joy, peace, etc.). Without any doubt, the nominal church, throughout all the ages, has miserably failed in this area. That is because she was endowed with religion, a work of the flesh, and not with redemption, a work of the Spirit of God. What institution in all history can be shown to reveal God in his attributes but the church?

When Paul wrote his second letter to the church at Corinth, chapter 3:2-3, he told them that they were epistles of Christ. That is, they were representatives of Christ in the world, to reveal Christ in all his glory to that world. Many times the scriptures will speak of our being an example or ambassador or temple of God. The church is his body in this world to declare unto the world not only his glory but also his being. What an awesome responsibility is placed upon us as children of God.

D. GOD REVEALED THROUGH THE BIBLE.

We come now to the Bible, an extremely powerful, accurate, all-in-compassing and miraculous source of the revelation of God. In fact there is no other source, in heaven and in earth, created for the express purpose of revealing to man his great need of God while also revealing God himself to man in all of his eternal sovereignty and godhead. Every page of this divinely inspired book is infused with God: who he is, what he has done, what his will for man is, what his attributes are, along with his omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence. No other book written by any other author in all time, whether that author is for or against God, can come even remotely close to the Bible in its scope, authority, accuracy and revelation about God. After all, the Bible is the divinely inspired word of God given specifically about him in its exclusively inerrant truth.

Obviously, in the writing of this lesson about God and the godhead, we will rely heavily on the Bible as we look at every aspect of this subject. We expect to include separate sections covering different areas of this massive undertaking, with the Bible being the last word on every thought and every proposition regarding it. We will let the Bible provide its own exclusive revelation of God in each respective area. For now, under the current topic of "The Bible" (as a source of the revelation of God) we are not trying to address each area of interest and concern about the totality of the godhead. We are only setting forth the fact that the Bible is a major source of revealing God to man. What it says in that process of revealing God will be explored in separate topics. I would expect that the entire Christian community would agree that the Bible is the major, exclusive source of revealing God, although there may not be agreement on how to interpret that revelation.

The Bible, by virtue of its very existence and nature, compels us to accord to it the position and authority of being the final word about God, his being, godhead and sovereignty. Unless we recognize this we are left with no overwhelming substance or evidence that the God of the Bible is the one sovereign of the universe. Written over a period of many centuries, by many different authors, many who never knew or saw each other, the Bible, apart from being the divinely revealed word of God, about God, is without any doubt the most amazing marvel of all time. It stands alone in all the history of man, unique and without parallel or equal. How it has been preserved, compiled, distributed, endured and defied all attempts against its existence is a grand and glorious testimony to God and all that this book says about him. Its critic-defying harmony and its record of influence in the world, in the halls of any stable government, in the home and in the hearts and lives of mankind, along with the blessings it has ordained, is beyond all explanation, unless it is, indeed, the mighty revelation of God to man. It stands alone and above all science and knowledge of all time in its precise and compelling instances of foretelling, ahead of time, what God would do or reveal about himself and his work in the world. Its authenticity, authority, accuracy, along with its limitless and unsearchable truths, spanning

every area of human existence and need, compel the conclusion that the God of its volume reigns supreme, there is no searching of his understanding. Finally, its message of mercy, love and forgiveness, could not be the product or work of fallen mankind. With its pages saturated with these heavenly attributes, the God which those pages describe is the greatest revelation the human soul could ever receive. That, after all, is why the Bible was written: to be a revelation of God to man.

E. THE REVELATION OF GOD THROUGH THE “MAN” CHRIST JESUS.

We have described the Bible as the final word and absolute authority on the revelation of God. And it is. But it is because it is the inspired word of the Lord Jesus Christ. We have the Bible in our hands physically, but we don't have Jesus Christ to hold and look upon. Of course, if it were not for Christ, we would not have a Bible. This means, then, that Christ is the real, final revelation of God to man and the Bible simply tells of this revelation of God throughout all history.

Therefore, Jesus, who was the Christ, is the only eternal revelation of God – to man. How can we say he is the only revelation of God to Man? Because the other mediums through which God is revealed (creation, theophany, church and the Bible), are not God but are mediums through which God is revealed or known. This is not the case with Christ. He is not only a medium by which God is revealed – he is God – in all of his fullness and godhead. In (the man) Christ, God has come down to earth as a man, yet he is totally and completely God in all of his being, person and fullness. Jesus Christ is not just “a” revelation of God he is “the” revelation of God.

Many passages of scripture in both Old Testament and New Testament declare that Jesus Christ is the manifestation or revelation of God. That is to say, the one and only true God, creator of the world, has been revealed to man, not simply “by” Christ, but more appropriately “as” Christ. Let us consider some scriptures found in the New Testament on this thought.

- II Cor. 5:19. “To with, that GOD was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself”.
- Heb. 1:3. “Who being the brightness of his (God’s) glory, and the express image of his person – (the express image or exact copy of God’s substance or person).
- Jn. 1:1 & 10 & 14. In the beginning was the word and the word was with God and the word was God. (In the beginning there was God) He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. And the “Word” (which was God) was made flesh and dwelt among us and we beheld his (God’s) glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father. (The word in the beginning was God; that word became flesh and (God) was in the world in the form of human flesh).
- Mt. 1:23. Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name “Immanuel”, which being interpreted is GOD with us. (This is not in the same sense as God is with us in his everlasting presence. Rather it is in the sense that God who was Spirit only has now become a child (man) and is (physically) with us through the medium of human flesh which he has become).

- Jn. 14:8-9. Philip saith unto him, Lord, show us the Father and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, have I been so long time with you and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, shew us the Father? What a stunning declaration. Philip, you want to see the Father? Well, take a look at me for I am the Father (and I am also the Son).
- Jn. 10:30. I and my Father are one. Not two or three, but one – numerically. Not agree as one, but are one.
- I Tim. 6:15. Which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the king of kings and Lord of Lords. “Only Potentate” does not leave room for other potentates.
- I Tim. 3:16. And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: “GOD” was manifest in the flesh (as the Christ), justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. God, in this verse, is an obvious reference to the Lord Jesus Christ.
- Col. 2:8-9. Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the godhead bodily. Whatever there is in the godhead, its entire fullness dwells in Christ. All there is of God was manifest in the man Christ Jesus, and we are complete in Him.
- II Cor. 5:19. “To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation”. God has not revealed himself in “3 persons”; he has revealed himself in Jesus Christ.

There are many other scriptures revealing the Lord Jesus Christ as the full, complete and only manifestation of God in a body. In later sections we will address more of them. The unavoidable truth proclaimed in the preceding verses is that God – in all of his fullness -- came to the earth in the form of a man, to become a sacrifice for our sins. The only conclusion to be drawn from all of this is, that the blood which was shed at calvary, was the blood of God. That is precisely what we are told in Acts 20:28.

Thus it is that the Lord Jesus Christ was both God and man. Therein is the dilemma, mystery and controversy that has surrounded the “godhead question” throughout the church age. There were times when he talked, acted and bore the limitations of man; then there were times when he talked and acted as God in all of his power and godhead. It is from these two undeniable conditions of God-as-man, that most of the controversy surrounding the godhead arises. That is the reason divine revelation is so essential in the interpretation of God.

III. THERE IS ONLY ONE GOD.

There is only one true God and that God is one; that is, numerically one: one in being, sovereignty, power, rule, worship, glory and godhead. To be "GOD" means to be supreme in power, authority, majesty and being. In fact it is a misnomer to call him "God" if he does not possess these attributes exclusively to himself alone. The Romans had many gods and among them were those which they gave higher degrees of honor, purpose and position. But they did not have one sovereign god above all unless you attribute that to the caesars, which were not sovereign god. You cannot ascribe exclusive sovereignty to a plurality of "beings" as god. To be God above all and over all requires of its very qualification to be singularly one. One God can be or do many things; but a plurality of "gods" or "deities" cannot each have all power, wisdom, sovereignty and superiority, each unto themselves. Stated another way, any plurality of divine beings cannot each claim sovereignty, because sovereignty is a singularly possessed attribute. That is, if two or more deities claim sovereignty, one or all of them are false, because only one can be sovereign. To be sovereign means to be alone at the top in authority or power. It is an abuse of language to ascribe sovereignty to more than one unless you are going to talk of a sovereign state, committee or vested group, which of its very make-up consists of many with different minds and attributes. One God, means just that; ONE GOD!

So we begin this section with the premise that the "GOD" of the Bible is the one, true, sovereign of the universe. And, further, that this sovereignty is not and cannot be shared, divided, jointly held or exercised since sovereignty can only exist or be vested in ONE.

It cannot be avoided that this proposition which holds that the "sovereign God" of the Bible is numerically one, brings to the surface one of the great controversies of biblical exposition: "whether or not the godhead is one or three functioning in a co-operative, agreeable unit. Our position is that the "ONENESS" view of God, is the only biblical definition of the God of the Bible. We will explore other theology of the godhead in due course without minimizing the positions set forth by either view. Our Position will always be to seek to find out what God, through his word, says about himself.

Let us proceed with a search of the Bible to see what it teaches regarding "ONE GOD". Is God numerically one or only theologically one, thereby allowing for some form of plurality in the godhead?

ONE GOD. Det. 4:35. Unto thee it was shewed, that thou mightiest know that the Lord he is God; there is none else beside him.

Det. 4:39. Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath: there is none else.

Det. 6:4. Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord

Det. 32:39. See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no God with me: I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal: neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand.

Ex. 6:2-3. And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am the Lord: And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty, but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them. *(Note: in the first verse above the word LORD is translated from the Hebrew word for JEHOVAH, as it is over 6000 times in the O.T.)*

II Sam. 7:22. Wherefore thou art great, O Lord God: for there is none like thee, neither is there any God beside thee, according to all that we have heard with our ears.

Ps. 83:18. That men may know that thou, whose name alone is JEHOVAH, art the most high over all the earth.

Ps. 86:10. For thou art great, and doest wondrous things: thou art God alone.

Is. 40:28. Hast thou not known? Hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? There is no searching of his understanding.

Is. 43:10. Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me.

Is. 44:6. Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel, and his redeemer the Lord of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God.

Jl. 2:27. And ye shall know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I am the Lord your God, and none else: and my people shall never be ashamed.

I Cor. 8:4. As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one.

Eph. 4:5-6. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, -- One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

I Tim. 2:5. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.

I Jn. 5:7. For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

Gal. 3:20. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.

Jas. 2:19. Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe and tremble.

ONE FATHER. Mal. 2:10. Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us?-----

ONE NAME. Zech. 14:9. And the Lord shall be king over all the earth; in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one.

Acts 4:12. Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.

HOLY ONE. Is. 40:25. To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One.

Is. 41:14. Fear not, thou worm Jacob, and ye men of Israel; I will help thee, saith the Lord, and thy redeemer, the Holy One of Israel.

Is. 41:20. That they may see, and know, and consider, and understand together, that the hand of the Lord hath done this, and the Holy One of Israel hath created it.

Is. 43:3. For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Savior: I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee.

Is. 45:11. Thus saith the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, and his maker, ask me of things to come concerning my sons, and concerning the work of my hands command ye me.

Is. 47:4. As for our redeemer, the Lord of hosts is his name, the Holy One of Israel.

Is. 48:17. Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; I am the Lord thy God which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by the way that thou shouldest go.

Is. 49:7. Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, and his Holy One, to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth, to a servant of rulers, kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of the Lord that is faithful, and the Holy One of Israel, and he shall choose thee.

Is. 54:5. For thy Maker is thine husband; the Lord of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; The God of the whole earth shall he be called.

Is. 57:15. For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones.

Is. 60:9 & 14. Surely the isles shall wait for me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel, because he hath glorified thee. The sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee; and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet, and they shall call thee, the city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel.

Jer. 50:29. Call together the archers against Babylon: all ye that bend the bow, camp against it round about; let none thereof escape: recompense her according to her work; according to all that she hath done, do unto her: for she hath been proud against the Lord, against the Holy One of Israel.

Jer. 51:5. For Israel hath not been forsaken, nor Judah of his God, of the Lord of hosts; though their land was filled with sin against the Holy One of Israel.

ONE SHEPHERD. Jn. 10:16. And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.

Ps. 23:1. The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.

ONE UPON A THRONE. Rev. 4:2. And immediately I was in the spirit; and, behold, a throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne.

ONE KING. Zech. 14:9. And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one.

Jer. 10:10. But the Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting king: at his wrath the earth shall tremble, and the nations shall not be able to abide his indignation.

I Tim. 6:14-16. That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ. Which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen.

ONE SAVIOR. Jude 1:25. To the only wise God our Savior, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen.

Tit. 2:13. Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ.

Ph. 3:20. For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Is. 43:3. For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Savior: I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee.

Is. 43:11. I, even I, am the Lord; and beside me there is no Savior.

Is. 45:21. Tell ye, and bring them near; yea, let them take counsel together: who hath declared this from ancient time? Who hath told it from that time? Have not I the Lord? And there is no God else beside me; a just God and a Savior; there is none beside me.

God is always referred to as he, him, his, I. He is never referred to as they, them, theirs. One exception to this is where he is referred to with the words we and our. We will address this specifically later in the study.

There are numerous other scriptures such as these which we have listed, which give abundant and emphatic testimony to the scriptural verity that GOD is ONE. This “oneness”, as described in these and other scriptures, does not have any sense or capacity to be interpreted in a plural sense. It should be carefully noted that the Bible never speaks of God as “two” or “three”; always as “one”.

There is general unanimity among theologians about the fact that there is but “one God”. But then it is “explained” that within that one, there are three persons. However the scriptures we have presented, plus countless others like them, precludes entirely the interpretation that within the “one” God, there is a plurality of persons, beings, deities, etc. The Bible says there is “one” faith (Eph. 4:5).

Can we justify interpreting this one faith as three? If not, then by what rationale and authority can we interpret “one Lord” as three? If God is indeed three, why is it not noted somewhere in clear and unmistakable terms in all of the verses where God is referred to as “one”. Why is the term “three”, in reference to the godhead not stated so as to avoid the obvious conclusion of the numerically-confining word “one”? We should be able to find abundant scripture that emphatically states that the “one” God consists of three distinct persons, if in fact it is true. Has God left his truth of “three persons” hidden behind a veil of “one”, when he could have just as easily told us “I am three” and there are no other divine persons but the three of us?

If the scriptures we have presented, declaring that there is one God as well as the oneness of the godhead, do not require an absolute oneness of his total godhood, then language utterly fails to sustain its avowed meaning. In such case, there could verily be any number of entities, deities or persons in the godhead, the number of which would be un-provable.

Let us move to the next thought about this “ONE GOD” to:

IV. GOD OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

“IN THE BEGINNING GOD”! Thus begins the Bible in the first verse of Genesis. This fact of the existence of God is thereafter stamped indelibly throughout the entire Old Testament. If there is one truth above all others that the Old Testament abundantly reveals it is who God is and what his godhead consists of. The revelation of God in the Old Testament is so conspicuous and decisive that it leaves no doubt as to who God is and what his godhead is like. If there is only one truth which the Old Testament was written to inform us of, it is God. God did not take the entire Old Testament which comprises a greater portion of the entire Bible and fill it with absolute information about every purpose for that Bible and then not make it abundantly clear who he was. With all of the great works, countless stories of his patriarchs, servants, priests and prophets along with the types and shadows which are so foundational for his plan of redemption, and then, with all of that information, to leave out an unquestionable declaration of himself would be unthinkable. That would be like writing an important book and not giving the name of the author. If there is one thing the Old Testament clearly defines above all others, it is who God is. I emphasize this point because in the theology of the godhead, because nothing is said in the Old Testament regarding a plurality of that godhead, many writers declare that God did not reveal himself to the people of the Old Testament, reserving that for the New Testament. That simply is not the truth! To be sure God did not reveal himself as existing in a plurality of persons in the godhead in the O.T. for the simple reason he has no such existence. So when we look at the Old Testament and the great truths propounded by great heroes of faith in God such as Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, David, Daniel, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Moses and all the rest, of one thing we can be sure, they not only had a revelation of their God, their lives and their testimonies are the foundational truths upon which our own faith in God must be built. Not only does the O.T. clearly reveal the godhead, it is the very place for us to begin our own search of who he is.

When you consider **“God”** in the Old Testament, you are confronted with absolute claims, unmistakable statements, irrefutable declarations and an unchanging record about himself as he deals with his people of every age, from Adam to Christ. In fact the countless references, statements and claims in which God is represented, leave no ambiguity or alternatives regarding his infinite being, sovereignty and godhead. This should have been of great strength and confirmation to all who followed him in Old Testament times, as well as the rock upon which God is revealed in the N.T.

In the beginning **“GOD”** created the heavens and the earth and all things therein. On the sixth day he created man in his own image and his own likeness. Many times in the process of creation, on different days, the unqualified expression **“God said”** is used. These expressions, I believe, confirm to us that the creation of the world and all that is in it, was by the power, design and good pleasure of one divine being; and that one divine being simply **“spoke the word and it was so”**. If there was a plurality to this God-being, then it begs the question as to how many more than one could have thus spoken; what part each played in the process, and, indeed, if this God-being is plural, how would you confine it to two or three when there is no assertion of plurality mentioned. The expression in Gen. 1:26, **“us and our”** does not propose a plurality of the godhead as we shall see later. For now, we will simply point you to the very next verse, Gen. 1:27, where it says that God created man in his own

image, which is certainly a singular use. Further, the apparent inconsistency of trying to interpret a plurality of “persons” from these scriptures and from the word “God” is manifest in the ingrained thoughts and convictions that this Genesis expression of God refers to God the Father. However, if it refers to a plurality of persons, then God must refer to all three. The general thinking of pluralist advocates is that “God” refers to God-the-Father, thus excluding “Son” and “Holy Spirit”. The greater problem with this pluralist interpretation is that the “Son”, as a Son, has not been begotten. The “God” of creation will be more clearly manifest to be the one, single, sovereign being as we proceed in the accumulating process of our study.

Continuing with our search of God in the Old Testament, we now turn to the God of Abraham. In Gen. 12:1, we read: “Now the Lord had said unto Abram, get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy fathers house, unto a land that I will shew thee”. It continues in verse two, “and “I” will make of thee a great nation, and “I” will bless them that bless thee” ----. Again, in verse three, “and “I” will bless them that bless thee”. Further in verse seven, “and the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, unto thy seed will “I” give this land ----. Then in verse eight it is said, “and there he builded an altar unto the Lord, and called upon the name of the Lord.

In all of this record of the Lord appearing to Abram and calling and sending him forth, the language used is singular, with no hint or suggestion of any degree of plurality. Further, the word “god” used in application to false gods and also at times as a reference to “the God” is not even used in this process of calling Abram. Moreover, the word “Lord” used here comes from the Hebrew “Yaweh”, or “Jehovah”, which as we shall verify in much detail, was the Hebrew name for God. (Abram called on the name of YAWEH).

Perhaps more convincing was Abraham’s unique relationship with God. Since the flood, no established, formalized communication of some specific religious order and purpose had been set up among men. To be sure, there were those who worshipped God, Shem being a good example of this. But from Noah to Abraham there was a time when no pronounced dealings of God with man were manifest. Abraham had been raised in an environment of idol gods, with his father reportedly a maker of idols. God needed clarity of relationship between himself and man. More than that, God was about to call Abraham to be the father of the faithful and the establishing through him of the lineage through which Christ would come and by which all the world would be blessed. An environment even close to idol gods was no setting for this mission to be born into. Thus God called Abraham out – away – and to another country. May I suggest two major and inseparable purposes in this call of God to Abraham? (1) To prepare a people and a lineage which was distinctly set apart as the channel through which Abraham’s seed would bless all mankind (Gal. 3:16). (2) To establish the framework for declaring the power, greatness, mercy, sovereignty and oneness of God to the entire world as opposed to any form of idolatry.

In Genesis chapter 15:1, the Lord came unto Abram in a vision, saying, fear not, I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward. Then Abram said, (V2) Lord God, what wilt thou give me --. And in verse four, “the word of the Lord came unto him saying” --. And in verse six, “and he believed in the Lord.

Further, in chapter 17:1, “when Abram was ninety years old, and nine, the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said unto him, “I AM THE ALMIGHTY GOD” ---. Further on in chapter 17, verse seven and eight, God said to Abraham: “I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee”. “And I will be their God”.

In all of these appearances to Abraham, God has distinctly revealed himself unto him in the most exacting terms of sovereignty and oneness, with no statements or inference that “God” to Abraham was, in any manner, to be interpreted as a plurality of beings. With this fact of one God covenanting with Abraham, are we supposed to assume that “God” in these instances is to be understood as a numerical plurality in the same way that we would speak of a board of directors of a corporation? That might be so if you could twist distinct, unequivocal language to mean what you want it to mean.

There is one instance in Abraham’s life, found in Genesis chapter 18, that we should not overlook. Verse one says: “And the Lord appeared unto him in the plains of Mamre”. Then verse two says, “lo three men stood by him”. When Abraham ran to meet “them” (V3) he exclaimed, “my Lord”. With verse two identifying three men meeting Abram, and with verses one and three describing the Lord as being present, the question becomes: “Does this mean that the Lord here is distinctly described as being three”? The answer is absolutely not, as the further verses describing this meeting shall abundantly show. In verse two the scripture says that – “three men” stood by him”. Then verse 22 explicitly tells us that the (three) men went toward Sodom, but Abraham stood yet before the Lord (alone). Following this, in verses 23-33 Abraham petitions before the Lord for Lot and Sodom to be spared. All the while, the three men or angels have gone on into Sodom. Abraham was called by and dealt exclusively with one almighty God. In fact, as we have previously stated, one of the great purposes of God in his call of Abraham, was that he might establish the fact of “ONE GOD” in a world of idolatry and polytheism. Abraham understood clearly that his call and mission was ordained by “ONE ALMIGHTY GOD”, with no revelation anywhere of any component of plurality in the godhead. Abraham is that individual whom God endowed with a personal relationship with him and, while Abraham had a typical fore shadowing of the coming of Christ the savior, he had no inspiration of any plurality of God. Rather instead, his entire revelation from God about who God is, leaves no room for the inclusion of a plurality of persons.

We now turn to the life of Moses and the understanding he had of God in the Old Testament. We will begin in Exodus, chapter two, verses 23-25, when the children of Israel were under bondage and oppression in Egypt. They cried out and their cry came up unto “God”. And “God” heard their groaning, and “God” remembered his covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. And “God” looked upon the children of Israel and “God” had respect unto them. GOD! Who is he and what is he and is he one or is he plural?

Then in Exodus, chapter three, God appears to Moses in the burning bush. In verse six we read: “Moreover, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob”. “And the Lord said (V7), “I have surely seen the affliction of my people” ----. (V8) “I am come down to deliver them” ----.

Moses remonstrates with God over his impediment because of the task God had called him for. In 3:13, he is very concerned over the need of being assured as to who is sending him to deliver the children of Israel, and questions: “when I tell them the God of their fathers hath sent me, and they say unto me, what is his name”? “What shall I say unto them”? Moses is asking for a very specific identification as to exactly who “GOD” is. In V14-15, he receives a very specific answer, one that a plural theology has apparently prevented theologians from being able to see. Let us notice the answer God gave to Moses so that we might understand precisely what that answer is.

In verse 14, “And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, “I AM” hath sent me unto you. Sounds like a very strange name. But God is not through with his answer to the question Moses has about what is the name of he that has sent me to Israel to deliver them from bondage. He continues with his answer in verse 15. “And God said moreover unto Moses, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, THE LORD GOD OF YOUR FATHERS, THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, THE GOD OF ISAAC AND THE GOD OF JACOB, HATH SENT ME UNTO YOU: THIS IS MY NAME FOREVER, AND THIS IS MY MEMORIAL UNTO ALL GENERATIONS”. What name? What name is so precisely identified here, by God himself, as being his name unto all generations? Let’s analyze this text.

First, Moses is told by God, in verse 14, say unto the children of Israel, “I AM” hath sent me unto you. Later when Moses goes to his people and tells them that the God of their fathers has sent me to lead you out of Egyptian bondage, they are going to ask: “what is his name”? The response Moses is instructed to give them (translated from Hebrew) is “HAW-YAW” (I AM) is the one who sent me. Every Hebrew, including Moses, would understand this expression “HAW-YAW” to mean “to exist”. That is to say, the God that exists (continually) is the one who has sent me to deliver you.

It does not end there. (V15) God said moreover unto Moses, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, “THE LORD” – God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: “THIS IS MY NAME FOREVER – AND THIS IS MY MEMORIAL TO ALL GENERATIONS”. This is my name forever? What does this statement refer to? Notice above that I separated the word LORD from the word GOD. Though these two words obviously refer to the one and same being, yet it is a fact that the two words (LORD – AND – GOD) come from two totally different original words. That, in and of itself is not a problem, but understanding what original words these two are derived from makes a huge difference in properly understanding this text. “LORD” is the word here that contains this eternal name forever, unto all generations. Here’s why. It comes from the Hebrew word JEHOVAH (vowels added). JEHOVAH means: “self-existent, eternal God. It also is the same name as was used in “I AM” in verse 14. Combined together they mean the self-existent, eternal God: JEHOVAH. That is my name forever and my memorial unto all generations. When the translators of the KJB came to this word “Yaweh” or “Yehovah”, throughout the entire Old Testament, they translated it to the English word “Lord”. It is a mystery why modern theologians have, either willfully or unknowingly, completely passed over this fact especially when this name of God is used over 6000 times in the Old Testament. Perhaps “plurality” theologians do know this, but to acknowledge it would totally change their understanding of the godhead. This is the answer given to Moses and the instructions as to who he shall say it is that hath sent me to deliver Israel.

Now take a look at Ps. 83:18. “That men may know that THOU, WHOSE NAME ALONE IS JEHOVAH, art the most high over all the earth. In this verse the translators simply preserved the original Hebrew word. There are other versions which have retained the original word even more. The point is that Moses was told that LORD (as translated from Jehovah) is the Hebrew name for the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Later, in a section devoted exclusively to God’s name, this name, its translation and interpretation, will be a specific focus. For now we are safe to recognize “GOD” as Moses knew him as being one and his name one.

There is another significant representation of God to Moses that we shall include here. God gave to Moses the law at Mt. Sinai. In that law were the Ten Commandments. In those commandments there are emphatic statements that God makes of himself that are very applicable to this study. From Exodus chapter 20, note the following:

- V1. And God spake all these words, saying,
- V2. I am the LORD – thy GOD.
- V3. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. (I am sovereign God alone and my name is Jehovah)
- V4. Thou shalt not make any graven image (about me).
- V5. I the LORD – thy GOD am a jealous God.
- V7. Thou shalt not take the name of the LORD (JEHOVAH) thy God in vain.

Thus we see that the first three of the Ten Commandments are devoted to the exclusive sovereignty of God, and that Jehovah is his name and it should not be used in vain. The exclusive expressions God makes of himself in these commandments completely precludes and denies any degree of plurality within the godhead.

Next, in Deuteronomy, chapter 6, verses four and five, we have unmistakable and irrefutable evidence of the absolute oneness of the godhead. Det. 6:4. “Hear O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord. (Jehovah our God is one Jehovah). Det. 6:5. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.

Let me return to Det. 6:4. I have pointed out that the words “LORD” in this verse are translated from Jehovah. I should also point out that the word “GOD” is translated from the Hebrew word “elohiym”. This is very important because this word “elohiym” is also used in reference to heathen gods (many) and thus, depending upon its use, can refer to a plurality of gods. Dr. D. James Kennedy, in his treatise on the “trinity”, uses this as proof that there is, indeed, a plurality in the godhead. This simply will not stand up under scriptural scrutiny. Det. 6:4 denies this application by stating: “Jehovah our elohiym is ONE Jehovah.

The record of Moses’ understanding of God which we have considered and the direct, unequivocal statements we have referenced leave no room for any sense of plurality in the godhead. In addition, the emphatic statements that Jehovah is God’s name forever, and that there is one Jehovah, is overwhelming evidence that there is but one being in the godhead.

After the death of Moses, God chose Joshua to lead Israel across Jordan and into the land of promise. In Josh. 1:1-9, God appears to Joshua to reassure him that he would be with him to lead Israel into Canaan land. It is specifically stated in verse one that the LORD (JEHOVAH) spoke unto Joshua. In these nine verses the singular nouns "I" or "my" are applied to God numerous times. This is a fact that is repeated continuously throughout the entire Old Testament. Yet it always seems that when plural advocates read these numerically restrictive references of God, they are passed by. It can hardly be denied that the language God uses to refer to himself is overwhelmingly singular and in such a manner that any inference to a plurality in the godhead is completely precluded. Over and over, throughout the book of Joshua, the Lord speaks to him: that is "Jehovah" speaks to him. The God who declared unto Moses that he, "Jehovah", was the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, is the same God that speaks to Joshua.

Throughout the Old Testament, with every leader of God's people; every king and every prophet God speaks from an absolutely sovereign position; a position of being God alone. Also throughout the Old Testament God is called "Jehovah". God speaks of himself in absolute, exclusive terms, such as: "besides me there is not God". You cannot read the Old Testament and derive any sense of a plurality of God. There are two instances where theologians interpret a sense of plurality in the godhead. (1) In Gen. 1:26, where God said, "let us make man in our image, after our likeness. (2) When "God" is translated from the word "elohyim", it is interpreted to apply a plurality to God. Neither of these interpretations of God possessing a plurality of being will stand up to fair and thorough scrutiny of the entire body of Old Testament scriptures. Why is there an absence of any reference to the expressions of "God the Father", "God the Son" and "God the Holy Spirit" throughout the Old Testament; just "God"?

Perhaps no writer of Old Testament scriptures offers a more conclusive perspective of the oneness of the godhead than the prophet Isaiah. While all biblical writers confirm this oneness, some offer more direct statements than others. Isaiah is one that does. Consider the following examples.

In chapter one, verse 2, he states: for the Lord (Jehovah) hath spoken. Then in verse four he declares: "they have forsaken the Lord (Jehovah), they have provoked the HOLY ONE of Israel. In chapter six you have a dramatic scene wherein Isaiah saw the Lord (Jehovah) high and lifted up, sitting upon a throne. In chapter 7:14, we have the powerful prophecy of the birth of the Christ in these words: "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. We all know how wonderfully this was fulfilled in the words of Mt. 1:23: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is God with us. The inescapable conclusion from these two verses is that, (Jehovah) God was born into this world in the form of a man: God with us. Any other conclusion distorts the entire realm and scope of the prophecies of Christ. As if to reinforce his prophecy of this, Isaiah continues in chapter 9:6 with these words: "For unto us a child is born; unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called wonderful, counselor, "THE MIGHTY GOD, THE EVERLASTING FATHER, THE PRINCE OF PEACE. The promised child was not a second person of the godhead, if you will; he was the MIGHTY GOD AND THE EVERLASTING FATHER.

The entire 40th chapter of Isaiah is a great commentary on the coming of GOD, the Holy One, to be the savior of the world. Verse 9 says in part – Behold your God – in reference to the coming savior. Then verse 10 continues, “Behold, the Lord (Jehovah) God will come with strong hand,---. While verse 11 states that, “he shall feed his flock like a shepherd”. In verse 25 he repeats a frequent phrase: “To whom then will ye liken me, or shall “I” be equal? saith the HOLY ONE. In chapter 42:8, he declares: “I am the Lord (Jehovah); that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another----. Finally, from Isaiah 43:10-11, we have these powerful words: “Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am the Lord (Jehovah); and beside me there is no savior.

And there is more, much more, all of which bears irrefutable witness to the fact that there is not only one God, but also that God is one – numerically. All of this leads us into our next consideration of the godhead and the oneness thereof, and offers us the most conclusive evidence there is in the entire Bible that God is, indeed, ONE. It is a portion of the study of this subject which is almost entirely overlooked or ignored, but one that brings absolute clarity and finality to the proposition that God is ONE and not plural. For that conclusive evidence we will now consider ---

V. THE NAME OF GOD.

As we begin our consideration of the “NAME OF GOD”, I cannot over-emphasize the importance of this portion of our study of the godhead. This is especially true since most professing Christians do not know what God’s name is or whether or not it even matters. We frequently quote from one of the Ten Commandments which requires of us not to take the name of the Lord our God in vain. When God himself has clearly and repeatedly identified his name and has declared it to be his exclusively, by what authority can we ignore it or believe that it does not matter? The “Name” of God has been lost through the concept of plurality of the godhead. In addition, translators could have used a better word when they were translating the Old Testament term “Yawheh”. (I have no problem with the translation as it is; I just think that there was a better choice of a word into which to translate the one word that is used over 6000 times in the Old Testament. My opinion is confirmed by those translators which have retained the original word or a configuration of it in their work). Let us begin our search into the NAME OF GOD by considering:

A. THE DIFFERENCE IN A “TITLE” OF POSITION AND A “NAME” OF IDENTIFICATION.

This should be obvious, but unfortunately it does not seem to be so, especially where a plurality of the godhead is believed. In very simple terms, as an example, my name is: Tommy Blanton. That name specifically identifies me to all of my acquaintances. However I bear many “titles” which denote some particular position in my life, such as: father, son, husband, minister, etc. I have not been a father or husband for all of my life, but I have been Tommy Blanton all of my life. If I were standing in a crowd of 100 men and someone called for the “father” in the crowd to come forward, confusion in the crowd would reign since there could be many fathers present. But if they called for Tommy Blanton to come forward, specific identification would eliminate such possible confusion. (Of course there could be, and in fact is, more than one Tommy Blanton. But there isn’t more than one God).

If reference is made to a general of the army, the immediate question is, what general? “President”, Prime Minister”, “King”, “Governor” and the like, are significant titles with much authority represented. But unless you give the specific name for the particular one to whom you are referring who bears such title, you are talking in vague, generalized terms, and no one would understand precisely of whom you are speaking.

We don’t call our children “son”, or “daughter”, or “child”, or 1,2,3, etc. We call them by the names we have given them. And it is of sufficient importance that a certificate of birth is created bearing this name, and duly recorded with the appropriate public registry. While this certificate also bears other pertinent information, we don’t refer to our child as “the one born on 12-25-2000, with red hair and is a “female”. We refer to the name which we proudly identify her with and by which she is specifically known as and related to us as our child. In addition, while we may choose to couple “two names” to our child, followed by our family name, it only serves to more specifically identify the child as well as to identify a broader relationship with our family. That is what a name is for: specific identification.

We even give the family dog a name. We don't call it "hound", "bull dog", "Collie", etc. We give it a name and maybe even put a collar on the dog with this name so others will know it also.

We do not simply refer to Bethlehem long ago and say a baby was born to a virgin there. We read in the scriptures, they shall call his name "Jesus", and we know that there was a specific reason for calling that child by such name. That name was the highest name in heaven and earth; no name on earth has meant so much to mankind. There will be more on that name later.

How can we doubt or minimize the importance of a name and that its purpose is for specifically identifying the one who bears it. My name may not have any significance to it, but the mere mentioning of the name of "JESUS", and the whole world knows to whom it belongs. And the fact that others have since been named Jesus does not confuse the identification of the one and only JESUS, THE CHRIST. Moreover, the name of God throughout the entire Bible is above every name that has ever been named. How could anyone be against that thought and the eternal importance of the name of God? We declare that it is the single most significant and identifying possession of God in the Bible, even if religious philosophers and students do not know it or give it any importance. With all of the mystery and controversy about the godhead, the name of God is the one infallible and distinct attribute of God that can bring total clarity to who God is and whether or not his godhead is one or plural. Let us proceed to identify:

B. "THE NAME OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT".

By proposing the "name of God" as found in the Old Testament, we will seek to answer many questions. They will include: Does God have one, specific name, by which he is distinctly identified and known in the Bible (Old Testament first of all)? Does God have many names instead of only one? Does it even matter what his name is, if, in fact, he has one? Should any specific significance be put on the name of God? Should we hold his name reverend or hallowed? Can we know what his name is? (Some say that we cannot). What does God have to say about his name? Is his name some hidden word, concealed from us, found only in some few passages of scripture that the average person seldom consults? If God has a significant, meaningful, hallowed and holy name, that clearly identifies who and what God is regarding his person, power, sovereignty and his godhead, why are professing Christians not aware of what it is?

These are all valid questions which come into clear focus when we seek God, through the Bible, for their answers. As we have already illustrated, there is a difference in a name and a title of position. This fact is abundantly true with the name of God. God fills many positions but, as we shall seek to demonstrate, only one name. Some of the titles of God are: God, sovereign, Lord, master, king, creator, ruler, judge, almighty, Father, Holy One, Holy Spirit, Most high, shepherd, Savior, son, deliverer and more.

The Bible teaches us that "God is a Spirit", invisible and cannot and has not been seen. Yet the Bible speaks of God's hands, feet, eyes, ears, heart, mouth, mind, etc. It also refers to God's wings, feathers, as a rock, a shield, a fortress, a buckler and a tower. All of these terms refer to certain positions or attributes of God, but they are not his specific identifying name.

One other attribute of God that impacts who he is has to do with “where” he is. In this regard we speak of God as “omnipresent”, meaning that he is present everywhere. So often the mental conception of “God” is that he is confined to one geographic location, such as that of an older man sitting upon a throne. While God surely is the sovereign ruler of the universe, yet it is totally carnal to confine him to a throne like some earthly king sits upon. God cannot be confined to time or space; that is for humanity.

Psalm 139:7-10 draws upon an analogy of extremes to illustrate God’s all-abiding presence. “Whither shall I go from thy Spirit” or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. The notion that God is physically seated on a literal throne, with “God the Son” seated beside him, while the Holy Spirit is “down” here on earth, is purely carnal reasoning, with no scriptural basis for such description or confinement.

Isaiah 66:1: “Thus saith the Lord, the heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool. Shall we conceive of God seated in a chair in the sky, with his feet resting upon the earth, or shall we see in this verse a description of the greatness of God, using these extreme terms to illustrate that greatness?

Jeremiah 23:24, says in part, “Do not I fill heaven and earth”? You cannot restrict the location of God with carnal terms. We speak of God as being in the church, in our heart and in our lives. But this in no way means that the “substance” of God is somehow squeezed into our hearts and lives. It means instead that our lives are under the all-pervasive divine influence of the power of God’s Spirit. These thoughts tell us that we cannot define God in the narrow and limited confines of being physically seated on a throne in some geographic, heavenly location. To believe such raises the old question of which side of the earth is “up”; the one we live on in America or the side which the Australians live on? And yet, this is the conception so many have of God. O how we need to know what his name is and what it represents to us.

We have previously noted that the name of God appears over 6000 times in the Old Testament. We have selected representative verses to emphasize the importance of God’s name, its uses and, most of all, exactly what it is. They are as follows.

Ex. 3:13-15. Moses very specifically asked God who he could tell the children of Israel had sent him to deliver them from Egyptian bondage. In answering Moses’ question, God said, tell them “I AM” hath sent you to deliver them. Then he explains further to Moses, “I am the Lord God of your fathers; this is my name forever and this is my memorial unto all generations. So then, the express name of God mattered very much to Moses and his task of leading Israel. Above, when he said “I am the Lord God of your fathers and this is my name forever, it is necessary to identify just what these two words “Lord and God” originated from and what they mean. The word Lord used here is translated from the Hebrew “Yehovah”. The word God used here is translated from the Hebrew “elohyim”. This word is used for heathen gods, magistrates and any ruling authority. It is also used for “GOD”. This word carries the option of a plural application. The context in which it is used will determine that. For example when it is used in reference to the eternal God, it will be applied as one God and certainly never as plural. This verse would read thus: The LORD, GOD OF YOUR FATHERS, THE GOD OF

ABRAHAM, THE GOD OF ISAAC AND THE GOD OF JACOB, hath sent me unto you. Jehovah, elohyim of your fathers, the elohyim of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, sent Moses to deliver Israel. The word Jehovah, by reason of its numerous references to being one Jehovah, controls the expression “elohyim” to a singular use instead of a plural use as would be the case for a heathen god. As if it would be possible for the eternal God to be plural in any sense anyway.

Det. 28:58, describes God’s name as “glorious and fearful”. “If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, the Lord thy God. This expression “the Lord thy God is clarified if we read it: “The Lord, thy God. That is, the Lord, is thy God. Thus you have absolute harmony with what God has already told Moses, as we saw in Ex. 3:13-15. This scripture in Det. 28:58, distinctly reads for us as: “Jehovah our elohyim”. Jehovah, then, is defined as the glorious and fearful name of God.

When Moses was given the 10 commandments, God included one of them about his name. Ex.20:7 says: “Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord – thy God in vain -----. This verse bears out the same thought as the previous verses, namely that the Lord (Jehovah) is the name of God.

In Gen. 12:8, we read in part: “and there he builded an altar unto the Lord, and called upon the name of the Lord. Abraham built an altar unto Jehovah and called upon the name of Jehovah. When Abraham was called of God, it had a two-fold purpose. (1) To be the channel through which God would bring redemption to the world, and, (2) to establish the fact of one God in a world that worshipped plural gods. So often the expression is used: “the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. God thus mentioned was Jehovah and that was his self-existent, eternal name.

Ps. 148:13 emphasizes the name of Jehovah, when it says: “Let them praise the name of the Lord (Jehovah): for his name alone is excellent; his glory is above the earth and heaven. Combine this with Ps.83:18, and the emphasis on God’s name could not be elevated higher. “That men may know that thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth”. This is one of the few times that the KJVB preserved the name Jehovah in the text without translating to the English word Lord.

Ps. 44:20-21, God warns of our forgetting his name: “If we have forgotten the name of our God, or stretched out our hands to a strange God; shall not God search this out” for he knoweth the secrets of the heart”. What does this verse say to us about the almost universal lack of knowledge, adoration and excellence of the name of God?

Ps. 90:1-2. Lord (Jehovah) thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God. This is a most emphatic statement that Jehovah who created all things is the everlasting God.

Det. 6:4. Hear O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Jehovah

Det. 6:5. And thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy might.

Ex. 20:2. I am Jehovah thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt.....

Num. 2:34. And the children of Israel did all that Jehovah commanded Moses

Num. 15:41. I am Jehovah your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt, to be your God.....

Det. 6:15, 16, 17, 24. For Jehovah thy God is a jealous God among you lest the anger of Jehovah thy God be kindled against thee Ye shall not tempt Jehovah your God..... Ye shall diligently keep the commandments of Jehovah your God and his testimonies..... And Jehovah commanded us to do all these statutes, to fear Jehovah our God

Det. 7:6,9. For thou art an holy people unto Jehovah thy God: Jehovah thy God hath chosen thee, to have a special people unto himself Know therefore that Jehovah thy God, he is God, the faithful God

Jos. 2:11.For Jehovah your God, he is God in heaven above, and in earth beneath.

Jos. 4:24. That all the people of the earth might know the hand of Jehovah, that it is mighty: that ye might fear Jehovah your God forever.

Jos. 24:24. And the people said unto Joshua, Jehovah our God will we serve, and his voice will we obey.

I Kgs. 17:12,14, 20. And she said, as Jehovah thy God liveth, I have not a cake, but an handful of meal in a barrel..... For thus saith Jehovah God of Israel..... And he cried unto Jehovah, and said, O Jehovah my God, hast thou also brought evil upon the widow with whom I sojourn.....

II Chron. 34:23. And she answered them, thus saith Jehovah God of Israel.....

Ps. 23:1. Jehovah is my shepherd, I shall not want.....

Ps. 27:1. Jehovah is my light and my salvation: whom shall I fear? Jehovah is the strength of my life, of whom shall I be afraid?

Ps. 100:1,2,3. Make a joyful noise unto Jehovah, all ye lands..... Serve Jehovah with gladness, come before his presence with singing..... Know ye that Jehovah, he is God, it is he that hath made us and not we ourselves; we are his people and sheep of his pasture.

Is. 40:10, 28. Behold, Jehovah God will come with strong hand..... Hast thou not known? Hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, Jehovah, the creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? There is no searching of his understanding.

Rather than reproduce many more entire verses here wherein the word LORD is translated from the Hebrew word JEHOVAH, I will simply provide scripture locations for several more, thus allowing the reader to pursue if desired. These are randomly selected.

EXODUS: 6:2,6,7,8,29; 8:10,26,27; 10:2,3,7,8; 15:3,11,17;

LEVETICUS: 18:2,4,5,6,21,30; 19:10,12,14,16,18,25,31,34;

DEUTERONOMY: 6:4,5,10,12,13,15,16,17,21; 10:17;

II SAMUEL: 7:22,26,27,28;

I KINGS: 5:5; 6:1; 8:4,11,17,20

II CHRONICLES: 33: 11,12,13,15,16,17,18.

PSALMS: 23:1; 30:2; 71:5; 99:5; 150:1,6.

ISAIAH: 7:14; 12:2; 25:1; 40:3,10,28;42:8; 43:3,11,15.

Of course there are many more such references of the word LORD being translated from the Hebrew JEHOVAH, which is the Hebrew national name for their God under Old Testament times. These should suffice for the diligent student.

I am amazed and dismayed at the fact that most professing Christians do not know or never think of the idea that God even has a name. If you ask them what his name is, you get answers such as, God, Lord, king, master, savior and other such titles (not names). If you press the question they will brush it off with the idea that it does not really matter what his name is. If that does not work they will tell you that it is so holy and sacred that it is a hidden name. Or, like one preacher one time, trying to avoid the reality of God's name and how it defines who and what he is, said that the word used for his name was a "tetracramaton". It sure sounds awesome, but it isn't. It simply means "a four letter word". The reason it can be applied to the Hebrew word for God's name, JEHOVAH, is that in its original form there are no vowels and in order to pronounce it in the English language, vowels must be added. It doesn't change anything and it sure does not suggest that the name of God cannot or should not be known and pronounced. Think of it like this: we pronounce the name JESUS readily and often and there is no greater or higher name in heaven or earth.

So that we can clearly see that the NAME of God in the Old Testament was known throughout the nation of Israel and that it was frequently invoked, we are going to provide some scripture references which show just that. We will only print parts of the verses in the interest of brevity.

Gen. 4:26. ---- then began men to call upon the name of the Lord (Jehovah).

Gen. 21:33. And Abraham planted a grove in Beer—sheba, and called there on the name of the Lord, the everlasting God.

Gen. 6:3. ---- but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them.

Gen. 33:19. ---- I will proclaim the name of the Lord (Jehovah) before thee:

Ex. 20:7. ---- Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord (Jehovah) thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.

Deut. 16:11. ---- in the place which the Lord thy God hath chosen to place his name there.

Deut. 28:58. ---- If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, "THE LORD THY GOD". (Jehovah, thy God).

1 Kgs. 5:5. ---- And, behold, I purpose to build an house unto the name of the Lord my God.

Ps. 22:22. ---- I will declare thy name unto my brethren: in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee.

Ps. 29:2. ---- Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name; worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness.

Ps. 44:20. ---- If we have forgotten the name of our God, or stretched out our hands to a strange god.

Ps. 111:9. ---- holy and reverend is his name.

Ps. 148:13. ---- Let them praise the name of the Lord (Jehovah): for his name alone is excellent.

Is. 42:8. ---- I am the Lord: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images.

Joel 2:32. ---- And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord (Jehovah) shall be delivered. (See also Acts 2:21 for a quote on this verse).

Zech. 14:9. ---- And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord (Jehovah), and his name one.

There are many more but these are sufficient to show very clearly and completely that God's name is important for his people; that it can and should be known and called upon, and that there is no other name upon which men can call for deliverance.

C. VARIOUS HEBREW WORDS FOR "GOD" or "god", TRANSLATED INTO THE ENGLISH WORD "LORD"

After having considered many scriptures which clearly identify God's name in the O.T. as JEHOVAH, and also how glorious, excellent, hallowed and singular that name is, let us expand on this search into the name of God by considering other words which are used to refer to him. We have already noted that many titles are used to describe God and his position in the universe. We have more particularly noted that the "name" of God is one thing and a "title" of position is something else. To further define this we are going to identify other words used in reference to God and how they relate to our analysis of this subject. (All references are from the KJBV)

- **LORD.** *When capitalized it is translated from Jehovah. This is unequivocally known as the name of God. It is never used for any god but the eternal Lord.*
- **Lord.** *As translated from “awdone” is used for any sovereign, ruler, master or lord.*
- **Lord.** *As translated from “adonay”. This is an emphatic form of “awdone”, and is used only when referencing the God of eternity.*
- **LORD.** *Translated from JEHOVIH. This is found predominantly in Ezekiel, during the Babylonian captivity and the specific spelling is undoubtedly affected by the language used there.*
- **God.** *Translated from elohiyim. gods in any form and also used for Jehovah God. It is a plural form of gods except when used in reference to **the** God, in which case the context will always limit its use to a singular form.*
- **God.** *Translated from “ale”. It means “mighty”. It is used of any god and of the mighty God.*
- **God.** *Translated from “elowahh”. The deity, God, or god.*

From these examples it is evident that the word “God” or god, comes from several different words. Likewise, the word “Lord” or lord also comes from several different words. There are lords many and gods many, but there is but one LORD, GOD. It almost seems superfluous to state that there is but one GOD. The Bible is so emphatic on this fact. Even in our own language we use more than one word to refer to God, or Lord, etc. But we do not use many words to refer to his name. So far, in the Old Testament, the only word which is used as the name of God is JEHOVAH. We have not yet described the name of God from the New Testament. That will be very interesting when we get to that.

Regardless as to what your concept of the godhead is, it must be acknowledged that the name “JEHOVAH” is applicable only to the supreme God. We have used a very large number of verses sufficient to prove that point. In addition, there are thousands of verses in the Old Testament using the name “Jehovah”, all of them exclusively applicable to the supreme God. And as Zech. 14:9, tells us, there is only one Jehovah, and his name one, thus preventing the name from being used as a blanket name for a plurality of divine entities. We confidently conclude from all of this that “JEHOVAH” is the one and only specific name of the supreme God throughout all of the Old Testament. God has many titles or attributes of position or characteristics, but only one name. That name is “JEHOVAH”.

Someone is going to try to describe this conclusion that the name of God in the Old Testament as Jehovah, is simply the theology of the “Jehovah’s Witness” organization. Nothing could be further from the truth. The theology of the Jehovah’s Witnesses, while it does ascribe to Jehovah the sole position of God, yet they define Jesus as a subordinate character with no element of deity in him. That is not the conclusion we will reach when we get to the N.T.

Another objection that is made about Jehovah as the singular name of God in the O.T., is that the name of God was unpronounceable. First it is argued that the name of God was so sacred that it was tantamount to sacrilege to say or pronounce it. If this was true, no one ever told the inspired writers of the O.T., who, as we have indicated, used this name over 6000 times. It was sacred to be sure, but it was also always on their lips and in their sacred writings and commands. This argument of the name of God being un-pronounceable, comes also with the contention that the word Jehovah is a “tetracramaton”, and therefore cannot be pronounced. Those who use this “smoke screen” to side step

the truth apparently do not realize what this difficult sounding word means. Tetracramation simply means a “4 letter word”. The word Jehovah, as any student should know, comes to us from the Hebrew without vowels. Thus we are given JHVH, without vowels, and translating this into English requires of us to provide the necessary vowels. Thus, JHVH becomes Jehovah. Ps. 83:18, is a distinct example of this.

Even though we have already given an explanation for the use of the word “elohiym” in reference to the one supreme God, because of the improper application of this word in the study of the godhead, I am going to explore it further.

Many times in the O.T. the word elohiym has been translated as “God”. In the O.T., in a majority of times when you find the word God (capital G), eloheem is the root Hebrew word. Some examples of this are: (For ease of checking I have selected examples from one chapter in Exodus. Ex. 3:1,4,6,11,12,13,14,15,16,and 18.

This word eloheem or elohiym means god, magistrate, judge, etc., and is applicable to both the supreme God and also heathen, idol gods. The argument is put forth that “eloheem is a plural word and as such is proof of a plurality in the godhead. No less of an authority than Dr. D. James Kennedy, in his book: “Understanding the Trinity”, on page 7, writes the following. *“In Hebrew the word for “God” is elohiym. If you are a little rusty on your Hebrew, let me tell you the word happens to be plural. It could literally be translated in the beginning Gods created the heaven and the earth. But we know that it is plural because it contains within it the personalities of Father, Son and Holy Spirit”.* (Note: By what authority or definition can it be emphatically stated that “it contains within it the personalities of Father, Son and Holy Ghost”? This is pure presumption on Dr. Kennedy’s part).

It is correct that the word elohiym does have a plural usage to it. But it is incorrect to refer to a plurality of “personalities” in the godhead because of the use of this word. Every Bible use of the word for GOD is a singular use when applied to the supreme God. But when it is used in the Bible in a plural sense, it is translated “gods”, in reference to idol gods. Beyond this, the absolute statements and the associated context when used as “GOD”, demand a singular application. For example, Det. 6:4, reads: “Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God (elohiym) is one Lord”. Further, when you apply the original to the word Lord, this verse reads: Hear, O Israel: JEHOVAH our GOD is one JEHOVAH.

It doesn’t end there. Dr. Kennedy surely understood when he wrote his book that many words not only have the same spelling, but also the same pronunciation for both a singular and a plural usage, and only the applicable context can determine which it is. Let’s test this fact. If you had only one sheep, the correct spelling would be: s h e e p. If you had 100 sheep, the spelling and pronunciation are the same. When you see the word sheep, you don’t know if it is 1 or 100, without the associated contextual information. For example, “this sheep” is the singular application, while “these sheep” is the plural. But sheep remains the same in either case. And so it is with elohiym and its application to either “GOD” or gods. Fortunately, and correctly, the KJV translators reverently used a capitalized God when reference is made to the supreme God and therefore you know immediately to whom it applies. Otherwise it would require us to discern the manner of use and its context to know how to apply it.

Since it is true, therefore, that elohiym can be used to denote plural gods and also the singular, one God, you certainly cannot make a blanket statement that wherever it is used that it always has a plural application. When I read the countless uses of God and gods in the O.T., translated from elohiym, I don't know about Dr. Kennedy, but I want to know the scriptural context, application and boundaries in which it is used. Just because you see the word elohiym does not automatically apply a plural meaning any more than the word "sheep" does. Trinitarian theologians surely understand this but it doesn't fit the theology of a "3 person God" and therefore it isn't recognized. However, the truth remains that words which can have either a plural or singular application must be discerned from their supporting text or context.

Referring to Gen. 1:1, where the Bible says: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth", Dr. Kennedy states on page 7 of his book that, "it could literally be translated "in the beginning Gods created the heaven and the earth". (I have not misquoted him here). He is asserting that "elohiym" necessitates a plural application, under the presumption, as he says, that elohiym is plural (and never singular). Our word "God", used over 3000 times in the O.T., translated from elohiym, requires of us to ask why the translators ever used the word "gods", if the inherent application of this word is only and always plural. We will reiterate once again, that the word elohiym or eloheem, includes the application to either singular or plural, and the text and or context determines which. And, finally, its application to the one supreme God is always, without a single exception, a singular use.

There is one other area that deserves emphasis in this section on "THE NAME OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT", and that His name is JEHOVAH, and only Jehovah. We have already made reference to verses which declare that "JEHOVAH" is one and that it is the singular name of God as used in the O.T., found there more than 6000 times. In addition, also, there are many verses which use the emphatic expression such as: "The Lord our God", or "The Lord my God", and other similar expressions. What these verses are declaring in an absolute manner is: "JEHOVAH IS MY GOD". Since Jehovah, by everyone's interpretation, is singular and applicable to GOD only, then these expressions of "Jehovah my God" are an unequivocal, numerical restriction upon God and the godhead to JEHOVAH alone. Otherwise language and expressions used repeatedly in the Old Testament would have no meaning and, in fact, would be in complete error.

These expressions are found throughout the Old Testament countless times. In order to give you a good understanding of this, we have chosen examples only from the books of Deuteronomy, Psalms and Isaiah, rather than have you read throughout the entire O.T. In these three books alone the expression of "the Lord my God", or like expression, is found over 300 times. We are only saying by this that the expression is used so frequently that it cannot be overlooked or without consequence or value. When one of the inspired writers states that "JEHOVAH IS MY GOD", etc., it is an emphatic declaration that he (Jehovah) is not just God but he is the ONLY God for then and all eternity. Following are several such examples of this expression.

Deut. 6:1. "Which the Lord (Jehovah) thy God commanded"

Deut. 6:2. "thou mightest fear the Lord (Jehovah) thy God"

Deut. 6:5. "thou shalt love the Lord (Jehovah) thy God"

Deut. 6:16. "thou shalt not tempt the Lord (Jehovah) thy God"

Deut. 6:25. "commandments before the Lord (Jehovah) our God"

Ps. 7:3. "O Lord (Jehovah) my God, if I have done this"

Ps. 18:28. "the Lord (Jehovah) my God will enlighten"

Ps. 100:3. "know ye that the Lord,(Jehovah) he is God"

Is. 36:7. "we trust in the Lord (Jehovah) our God"

Is. 40:28. "that the Lord, (Jehovah) the everlasting God"

Is. 43:3. "for I am the Lord (Jehovah) thy God"

Is. 60:9. "unto the name of the Lord (Jehovah) thy God"

One final reference from I Sam. 17:45-46; the story of David and Goliath. "Then said David to the Philistine, thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield, but I come to thee in the NAME OF THE LORD (JEHOVAH) of hosts, the GOD of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied. This day will the LORD (JEHOVAH) deliver thee into mine hand:

There are many others but these show us the use of the expression of "the LORD THY GOD" or the Lord our God, etc. In every example including those we did not list, the expression is saying: JEHOVAH IS MY GOD". And, again, since there is only one Jehovah, "GOD" is thereby limited to ONE.

We have discussed at some length the name of God as it is found in the Old Testament. We have found the name of God to be use over 6000 times, which by virtue of the magnitude of the numbers, ascribes an enormous level of importance to it. We have shown that name to be "JEHOVAH", translated from the Hebrew Yehovah. This name means "the self-existent God". It is the Hebrew national name for God. This name is emphatically declared to be the only name for God: hallowed, reverend, not to be forgotten, not to be profaned, and is the singular most identifying possession of the "high and lofty God who alone inhabiteth eternity" (Is. 57:15). Altars are built to invoke this name; a temple was built as the sole residency of this name; we are charged to never forget it and it is associated with everything God is and does. The translators of the KJV Bible used our English word Lord as the embodiment and translation of the Hebrew Jehovah. No doubt some confusion could have been avoided if they had simply used the English form of Jehovah. At the time of the KJV translation the predominant control over all Christendom was under the Church of Rome and perhaps the split from it by the Church of England. For centuries the control of the theology of the godhead had been by the Roman Church, which all history attests to. It follows then, when the KJV translation was made, that the mind set of everyone related to this work was under the influence of the Trinitarian view. Thus, the name Jehovah did not have the significance to a plural minded theology that it does to those who have searched out its

true meaning and application and found it to be a powerful and unequivocal testimony of the absolute oneness of the godhead.

I would like to point out that other translations since the KJV have retained the word Jehovah in every instance where the KJV has used the English word "LORD" as a translation from Jehovah or YHWH. An example of this is the "AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION". This is a translation that was published in 1901. It is a highly acclaimed version for its accuracy and was translated based upon other versions and early copies just as widely accepted as those upon which the KJV was based, or even more so. In addition many of the subsequent translations which are in use today were based, in part, upon the American Standard Version. In other words, the ASV is not some lightly regarded translation but is very highly recognized as being as accurate (or more so) as the KJV.

I have noted all of this to make only one point. The American Standard Version, retained, in every instance in the O.T. the word JEHOVAH when translated from YHWH (over 6000 times). This is a very compelling fact both regarding the name Jehovah and also that it is thus recognized as the name of God in the O.T. It is a fact that proponents of a plural godhead must recognize and deal with.

I would encourage and challenge my readers to thoroughly check the ASV rendering of the name Jehovah and determine yourself how this impacts the entire interpretation of the godhead.

We have also discussed at some length other words associated with or designated as pronouncements of God. We have distinguished between terms applicable to the one supreme God as opposed to heathen, idol gods. We have also given scripture references representing the intended use of such words or terms. We made a point of the distinction between a "name" and a title, and the proper application of each. We have elaborated on the singular nature, being and name of God. Next we will consider

D. THE NAME OF GOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

When you open the Bible to the very first book of the New Testament, and the very first chapter of that book, you are at once confronted with an astounding miracle that is either the most profound act of God of all history, or a colossal fabrication, hatched in the mind of a warped heathen philosophy. Obviously, we believe that it is a profound act of God! We are told that a virgin (who has never known marital intimacy of pro-creating relations with any man), is expecting a child. The Father of that child, we are told, is the Holy Ghost. With no human, biological seed through any form or process implanted in her womb, she is expecting a child, the Father of which is the Holy Ghost. Moreover, we are authoritatively informed that this child which is to be miraculously produced (born), by the process of insemination of the seed of creation by the Holy Ghost, shall be called IMMANUEL. Immanuel, we are informed, means this child will be God with us. To further corroborate and authenticate this event, it is announced that it is simply a fulfillment of what the prophet foretold over 700 years before. That is, that a virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name "Immanuel", which being interpreted is, God with us. If you search through Old Testament scriptures to verify if one of the prophets really did foretell this, you come upon Is. 7:14 which confirms what Isaiah said. If this fact, that a virgin would conceive a child by the over shadowing of the Holy Ghost, and that child would

be “God with us”, is not profound enough to set the whole world off in eternal praises to God, then the next announcement should stop the earth in its orbit and the universe bow in holy adoration before him who created it in the beginning. That next announcement is this: “thou shalt call his name “JESUS” for he will save his people from their sins. “And he knew her not till she had brought forth her first born child: and he called his name “JESUS”.

Just a nice Hebrew name Mary and Joseph selected for their child, right? Not hardly! This is a name that is above every name in heaven or earth. Absolutely! A name which stands alone in the universe, among men, whereby they might be saved? There is no other! A name before which every knee shall bow and unto which every dimension of power of any source shall ultimately surrender? His dominion is from everlasting to everlasting. To solidify, affirm and indelibly impress the farthest reaches of all mankind with the magnificence and magnitude of this name, the entire New Testament is practically consumed with page after page of setting this name forward above any other name ever to cross human lips. The history of the world was altered by this name; the calendar took its cue from it and started anew; this name has more followers and devotees than any other, in fact no other name is even remotely close to it; more songs have been sung to it, books written about it, sermons preached under its banner, and more prayers and praises lifted to its honor than any name ever declared among men, either Old or New Testament.

So just where did this name come from? Is it a name that God in his divine wisdom selected for this child of virgin birth and therein is its significance? Is it a name that only grew to its omnipotent status by virtue of the great things done by its authority; or did its authority, status and great works, all derive from the very essence of this name? Is it a name which upon its initial announcement to Joseph, was at that time first formed to identify this child and thereafter its fame and reputation evolved, or was it a name which has possessed the same grandeur since before the world began?

There are those who say that the “name” is not significant within its own right, but that the significance comes from the authority and power it bears. What they seem to be trying to say is, forgetting the name altogether, it is the power and authority that should be elevated and adored. This is a notion that has no scriptural basis and should be dismissed outright as some subtle agenda that has some theological reason to try and prevent the name of Jesus from being extolled. It is the “NAME” that is significant, now and always, and not some other related attribute of it.

Let us stop for a moment and think and observe where this extraordinary emphasis and exaltation of the name of Jesus, well deserved as it is, brings us to. We have just come through the Old Testament with its emphatic and exclusive and total superiority and sovereignty of the name of God as represented throughout all of its writings. We noted over and over again that the name Jehovah, found over 6000 times in the Old Testament, with every imaginable accolade, authority and grandeur ascribed to it, was the exclusive name of God and that no other name in the entire universe compared to it. As Jehovah declared in Is. 42:8: “I am Jehovah; that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another neither my praise to graven images.

Now, as the New Testament opens up, we are immediately brought face to face with the name of Jesus and his total sovereignty and exclusiveness of every divine right and possession; while that same sovereignty and exclusiveness along with every divine right and possession is ascribed to and claimed by Jehovah of the Old Testament. This raises questions that literally demand reconciliation or we are left with 2 sovereign deities, claiming every divine prerogative, each exclusive to themselves. That would be catastrophic to the entire theology of the godhead, no matter what view you believe.

That is why we believe and teach, emphatically, that JEHOVAH of the Old Testament is JESUS of the New Testament; one and the same individual God, possessing every divine prerogative, exclusive of any other. And that is what we shall now set forth as the only possible answer to the very idea that there is a supreme God. That is, that he must be one in the totality of his being or nothing can be reconciled regarding who and what he is. That is the only way there can be ONE GOD in any sense of the expression, and that one God, Jehovah of the Old Testament, voluntarily became a man to become the sacrifice for the sins of the world and his name in the New Testament was Jesus. He was both God and man, savior and redeemer to all who believe on HIM. This one fact, JEHOVAH OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IS JESUS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, is the only possible scriptural way to reconcile the claims of all scripture and their infallible truths to his honor and glory.

It should strike the concerned student of this vital subject with a serious question as to why “JEHOVAH” is found in the O.T. over 6000 times, with every conceivable element of sovereignty, glory and power ascribed to he who bears this glorious name, and yet, it is not found one single time in the entire N.T. That is, unless you recognize and accept it in the name “JESUS”. Conversely, that name, “JESUS”, the only name in heaven or earth among men whereby we can be saved, the highest name there is in all creation – which is found over 1200 times in the N.T., but is not found one single time in the O.T., unless you see its root and its origin in “JEHOVAH”.

You cannot use the different languages of the two testaments to attempt to explain this enigma. It is not sufficient to say simply that one was of the O.T. and one was of the N.T. The questions this raises are legion. Neither can you try to explain this problem away by piously asserting that the “Father”, Jehovah, focused all attention on the “Son”, “Jesus”, so as to magnify his office. There is only one scriptural explanation as to why God’s name “Jehovah” is confined to the O.T., while his name “Jesus” is confined to the N.T. That explanation is: “JEHOVAH OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IS JESUS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, AS ONE AND THE SAME GOD AND THAT THE WORDS OR NAMES “JEHOVAH” AND “JESUS” ARE ONE AND THE SAME. JEHOVAH, GOD OF THE O.T., BECAME JEHOVAH – SAVIOR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AND “JEHOVAH-SAVIOR” IS PRONOUNCED “JESUS” IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

And this is precisely the truth. Jesus is a compound name made up of two Hebrew words: JEHOVAH – YASHA. Yasha is the Hebrew word for savior. Thus, when it was declared: “Thou shalt call his name Jesus for he will save his people from their sins”, Mt. 1:21, the Hebrew declaration of that term by the angel to Joseph was specifically announcing that “JEHOVAH” is your “SAVIOR”. Further, to be sure there was no misunderstanding, it was also announced (Mt. 1:23) that this child would be “IMMANUEL”, which, being interpreted is “GOD WITH US”. Thus Jehovah, the sovereign God of the universe, has become a man, while still remaining God, so that HE could be our savior.

After having looked into the O.T., with its overwhelming emphasis on the name “JEHOVAH” and all of the sovereignty, authority, exclusiveness and honor due to that name, how can we, theologically or morally, just drop it entirely as we open the N.T.? As the N.T. opens, another name “JESUS” takes over the entire stage of total sovereignty, honor, salvation, power and authority and “JEHOVAH” of the O.T. is dropped entirely from sacred scriptures. Well, the fact is, that it is not dropped or forgotten at all, except in the traditions and theology people allow to rule their hearts. Instead, it is continued, undiminished in the wonderful name of JESUS. We shall find that the name “JESUS” and “JEHOVAH” is one and the same, belonging to one and the same eternal God. Scripture never, ever asserts or suggests that there is a plurality of beings or names in the godhead. As Zech. 14:9 says: “In that day shall there be one Lord and his name one”. And as Acts 4:12 says of the name Jesus: “there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved. Thus the compelling responsibility is that we must reconcile and acknowledge that JEHOVAH is JESUS, totally and exclusively, or we have gross misinformation in the scriptures, both O.T. and N.T., as it relates to this wonderful name.

Maybe it would be of value to take another brief look at the name (JEHOVAH – JESUS) in order to confirm why it is such a high, exclusive, honorable and singularly-sovereign name. When God emphatically declared to Moses (Ex. 3:14-15) what his name was, he said that it was “I AM”. Continuing in verse 15 God said that (LORD = JEHOVAH) is my name forever and my memorial unto all generations. This name means “to exist”, that is, to continually exist, self-existent. God’s name in both O.T. and N.T., comes from his eternally self-existent capacity. It is his name exclusively because no other god or gods of all time can claim to be self-existent – eternally alive – in the entire universe. Thus the only self-existent, eternal God claims this “I AM” capacity in both the O.T. and N.T. and he has said my glory I will not give to another. This is simply because no other god possesses eternal self-existence. How revealing it is then, when Jesus says (Jn. 8:58) “before Abraham was “I AM”. Every sovereign claim of Jehovah in the O.T. language is also claimed by Jesus in N.T. language. The absolute singularity of this sovereign name is everywhere confirmed in both O.T. and N.T., leaving no room for doubt that JESUS IS JEHOVAH.

For just a moment, put aside every theological argument of every view of the godhead, with the questions and problems posed by them, and focus only on the profound truth of one God as the creator and sovereign of the world. Contemplate, if you will, for this one moment and one thought, that, in the beginning only one being or divine entity was God in all of sovereignty, power and glory; invisible, eternal and filled with every attribute of love, mercy, holiness and goodness. Then, consider the loss, sorrow, and disappointment he must have felt at the fall of his creation. Watch as he sets in motion countless events and fore-shadows of his desire to redeem his fallen creation. Listen carefully as he declares through his prophets his sovereignty as the only self-existent God of the universe. Then try to fathom the repeated declarations to his people: “I WILL COME AND SAVE YOU”, while also declaring: “I AM JEHOVAH, THAT IS MY NAME AND MY GLORY WILL I NOT GIVE TO ANOTHER”.

With this stage set firmly in the heavens and the earth, and while mankind waits for this God of the ages to come and save them, the angel of the Lord appeared to Mary and then Joseph with the message: you will bear a child which will be the Son of the Highest. He will be called, Immanuel, which being

interpreted, is God with us. Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save HIS people from their sins. Jehovah-Savior, will save his people from their sins.

Is. 25: 9. And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord (Jehovah); we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation.

Here is the point for which I asked you to put all arguments aside and consider. God, the sovereign ruler of the universe, who alone inhabiteth eternity (Is. 57:15), has taken upon himself Adam's clay, and has become man so that he might reconcile us unto himself. The magnitude of the thought that the one and only sovereign, divine being who himself condescended to the earth to live among us and ultimately sacrifice his "humanity" for our sins, because he loves us, is too great for us to fathom. Nevertheless, that is our God; that is the godhead; that is the full scope and marvelous portrayal of God. He was alone in the creation and he alone clothed himself in Adam's clay, as the only possible plan with the remotest chance of redeeming sinful man from the grave. This poses for us a powerful and conclusive question regarding God and the godhead: "Which exalts God to the highest honor and glory"? (1) That he, as God alone, came to the earth himself to save us; or, (2) that "one deity of a trinity sent another deity of such trinity to save us"? It is utterly incongruous to suppose that anything other than God alone came himself in human form to save us. And that, we are sure, is the profound testimony of all scripture. Jehovah, God of the O.T., is Jesus (Jehovah-yasha), the God and savior of the N.T. In that day, Zechariah said, there would be one king and his name one.

JESUS IS GOD! That is exactly what we are proposing and unequivocally declaring. Why should that be strange? It is also what the proponents of the Trinitarian view of the godhead vehemently declare. The Trinitarian view is that "God the Son" came to earth and gave his life at Calvary. We are not proposing that Jesus is (one) person of the godhead, along with two other persons. We are declaring that **JESUS CHRIST IS THE ONLY GOD!** He is not a third part of a triune God. He is God alone: the alpha and omega, beginning and the end; the first and the last; the God that was, is and is to come. He is the mighty God, everlasting Father, prince of peace; the creator of all things; the God in whom resides all power in heaven and earth; (and this is not a delegated power or he could not even be as much as a third of a triune God). He is the God who came to save us and the only God who shall return for us.

Thou shalt call his name Jesus because he will save his people from their sins. To be sure, "without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory (I Tim. 3:16). It is an eternal truth that man with his own intellect and thinking cannot discern God or the godhead. In fact that is a major part of the problem. We are prone to look at and interpret scriptures from the standpoint of how they appear to us in our natural way of thinking. God is not an explanation, he is a revelation. Only by the divine revealing power of the Holy Spirit can anyone discern the godhead. I do not say that so that elitist individuals can claim greater revelation. The scripture teaches us that all can know him from the least to the greatest. But we can know him not by our own intellectual resources but as God reveals himself to us. And that revelation of himself will be through the harmonious marvel of his Holy Word, by the empowerment of the Holy Spirit, and not by some presumed revelation of our own apart from the word of God.

No greater mystery has ever presented itself to the mind of man than that which involves "GOD AS A MAN". We will devote an entire section of this lesson to the study of the "Father and the Son"; that is, the relationship of "Father and Son". The natural mind reads about a Father and a Son and concludes that there must be more than one entity intended, otherwise, as it is thought, how can you have a "Father and a Son" and only one entity? Until we get to the section where we address the relationship of "Father and Son", for now we will only provide some examples which tell us that Jesus was God, even by his own statements.

Jn. 1:1-3, 10-11 & 14. 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 anything made that was made. – He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own and his own received him not. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we behold his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth. These verses tell us that in the beginning the Word (logos) was God; that all things were made by him; that he was in the world and the world knew him not, and that, the Word (God) was made flesh and dwelt among us. All of this is a reference to Jesus as the God who became flesh.

Jn. 8:58. Jesus said unto them, verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am. This expresses the eternal self-existence of Christ as God. "I AM", is the name God told Moses to go deliver Israel by, Ex. 3:14.

Jn. 10:30 & 33. I and my Father are ONE. The Jews answered him, saying, for a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. I and my Father are one; not in agreement but numerically. They took up stones to stone Christ for this because they understood that he meant that he was God.

Jn. 14:7-9. If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him. Phillip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father: and how sayest thou then, shew us the Father. Philip (and the others) wanted to know more about the "Father and the Son", so he asked Jesus to show them the Father. Jesus simply told him that he that hath seen me hath seen the Father. What a stunning revelation! Look at me Philip, I am the Father. We are one, not two or three.

Col. 2:8-10. Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him which is the head of all principality and power. All the fullness of God, the godhead and whatever makes up God dwells in Christ. Christ is the complete embodiment of God.

I Tim. 3:16. And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. Sure, there are many questions about God and the godhead. But if you will only consider it,

God was the one who was manifest in human flesh, preached unto the Gentiles and received up into glory. What a perfect description of Christ.

Add to all of these scriptures the fact of all that Jesus was and did while in the world and it is an inescapable conclusion that he was, indeed, God in human form. First consider all of the miraculous healings he performed which could not have been done by man. He was God! Consider his virgin birth of which the prophet declared that he would be called "Immanuel", God with us. The prophet also said that the "Son" that would be born would be the "Mighty God" and the "Everlasting Father". Consider that he turned water into wine, multiplied bread to feed a multitude, calmed the sea and claimed in his great commission that he had all power in heaven and in earth. The only rational conclusion is that he was God in human form. His name would be called Jesus because he would save his people from their sins.

At this point it might help to summarize some thoughts that will declare to us that Jesus was both God and man as follows.

- a. There is but one God, emphatically declared to be so throughout the entire Bible. Even though various views of theology defines his godhead differently.
- b. God did become man while remaining God in every aspect of his godhead.
- c. The one God was first manifested as the creator of the world; then he came as a man to be the savior of the world; then his Holy Spirit filled his temple (church & individual). Yet he remained one and the same God. He has filled more than one title and capacity, but his being is not divided into other than one.
- d. Father, Son, Holy Spirit are relational positions of the one God and not distinct, separate, all-powerful deities.
- e. One God does not pray to another God; that would destroy the position of God.
- f. However, God in his humanity could and would pray to deity. There is no other way to correctly explain the act of the man Jesus praying to the Father. It would be ludicrous to propose that "God the Son" was praying to "God the Father", with both persons being co-equal. Deity does not pray to deity.
- g. The name Jehovah was the Hebrew national name for God as expressed in the O.T. The name Jehovah is not found in the N.T. unless you accept it in Jesus.
- h. The name Jesus in the N.T. is the same as Jehovah in the O.T., with only the capacity of savior (yasha) added to it.
- i. The only way to completely reconcile the claims made by Jehovah in the O.T. with the claims made by Jesus in the N.T. is to recognize that they are one and the same.

VI. THE RELATIONSHIP OF FATHER AND SON

A. FATHER AND SON.

The New Testament is filled with a vast assortment of expressions which make reference to : God; Father; Son and Holy Spirit. These expressions are used both alone and in conjunction with each other. For Example, Jn. 3:16 tells us that, "GOD" so loved the world that he (God, whatever and whoever God is) gave his only "BEGOTTEN" "SON", that whosoever believeth in him (the Son) should not perish but have everlasting life. From this beloved verse of scripture we must determine who "God" is and, secondly, who the "begotten Son" is. As I have stated, it cannot be that one divine, co-equal, co-eternal "person" of a triune God, begat another divine, co-equal, co-eternal "person" of that triune God and then referred to the second co-equal, co-eternal "person" as the "Son" of God. One divine deity cannot and did not beget a second deity or divine person. The only possible way for the language of this verse to be rationally (and spiritually) discussed is that the one (and only) divine being (God) begat a Son, as a process and event of God becoming man. Thereby God is both God and man; the begotten and the begetter. When one man begets a son, there results two men. When God begets a Son, the results is a God—Man. You utterly confuse and destroy the idea of there being one eternal, all powerful, invisible God when you divide his godhead into several entities and then try to have one of the several as a begotten son.

Notice that this scripture does not tell us that "God – The – Father" begat a Son. It tells us that GOD begat a Son. Are we to conclude from this that a triune being actually carried out the process of begetting a son? The reality is that God, alone, begat a Son. The fact which is beyond any dispute is that a "BEGOTTEN" one did not always exist. Jesus was "born" of the virgin Mary. God condescended as a man through the begotten Son of Mary. And, lest we forget, the scriptures plainly tell us that the Son was begotten by the Holy Spirit. Does this mean, in the context of a triune God, that the third person of the godhead begat the Son, and, further, that this Son, when born, was the Son of the first person of the godhead (the Father)? To further exacerbate this confusion, by what process and decision did the Father become the "first person" of the trinity, and the Son the second person and the Holy Spirit the third person? The reality is that God, the almighty one, who alone inhabiteth eternity, overshadowed the virgin Mary and, by way of divine power, she brought forth a man child, which was God with us. Maybe that expression does not eliminate all of the mystery of the godhead, but it certainly provides a clearer view and one that is far more scriptural.

The relational expression of "Father and Son" is repeated many times throughout the New Testament. (By the way, it is never mentioned in the O.T.) Likewise, "God the Father" or "God even the Father" are oft-repeated expressions. There are likewise many N.T. expressions wherein Jesus makes a reference to his "Father". The 17th chapter of John is a classic example of this relational reality between "Father and Son" as Jesus offers a prayer for the disciples and others and offers this prayer as the Son to the Father. Are we to interpret this kind of expression as God the Son, as a co-equal person of a triune God, praying to God the Father, another co-equal person of the godhead? Or does it mean that the Son (the begotten flesh of the Father) is praying, as a man, to God, even his Father?

Until our theological interpretation of “Father and Son” recognizes and embraces the fact of the ONE GOD AS A MAN we will never come to a scriptural interpretation of this relational condition.

B. JESUS CHRIST OUR MEDIATOR.

There is another major factor in the interpretation of the godhead that is vital in our decision as to whether God is singular or plural. That factor is the office and function of “MEDIATOR” between God and man in the process of man’s redemption through the “MAN” Christ Jesus. Consider the following scriptural references.

Gal. 3:19-20. Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.

I Tim. 2:5. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the MAN Christ Jesus.

Heb. 8:6; 9:15 and 12:24 declare this office of mediator of Christ (as a man). “He is the mediator of a better covenant”; “And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament”; “And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant”.

This function of mediator speaks of Christ as the sacrificial offering for our sins. It further describes that vital function of being the bridge between God (deity) and man. It is, therefore, through Christ Jesus as our mediator that we are able to “come boldly to the throne of grace” and speak unto God for our sins and our needs. The law could not bring us into relationship with God due to its inability to mediate before God for our sins. That is to say, there was no propitiation for sins in the law, but there is through the mediation of Christ. This office of mediation is accomplished through the MAN, Christ Jesus; not through a “God the Son” officiator. And it is this mediation through the man Christ Jesus which gives us the many “relational” verses of scripture which refer to God the Father and Jesus Christ his Son. Notice carefully, that these expressions never refer to “God the Father and God the Son”! The human Christ mediated between us and the divine Father.

It should be noted that this office of mediator of Christ is the apparent cause by which some interpret there to be one God with a distinct and separate “Son of God”, subordinate and distinctly separate from the eternal God. That is not what we are describing by way of this function of mediator. We are describing ONE GOD who by his own power became MAN, while remaining God, and is therefore the GOD-MAN. In the Old Testament, this one God was named Jehovah. In the New Testament, this one God was named Jesus (Jehovah—yasha) and was God and man, yet only one eternal being.

In the greetings of the Pauline epistles there is a repeated expression that describes this “Father and Son” relationship along with the function of mediator of Christ Jesus which we will now note.

In Rom. 1:7, Paul greets the Roman Christians thus: To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints; “grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

I Cor. 1:3. Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

II Cor. 1:2. Grace be to you and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

Gal. 1:3. Grace be to you and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ.

Eph. 1:2. Grace be to you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

Ph. 1:2. Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

Col. 1:2. To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

I Thess. 1:1. ---Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

II Thess. 1:2. Grace unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

I Tim. 1:2. Unto Timothy, my own son in the faith: grace, mercy, and peace, from God our Father and Jesus Christ our Lord.

II Tim. 1:2. To Timothy, my dearly beloved son: grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.

Tit. 1:4. To Titus, mine own son after the common faith: grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ our Savior.

Philemon. 1:3. Grace to you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

Thirteen of Paul's epistles begin with this blessing of peace and grace from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ. Not a single one of them makes any mention of the "third person of a triune God", the Holy Spirit. All of them reference "God our Father" and our Lord Jesus Christ. If this is supposed to be interpreted as a distinction of "persons" in the godhead, then Paul made a colossal mistake by not including the Holy Spirit in this greeting. On the other hand, if we interpret it as a reference to grace from God our Father through the mediator-ship of our Lord Jesus Christ, then the function of the mediation of salvation through Jesus Christ (as a man) by God, the eternal Father, and if we do not make a distinction of persons, you have a beautiful declaration of how the plan of salvation (by grace) was administered (or mediated) to mankind.

To further demonstrate this office of God as our Father through the process of mediation by and through the man Christ Jesus, let's consider some other verses which will help in this process.

Rom. 15:6. That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. A simple declaration that God was the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. You cannot make this to be God as the Father of God the Son, but you can make it God as the Father of the man Christ Jesus.

I Cor. 15:24. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. Just what does it mean that Jesus will deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father at the time when he has put down all other power and authority? This is included in the resurrection chapter and the resurrection is at the

second return of Christ at the end of all time, when eternal life begins in reality. It is at this point that the office of Christ as the mediator of salvation will have no further function, inasmuch as all salvation that will ever occur will have been completed. Thus, it is not a reference to some aspect of the godhead, but of the work of redemption that was carried out by God through his manhood in Christ Jesus our Lord. Otherwise there is no rational explanation for this verse.

II Cor. 1:3. Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and the God of all comfort. Blessed be God, who is the Father of Jesus Christ our Lord, describes the obvious truth that God begat the Son and this process gives us the GOD—MAN. The blessing which Paul is enjoining is that of the gift of a savior, which was Christ the Lord. This “Christ the Lord” is the incarnate Christ as begotten by the only God there is. With this verse you can correctly interpret that God is the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, but you cannot twist it to mean that this Christ is a “God – the – Son entity which is being begotten.

I Thess. 3:13. To the end he may stablish your hearts un-blamable in holiness before God, “even” our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints. This is another reference to God even our Father, which supports the fact that it is not describing an additional entity, but that it is God who also is the Father. Otherwise, who is “God” in such case.

Eph. 5:20. Giving thanks always for all things unto God – and the Father – in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Surely this verse is not intended to make separate persons of God and the Father and thereby establish the idea of a God separate and apart from the eternal Father.

Col. 1:3. We give thanks to God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, praying always for you. This verse says, “We give thanks to God who is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Further, it cannot be describing a second, separate person of the godhead, otherwise it would be tantamount to saying that God (the Father) created God the Son.

Heb. 1:9. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. This verse is stating that the Lord Jesus Christ is subservient to God. How could this be if there are co-equal persons in the godhead?

Jn. 20:17. Jesus saith unto her, touch me not: for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend to my God, and your God. Like the verse in Heb. 1:9, this verse also is stating that Jesus Christ is subservient to God. You must either interpret this to be a reference to the “manhood of Christ as subservient to God (deity) or you are forced to interpret it as meaning that Jesus Christ is only a man and in no sense divine. Without doubt it refers to the manhood of Christ as being subservient to God (deity). If, in fact, there were three distinct “persons”, each divine, co-equal, co-eternal and of equal power, it would still be necessary to speak and write of the “human” “God-the-Son” in a subservient manner. It is an unavoidable fact that Jesus was human and as such had all of the faculties and temptations of humanity. Otherwise he would not be our great high priest, fashioned as we are to be tempted with all manner of human characteristics. This would mean, therefore, that you would have one “person” of a triune God who had a human component and all of its characteristics. Further, this would require the same “relational” expressions as we are

currently dealing with, but only as they would relate to a “God-the-Son “person” and not to either of the other “two persons” presumed to comprise a triune deity.

I Cor. 11:3. But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and head of the woman is the man; and the “HEAD OF CHRIST IS GOD”. If Christ is a second person of a trinity, then you have a very real problem with this verse and its declaration that the “head of Christ is God”. To say that “God” in this case is the Father will not suffice. That would be the same as saying that “God the Father is the head of God the Son”, which dissolves the co-equality of the 3 persons.

Eph. 1:17. That the GOD OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST”, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him. Is God the Father the “ruling” person in a co-equal, triune godhead, wherein each person is supposed to hold equal relevance, power and function in the universe? How does Trinitarian theology reconcile such statements as this.

ON THE OTHER HAND, WHEN YOU CONCLUDE THAT THE ONE ETERNAL BEING, GOD, CAME TO THIS WORLD IN THE FORM OF MAN, YOU WOULD CORRECTLY REFER TO THIS ONE BEING AS THE GOD-MAN, AND YOU WOULD ALSO REFER TO “GOD” AS FATHER AND “MAN” AS THE SON. THAT IS PRECISELY WHAT IS ATTEMPTED BY A TRIUNE THEOLOGY BUT IT CANNOT POSSIBLY MEET ALL OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF CALLING ALL THREE “PERSONS” “GOD” AND ONLY ONE “PERSON” AS MAN. IN ADDITION, YOU CANNOT SEPARATE “GOD” FROM THE “MAN” WITHOUT HAVING A SEPARATE, SUBORDINATE RELATION AND NOT A “GOD-MAN” BEING, THEREBY ELIMINATING ENTIRELY ANY DIVINITY OF CHRIST. GOD IS ONE – THIS ONE GOD BECAME MAN – THIS ONE GOD IS CERTAINLY THE ETERNAL FATHER, AND YET, IS. 9:6 DECLARES THAT THE “SON” WHICH WOULD BE GIVEN WOULD BE THE EVERLASTING FATHER. THE ONLY POSSIBLE WAY TO RECONCILE THIS LANGUAGE IS TO CONCLUDE THAT ONE GOD WAS BOTH HUMAN AND DIVINE. THEREIN IS THE GODHEAD!

It is both strange and self-defeating that proponents of triune God theology do not include in their official writings the imperative function of “MEDIATOR”, which is filled through the “MAN” Christ Jesus. Especially in the volumes wherein they seek to describe a “trinity of persons”, there is a total absence of this undeniable and essential function: “MEDIATION”.

Mankind had no possible way to bridge the chasm separating sinful, fallen man from a pure and holy God. God, by taking upon himself human flesh, by way of divine begettal in the virgin’s womb, has, thereby, become that “bridge” or “mediator”. And Christ, as a man, is the go-between to reconcile man back to God. This is the most fundamental, palpable and essential function of a “savior”. Every single function of Christ, including his virgin birth, his sinless life, his sacrificial offering of himself at Calvary and his glorious resurrection, serve this one distinct capacity of being the “MEDIATOR” through which mankind can “return” to (a relationship with) God. That is precisely what Jesus meant when he said (Jn. 14:6), “I am the way, the truth, and the life: NO MAN COMETH UNTO THE FATHER, BUT BY ME”. Is a “God-the-Son” entity a barrier to a “God-the-Father” entity, while both of them are “sovereign equals”? The very idea is preposterous. Instead Christ is saying, no man can come back into a saving relationship with “deity” (God) as our Father, except through his own human MEDIATION.

That is the true theological interpretation and application of the numerous references to “God our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, or, God our Father, even our Lord Jesus Christ”. Triune theology uses these expressions in an attempt to prove a plurality of persons in the godhead. In the process they completely avoid any reference or explanation of the mediator-ship of God the man. The resulting confusion and error is lethal to their interpretation of the godhead as well as to their claim that Jesus was both human and divine. Indeed, Jesus was both human and divine; but he was the only divine being and not a second person of three.

The numerous expressions in the Bible, especially the N.T., relating to the Father and Son relationship, the scriptures about Jesus sitting at God’s right hand, all the multitude of expressions wherein the “Son” speaks in a subservient manner to the “Father”, the concept of “God sending the Son” and others like them, are fully explained in the function of “MEDIATOR” through the “MAN” Christ Jesus. Not to recognize this destroys the entire body of truth relating to the undeniable fact that the “ETERNAL GOD BECAME A MAN”. As Paul wrote to Timothy, ch. 2:5, “For there is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus”. By applying these expressions as a proof or representation of a plurality of persons in the godhead, destroys the mediatorial redemptive work wrought through the man Christ Jesus.

When you open your Bible to seek out God, you must first recognize that God is one. Secondly, you must recognize that this one, eternal God came to this world in human form to be a sacrifice for our sins and redeem us unto “HIMSELF”; not unto them. Then you must see in the “Galilean” and all he did and represented on earth, the capacity of being fully God and fully man. And it is the manhood of Christ through which God mediates salvation to us. Through “Christ Jesus” we can pray to God, believe on God and have a restored relationship with God. That is why we are taught in I Jn. 1:2, that we have an “advocate” with God, Jesus Christ the righteous. That is why we have free access to the eternal God, because Jesus is the mediator of a better covenant (than the law), for through him we can come to God by him.

Jesus Christ as our mediator – standing between a holy God and sinful man – has purchased our opportunity to choose to come back to (the one) God through him. He is not a “second person of a trinity”; he is the one, eternal God – as a man – seeking to save we who are lost. He was God and he was man, and his name is Jesus! Now let us consider further the concept of:

C. GOD “SENT” THE SON.

Another area which we should consider in connection with this relational or mediator position, which was filled by the Lord Jesus Christ through whom our salvation was purchased, is the area or thought of “God” sending his “Son” into the world to save us. Triune theology would argue that if God “sent” his Son, that it must require that there is more than one “person” or entity in the godhead. It devolves to the point that it is presumed that “GOD” is fixed in one geographic location in the sky, and he has sent the “SON” to another geographic location on earth. Nothing could be more carnal than that. But let us consider some of these verses for more information.

Jn. 3:17. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.

Jn. 6:29. Jesus answered and said unto them, this is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.

Jn. 6:38. For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.

Jn. 6:39-40. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. – And this is the will of him that sent me, that everyone which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

Gal. 4:4. But when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law.

I Jn. 4:14. And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world.

There are many other such verses but these will suffice to represent this thought. Just what does it mean that the "FATHER SENT THE SON"? First, you can completely eliminate the idea of some kind of a geographic "sending", as from one location to another. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, was born in Bethlehem, of the virgin Mary. He was begotten in her womb by the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit. The Son of God was not begotten, formulated, birthed or in any other manner caused to descend, physically and geographically, from the sky or, if you prefer, heaven. And yet that is exactly what the interpretation which uses this "sent" description as an indication that there are two distinct entities in this "sender and sent" process would have us believe.

Look at another verse in Jn. 1:6. There was a man "SENT" from God, whose name was John. Was John the Baptist sent from some location in the sky, or was his mission in the world a divinely arranged mission, and therefore "sent" from God? And is not this the same meaning when the scriptures state that Jesus was sent from God?

Jn. 6:38 specifically states that Jesus "came down" from heaven, not to do his own will, but the will of him who sent me. The truth of this verse and many others like it is that this condescension from "heaven", "above", etc., is a condescension of God coming down to earth as a man. That is what we have declared over and over. Further, if triune theologians believe what they say, then they must concur with the exact same concept, for they declare that Jesus was both human and divine.

There is no doubt but that Jesus was "SENT" from and/or by God. That is to say: the divine, eternal God sent the human God-Man into the world to be a sacrifice for our sins. Therein is the meaning and usage of the various verses which speak of "God sending his Son". However this sending event was not by some geographic, physical descent from some lofty perch in the sky down to the earth. The sending event speaks of the divinely ordained and arranged process of Jesus-the-man being born of the Virgin Mary in Bethlehem.

D. THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD.

Another figure of speech frequently used in the Bible refers to the “right hand” of God. Following are examples of verses using this thought.

Ps. 16:8. (The psalmist said) I have set the Lord always before me: because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved. Are we to interpret this to mean that God is “seated” at the right hand of David? Certainly not! But it does tell us two important things. First, it surely was true that God was “with” David, though not in some physical form. Secondly, the companion to this verse is Acts 2:25, where Peter quotes from Ps. 16:8: For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved. He is on David’s right hand in the sense of the Davidic lineage through which Christ descended to earth.

Ps. 48:10. According to thy name, O God, so is thy praise unto the ends of the earth: thy right hand is full of righteousness. The “right hand” of God is filled only with righteous deeds; that is, the things which he does with his “right hand” are all righteous. The right hand is used here as a metaphor.

Ps. 80:15. And the vineyard which thy right hand hath planted, and the branch that thou madest strong for thyself. Who can show me a literal vineyard which God planted with his right hand?

Is. 48:13. Mine hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens: when I call unto them, they stand up together. Does not the book of Genesis tell us that God made the heavens and the earth entirely by his spoken word? Now this verse tells us that it was by his right hand. There is no conflict. His right hand represents his “power”.

Zech. 3:1. And he shewed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. Question? Is it Jesus, the second person of the trinity standing at the right hand of God or is it Satan? While you try to unravel this irrational sounding thought, let me simply suggest that there is always some force of evil standing right at what God is trying to do.

I find it very strange that no scripture ever mentions God’s “left” hand. Strange, that is, unless you are willing to recognize in the use of the expression “God’s right hand” a metaphor of power or purpose. To try to prove a plurality of “persons” by this “right hand” expression is really a very erroneous interpretation of scriptures.

Read further about the metaphorical use of the expression “right hand” in Mt. 5:30. “And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off -----. Is this literal or figurative?”

This “right hand” expression is explained in Mt. 26:64. Jesus saith unto him, thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. How do you sit on the right hand of power unless it is a figure of speech denoting position and not a plurality of personages in the godhead?

Acts 7:56. And said, behold, I see the heavens opened and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God. Instead of sitting on the right hand, this verse describes Jesus standing on the right hand of God. No other instance is recorded of someone seeing Christ sitting or standing on the right hand of God. That is, unless you compare this with many scriptures that refer to the mediatorial position of Christ. How could you physically tell if he was physically standing on the right hand of God since God is invisible and you cannot see him, let alone his right hand? Shall we descend to such depths of carnal thinking that we must have physical forms with geographic locations, all contrary to obvious scriptural facts? Jesus is the mediator of the new covenant and as such is the medium through which God (deity) administers the plan of salvation. Any other application sends you spiraling into a pit of unscriptural thinking.

This is a good place to ask where the Holy Spirit is seated. But there is no need to ask because the Bible does not mention anything about that. This is additional evidence that the repetitious mentioning of the “Father and the Lord Jesus Christ” is a reference to the function of the mediation of God through Christ. We believe that this is the essence of all such scriptures, including those that refer to Christ on the right hand of God. Any other explanation conjures up a purely carnal picture.

As to the “throne” of God, of which there surely must be one for him to be seated upon, or else we lose all the scriptural references to his throne. References such as Is. 66:1. Thus saith the Lord, the heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye build unto me? And where is the place of my seat? God is saying where can you confine my throne since I fill the heavens and the earth. If you still want to describe his throne literally, then you must have God seated in the heavens and his feet literally resting on the earth. Otherwise you can use the only rational explanation to this, which is, God is so great that he fills all matter and all space.

E. “LET US MAKE MAN IN OUR IMAGE”

There is another thought under this relationship between Father and Son which we must consider.

In Gen. 1:26. And God 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. The point usually made with this verse is that because the words “US” and “OUR” are used and since they are plural words, this means that there must be a plurality in the godhead. However this is a self-defeating argument. The very next verse (27) states: “So God created man in “HIS” “OWN” (not our) image, in the image of God created “HE” (not they) “HIM” (not them); male and female created he them. If you are going to use this event of creation to prove a plurality in the godhead, then you must also deal with a “male and female” factor in the godhead, which would be ludicrous.

Without entering into an unnecessary discussion of grammar as though I would teach a lesson on the use of the English language, which I do not, nonetheless we will at least observe a fundamental fact which can explain the use of “plural words” with a “singular” meaning.

- First, note the sentence above in which I used the statement “nonetheless we”, when “I” am the one “we” refers to. But it has an inclusive element in it which recognizes that I want others to “observe this fundamental fact” along with me. That is one of the definitions of the use of the otherwise plural word “we” according to “Webster’s College Dictionary”. This dictionary states that one of the uses of “we” is when it is used “INSTEAD OF THE WORD I”. It explains this in an example sentence as follows: “We will now consider the causes of World War I”. When some speaker makes a statement like this, he is using the word we instead of I, even though it is used in a singular sense.
- But a better and more complete explanation of this use of plural words such as “we”, “us” or “our” can be found in the Bible. A very thorough example of this is in Paul’s second letter to the Corinthian Church, chapters 1 and 2. I refer you to those chapters where Paul repeatedly uses these exact same three words, which ordinarily are used in a plural sense, but here they are used in an obvious singular manner. I urge you to carefully read both of these chapters. Let me share some verses from I Cor. 1:8,9,13,14 &17. For WE would not, brethren have you ignorant of OUR trouble which came to US in Asia, that WE were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that WE despaired even of life: But WE had the sentence of death in OURSELVES that WE should not trust in OURSELVES, but in God which raiseth the dead: For WE write none other things unto you than what ye read or acknowledge; and I trust shall acknowledge even to the end; As also ye have acknowledged US in part, that WE are your rejoicing, even as ye also are OUR’S in the day of the Lord Jesus. When I therefore was thus minded, did I use lightness? Or the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that with ME there should be yea yea, and nay nay? There are other examples but these will suffice for the point to be made.
- For whatever it is worth, years ago, I cut out a column written by the late “Ann Landers” on this same subject. In this article she upheld the fact that “we” can definitely be used for “me” or “I”.

All of that notwithstanding, let us go back to the scripture in Gen. 1:26-27, and ask the question: “Who was God talking to or about or with when he said let us make man in our image, after our likeness”? First consider what exactly did God create that we can answer this question with? The answer that Trinitarian theology gives to this question is that “man is a threefold” being: body, soul and spirit. And this is actually advanced as an explanation of this statement wherein God said “let us”. So, let me ask a question addressed to this “threefold” description. Are you, as God’s created handiwork, a direct replica of the godhead? Who dares answer this in the affirmative? Is God an identifiable body, confined to location and limitations? Is God made up of mortal elements? If you say that man is a “trinity”, then the theology of the Trinity of God is certainly built upon frail components. If you say that man is a threefold being, what happens if you eliminate the fleshly body which you are using as a part of such being? It is eliminated. Is that the way it is with one of the three persons of the Trinity? Without one you have no being?

As to the description that man was created in the image of God, let us look at this thought. Many times you hear preachers amplify the “present tense” reality that we are in the image and likeness of

God. But when I look at man, sinful, fallen, deteriorating, mortal, of few days and full of trouble, I have a real problem believing that is the image of God, don't you? Man WAS originally created in the image and likeness of God, at least that was God's ultimate intention for man, but he fell from that lofty sphere and it could no longer be said that he was in or could be in the likeness of God. The argument is put forth that this refers to the "soul" within man and not to the "outer man" himself. In that case you have just destroyed your presumed threefold man in God's likeness. There has to be another, better answer for this and there is.

I would declare that this reference to the "image" of God is speaking of the day when God would become a man, that is, a two-fold being of both God and man. One God manifested in human form. And that was his original design in the creation: that man would be like Christ. And that is what the Bible tells us as "born-again children of God" through Christ Jesus. This is what the scriptures tell us in Col. 1:13-16, "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: Who is the IMAGE of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and for him". Then Heb. 1:3, speaking of Christ, says: "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high.

A scripture in Mal. 2:10 should be sufficient to clarify just how many beings or persons were present at the time of the creation. It reads, "Have we not all ONE Father? Hath not ONE God created us? In all of this we are brought back to the mediatorial function of Christ through the wonderful, foreordained purpose and plan of God for our salvation at calvary.

We have dealt at length with the relationship between the "Father and the Son", as described in the scriptures. This relationship is mentioned almost exclusively in the New Testament. The only Old Testament reference to it is in the form of types and shadows or prophecies where the foreordained plan and purpose of God is the subject. I must emphasize again that any problem we have with the expressions such as "God our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ", is a problem more prevalent in Trinitarian theology than in Oneness theology. With Trinitarian theology, if we are to understand these expressions as a reference to a distinct plurality in the godhead, then you must answer the question as to whether the "Father" refers to the first person or the third person. No matter which you may answer, you only create a greater problem. You must decide which one of the three persons of the trinity actually is the father of the son. Trinitarian theology either states or implies that it is the first person; the Bible distinctly states that it was the Holy Spirit that overshadowed the virgin Mary and was the one who begat the child in her womb; this would be the third person as the "father" of the son. So where does that leave "God the Son" in this process?

Then you must deal with the allegation that the "only BEGOTTEN Son" eternally existed, when in fact to be begotten demands a beginning point. The only rational answer for this dilemma is that the one, and only eternal Spirit, who was Jehovah, God, overshadowed the virgin Mary and her offspring was a

divinely begotten Son. The eternal Father was both God and man; that is, both Father and Son. If this seems impossible for you, then I suggest you read again Is. 9:6: “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. The “SON” which was to be BORN would be called: THE MIGHTY GOD, THE EVERLASTING FATHER.

How do you discuss a singular being which has the distinct capacity of begetting someone? If that singular being is God, and since nothing is impossible with God, and since biological begetting is not a component of the process, what you then have is a God—Man. One being to be sure, but one which has two distinct components: divine and human. This God—Man being is the “Father and Son” entity. This is the meaning of the many scriptures which refer to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. If you make reference to the one who “begat”, you use Father; if you make reference to the one begotten, you use Son. If they were both human there would be two distinct beings, but they are not. A “God-the-Son” entity was not begotten and born. It was the human Son which was begotten, and that by the eternal God. Because it was a divine and not a human begetting, the one you have is both God and man, not just man. Is that not why Jesus said, “I and my Father are one”? Thus you have one being with both a divine and human nature. Is not this the same that the Trinitarian theology declares? There is but one divine, eternal being, God, and that divine God became a man (Father and Son), in order to bring our salvation by the sacrifice of the Son. The idea of a begotten “God the Son” (as a second person of the trinity) is a complete misnomer. You cannot beget a divine, eternal being that has always existed. But the one divine, eternal being can beget a (human) son. Neither can a divine, eternal being beget a human offspring without the merging of both the divine and human natures into the one being. The process of begetting itself requires this.

We confidently submit that the “ONENESS” view of the godhead is the only view which is capable of adequately fulfilling every scripture, every attribute, every office and every relational expression relating to the godhead, using the Bible as the only guide for every conclusion relating to it. The one, unquestionable and unwavering scriptural principal and fact which must ever be maintained under any circumstances, is that there is ONE GOD and his name one. Regarding the truth that God is one – as to being, sovereignty and eternity- there can be no doubt or departure from this fact. Once you break down sovereignty and the absolute requirement that God is one or try to express it through more than one personage or deity, you invariably break down the entire structure of God and his godhead. The overwhelming problem always confronting the student of the subject of the godhead invariably derives from the relational expressions of “Father and Son” and how it is understood and believed. To the natural mind, there seems to be an inescapable division between the Father and the Son. Since Jesus Christ is the “only begotten Son” of the Father, the natural mind, applying human reasoning, concludes that the Father is one person and the Son is another person. Therein is the source of most of the confusion and division over the subject. If you always keep in mind that God was both – God and man – while remaining as one being, the confusion which might otherwise result, becomes instead a beautiful revelation of the love, mercy and glory of God. When you acknowledge that the Father and Son are one (Jn. 10:30) and understand that the two words, Father and Son, are titles, the confusion is dispelled.

F. TWO NATURES IN US.

We have considered the “two natures” in Christ from several perspectives: “the Father – Son relationship, Christ our mediator, the Father sending the Son, the right hand of God, etc. It can help to understand this divine enigma of the God – Man, if we consider our own Christian experience and how we are daily confronted with “two natures” in us. Let me first reject any notion that I am proposing that we are like God as a man in the reality of the Christian experience. We are born with our own single nature (mind, spirit, desire, etc.), which is sinful in every respect with no capacity to be saved. Then we meet our Lord Jesus Christ and we yield our own sinful flesh-nature to his holy and divine will (nature). When we do so, God can work salvation in our lives, completely transforming us to his own sacred will. Every Christian knows what follows next. Every day we have a battle within us. That battle is between our “old” nature and our “new” nature. There is a battle simply because we must daily “mortify the deeds of the flesh and subdue them to the will of God”. As Paul said, when I would do good, evil is present with me; and how to do that which is good I find not. What he is saying is that I must deal with “two natures”; my own fleshly nature which I must subdue daily, and the nature of Christ which I must submit to. The scriptures describe this as “putting off the old man and putting on the new man”. Thus, every day of your life as a Christian, you must be like Christ: subduing your fleshly nature to the divine will of God. That is a description of the relationship of “Father and Son”. The Son (God’s human component) did not come to do his own will but the will of the Father. That is why you have a multitude of expressions in the N.T. regarding the “Father and the Lord Jesus Christ”. And that is precisely why Christ came: to overcome sin in his fleshly body and will and subdue it unto the “Father’s will”. It has absolutely nothing to do with a “first person and a second person”. It is altogether about the humanity of God being subdued to the deity of God that salvation might be wrought. And our lives as Christians should be a replica of this: the flesh subdued to the Spirit (of God). Thus there are two natures at work daily in our Christian life. It is not a question of a “God the Father and God the Son”; it is a question of the subjection of the human will to the divine will. God in Christ overcoming the human will and God in us overcoming our human will.

VII. GOD AS MAN

A. WAS HE GOD – OR – WAS HE MAN?

He was both God – and – man, all at the same time; one being, who was both God and man with many titles of position. Undoubtedly that is the absolute truth; the total and complete, undeniable evidence is, that Jesus Christ, the child born of Mary, was also the eternal, sovereign God of the universe.

It is called the “incarnation”, which is probably an inadequate term. The term “incarnation” means: “the embodiment of a deity or spirit in an earthly form; the union of divine and human natures in Jesus Christ. While incarnation is probably as sufficient a word as we have to describe the “God-Man”, yet it is still somewhat inadequate. The word implies God – inside – of a man, when the reality of scripture is, God as a man. In any case, it is a great mystery when you try to conceive of God as also a man. God was manifested to the world in human form; in Adam’s clay or as the offspring of Abraham. To confuse this mystery even further would be to try to represent a “three person, triune God as being manifested in human form. That is unthinkable. How could you possibly represent 3 distinct persons in one human form? Of course, triune theology will vehemently contend with this by saying that only one person of the godhead became human. My response would be, therefore, that “GOD” (in his fullness) did not become man. The main problem with this is that the entire Old Testament abounds with scripture that foretells that “GOD” would become man; the Lord God would come and save us. Again, the Son that would be born would be the everlasting Father and the mighty God.

When we attempt to discuss on any level the concept of “GOD AS MAN”, we are confronted with the greatest and yet the most wonderful of all mysteries and are destined to be caught up in questions or controversies over the relational aspect and significance of a sovereign God who would voluntarily choose to condescend to lowly manhood. Those controversies may be answered only by the entire, composite truth of scripture as revealed by the power of God’s Holy Spirit. Why should it seem unacceptable to propose that seeking and searching of God for him to reveal this marvelous truth, God-as-man, to us? God who is past finding out, whose ways man cannot fathom, can be known to us only as he reveals himself to us. We should thank God that it is so and that he will reveal himself to those who seek him with all of their heart.

Do we for a moment think that we have the innate ability to look upon the “man” who walked on water, and discern what manner of man he is? We know him as the “Son” of the virgin Mary, an humble handmaid, and we observe him weary, hungry and tempted exactly as we are; therefore, by what depth of human learning, comparison and example will we be enabled to see through these very human conditions and manifestations and conclude that he is God? Indeed, when we hear him exclaim, “I can do nothing without the Father which sent me, and simultaneously see him forgive sins, raise the dead and multiply the bread, shall we conclude that he is just a man or that he is sovereign God or both? And is he God Almighty, or is he dependent on some other deity, higher than he is to enable him to perform such miracles? Is he total and complete God, or is he only a contingent God,

who can do none of these miraculous things without the combined assistance and cooperation and approval of two other distinctly distinguishable divine beings whom we refer to as Father and Holy Spirit? Shall we conclude that he is sovereign, all powerful, the first and the last, the God that was, is and shall ever be, who possesses all power in heaven and earth and that there is no God but him? When he is declared by all expressions of sacred scripture to be the “Son” of the highest, shall we conclude on that basis that he is a “second person”, or shall we listen to him unequivocally declare: “I and my Father are one”?

When we see him tempted by the lusts of his flesh, the lust of his eyes and the pride of life, in all points just as we are tempted to sin (Mt. 4:1-11); then we see him hungry, thirsty, weary, needing rest; we see him praying to his “Father” for help or deliverance, how will we escape calling him a man? When we see him just speak the word and lepers are cleansed and all manner of diseases are instantly healed, and then we observe that all things are known to him, how do we escape calling him God?

This was the great dilemma facing the Jewish rulers: “thou being a man makest thyself God”. Rather than admit the obvious, they accused him of blasphemy and of being Belzebub. Is that the same dilemma facing theologians today? They cannot or will not ascribe to the “Son” the sovereign capacity of God, almighty God, alone. To them it does not seem possible for the Son to also be the Father. Can the “begotten” also be the “begetter”? Is it possible for the eternal Spirit which brooded over the darkness before creation and simply said, “let there be light”, and with no other resource except his spoken word, all creation came into existence, that this same God cannot, by his own loving purpose, become a man, with every attribute of manhood, and not relinquish any dignity and power of his godhood? If not, why not? And if he can then why can’t that eternal deity (who declared unequivocally, “I am God, and besides me there is no other and my glory I will not give to another) not also be able to robe himself in Adam’s clay and stand upon the earth which he has made and declare, again unequivocally, “he that hath seen me hath seen the Father, (Jn. 14:5-11). Hoary orthodoxy calls that impossible, and mocks the idea that God – if he is indeed sovereign God – can and did become a man, only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth and stood upon the earth which he alone had created, for the sole purpose of reconciling the world unto himself.

Jesus Christ, visible as a man, which John declares (I Jn. 1:1) was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and our hands have handled, of the word of life, and of whom Col. 1:15 declares to be the image of the invisible God, shall we deny him total and complete godhood? And further in Col. 2:9, this same Jesus is the one in whom dwelleth all the fullness (not just one third) of the godhead bodily (the fullness of God in a body).

If Jesus Christ was man in every attribute of manhood and also was fully and completely God in every attribute of the godhead, where does that leave any possible room for any additional deity, unless you are going to claim that there is more than one God in the godhead? Also, with reference to the concept that makes him only man, subordinate in every detail to a separate, sovereign deity, where is there any possible room for his obvious godhood or deity?

To be sure, dealing as we must, with human expressions such as Father and Son, God our Father – and – our Lord Jesus Christ, or God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which are found in abundance throughout the New Testament, we are confronted with either a marvelous revelation of God – as – man, or with a dilemma far beyond human wisdom – or both. To address this reality we must never resort to the notion that there is a plurality of persons in the godhead just to accommodate our human thinking. If it is too deep to unravel without divine revelation, and it is, we should never resort to simple human reasoning in order to comprehend the one who was both God and man. That is the answer to this dilemma, that God, the only God, became a man. To try to explain or describe it by having a plurality of persons in the godhead only compounds the dilemma and changes the truth of all scripture: that there is only one God, numerically one. Jesus did not come to earth to certify that there was a plurality of persons in the godhead; he came to reveal the everlasting Father in human form. (Is. 9:6)

I readily admit that there are many salient questions that can be asked regarding the “ONENESS” view of the godhead. He would not be God if we had answers to all the pertinent questions. But the questions are only increased, enlarged and compounded when you turn to a plurality of entities, deities or persons comprising the godhead. Every question which can be raised about the “ONENESS” view of God, for the most part, can also be raised about the TRINITY. This is true because you must inevitably deal with each person of the godhead. For example, the Bible distinctly says (Mt. 1:18-20, Lk. 1:34-35) that Mary conceived the Christ child by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost. Not God the Father (if you are going to make a distinction between God the Father and God the Holy Ghost). Question: which one of the three distinct persons actually performed the begetting process in the virgin’s womb? You cannot pass this off by saying “they were all involved”. Not if they are distinct persons, it could not be. On the other hand, if you believe in the ONENESS view, it is a moot question because the one God fills every capacity of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, with no division of persons. Did three persons beget the Christ child? Utterly ludicrous!

It gets even more confusing when you consider the second person of the trinity. After all, according to Trinitarian theology, the “second person” is just as much God as the “first” and “third” person. If that is indeed true, then it would follow that “God the Son” was the “Father” of the Christ child. And you are right back to the question of, “are the Father and the Son one and the same”? And if you declare that “God the Son” was the “Father” of the Christ child, you would not be able to find one single verse of scripture to support that. It appears that Trinitarian theology has made a distinction without there being any; they have made “persons” without the Bible doing so, they have made “God the Father” the begetter when the scriptures tell us it was the Holy Ghost and thereby have excluded “God the Son” from the process.

I feel sure that many Trinitarian theologians would mock these questions because that is what you do when you don’t have answers otherwise. It does not matter how “unified, cooperative and co-equal” Trinitarians presume the godhead to be, yet if they are distinct persons or beings and if they each possess sovereign, eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent qualities, then you have 3 beings, each with individual capacities to create worlds, hold individual sovereignty over the order of the universe and the capability to act alone in any capacity within their individual godhood. Even if

they have perfect harmony and function they still would be capable of functioning in any God-endowed capacity alone. If not, then they do not have any sovereignty individually and therefore none collectively.

In the midst of this triune, co-equal, co-eternal and co-sovereign God, you have obvious unequal conditions existing between each “person” in the form of the universal attributes and functions addressed to each one. For example, the Son is always interpreted in a subordinate position as compared to the Father. This kind of interpretation of positions, power and perspective is drawn from the abundance of times the Son is shown exalting the Father, praying to the Father, seated on the right hand of the Father and other such examples. By trying to maintain this presumed co-equal level between each person of the godhead, the obvious reality of the subordination of the humanity of the God-man is ignored. This results in an impossible maze of errors and half-truths. The Son (as the second person of the Trinity) is almost always described by this theology as ever bowing before the throne of “God” (which person is that) while making intercession for us that “God” will give us mercy and help us overcome the obstacles of sin and life. Think about that picture in comparison to the godhead. One sovereign, all-powerful person of the godhead is shown pleading with another sovereign, all powerful member of the godhead for the needs of sinful mortals. Surely, if God the Son is a co-equal with God the Father, he could and would provide the necessary grace and help himself. To compound this picture, we find in Rom. 8:26-27, that it is the Holy Spirit, the third person of this co-equal triune God which is the one making intercession for us before God. Again, when it says before “God”, by what rule are we to automatically understand this to mean God the Father instead of another member of the triune God? So, which one is praying to the first person of the triune God for us: the second person or the third person? O, can’t we see how carnal this is? There is a very clear answer which explains this “intercession” as well as other scriptures which have to do with the relationship of the “Father and the Son” That answer is the function of mediator of the man Christ Jesus before God. The work of mediator, through Calvary and the plan of salvation, on the part of Christ Jesus who could and did give his life to reconcile fallen man back unto God, is that answer. The sacrificial offering of himself on the cross along with his resurrection, ever and always intervenes before the throne of God’s eternal grace on behalf of needy mankind. One invisible God is not bowing before another invisible God.

A. RECOGNIZING BOTH THE DIVINE AND HUMAN NATURES OF CHRIST. (And resolving this to be the GOD-MAN).

Both the ONENESS view of God and TRINITARIAN view, each, confess that Jesus was both human and divine. After all, this was the reason and the process by which God came to save mankind. In this capacity of “human and divine” in one being, with the human visible and the divine invisible, the first and absolutely essential thing that must be acknowledged is the simple fact that there will be times of divine manifestation and times of human manifestation. We have already made some reference to this. However it must become instinctive that, whenever you are interpreting either the human or divine manifestation, that we allow for the limitations of the human and the infinity of the divine.

Failure to make this distinction will result in a misapplication of the scripture. This is especially true with references to discerning questions of the godhead.

We can see an example of this in the favorite verse in Jn. 3:16. "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son"----- It would be easy, but wrong, to deduce from these precious words that "God the Father" sent "God the Son" to save the world. Nothing could be further from the truth. It would be completely ludicrous to draw from this verse that one person of a Trinity sent another person of that Trinity. The one being sent is not a co-equal, divine, sovereign being, it is a begotten being. Surely no proponent of a triune God is going to propose that one divine, eternal, all powerful being, sent another eternal, invisible, all powerful being to be the savior of mankind. The very first and insurmountable problem this presents is, that a divine being could not die for our sins under any circumstances. The next problem this presents is the idea that when it says (Jn. 3:17) that God "sent" his Son, the Trinitarian mind pursues this "sent" event as a complete distinction and severance of beings. That is to say, that the idea of being "sent" presumes at least two distinct entities. But this completely ignores the "human and divine" component of the one being which is both God and man. It also ignores that the one being which is sent is "begotten". You do not speak of God (deity) as being begotten. On the other hand it is absolutely correct to say the "Son" was begotten. And as we all know, this begetting occurred when the Holy Ghost overshadowed the Virgin Mary and she was with child.

The next problem this presents, which should not be a problem at all, is the undeniable fact that God, the eternal one, could become man and still be God. In such case you would use such expressions as "begotten", "Son", "sent" and the like. The error that this can result in is that some might separate the "human" component into a totally separate being and one that is subordinate. This is where the dual concept of the godhead comes from. It is essential to godhead theology to recognize that the "human" component of the God—man, is a begotten component. That is, the human component, which is the "sent" component, had a beginning and did not always exist except in the forethought and predetermined mind and plan of God. God – became man – which he was not prior to his birth by the Virgin Mary. God – himself – condescended in human form. He did not "send" another person of a triune God; he sent the human being which he became by the begetting of the Christ child in Mary's womb.

In this concept it is proper that the "human" be addressed as subordinate to the "divine component". This is true whether you are a proponent of the oneness view or the Trinitarian view. If you don't recognize and appropriately address the distinct attributes of both human and divine, each in one being, the result is confusion and scriptural error. Further, this union of "God and man", deity and humanity necessitates a constant manifestation of both components in the discourse of the gospel message. The crux of this is the sacrifice of Christ at Calvary. God, as God, could not and did not die at Calvary. It was the man Christ Jesus who died for our sins, not the divine Christ. In Acts 20:28, we are told that the church of God was purchased by the blood of God. But God, the eternal Spirit, does not subsist on blood; God as a man did. And it was, indeed, the blood of God, because God had taken upon "himself" the properties of "flesh and blood". In addition it was the blood of God because of the begetting process. The blood of the child comes from its father, in this case, God. Moreover, it was not

sinful, corruptible blood because it did not come from human procreation, but divine begettal. This illustrates just how critical it is to always ask of every expression and manifestation, is it divine or is it human? while never separating the God-man into two beings.

Let us review a few scriptures we have already had occasion to look at, which describe this phenomenal occurrence of God as a man.

Is. 7:14. "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a "SON", and shall call his name Immanuel". As we all know, Immanuel means, God with us, Mt. 1:23. Not just God's omnipresence providentially about us, but God, himself, with us. God had always been present in his omnipresent Spirit but this is a presence that is God in one place. The "Son" born of Mary was God himself, in human form.

Is. 9:6. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a SON is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called wonderful, counselor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the prince of peace". This child of Mary, this "SON" that is "born" unto us in the city of David, he is the mighty God and everlasting Father. Was Isaiah deceived, referring to this child as both a Son and a Father? Obviously not! He was prophetically foretelling of the birth of the God—man, or God as a man. Let us not forget that the Christ child, Mary's Son, was also the everlasting, sovereign, all powerful Father; God of the universe and all eternity. By all means it is beyond man's wisdom. It is God's revelation of himself and we understand this unfathomable mystery only when we look in the face of Jesus Christ and declare, like Thomas, Jn. 20:28, "My Lord and my God".

Is. 25:6-8. These verses describe a time when death will be swallowed up in victory; a day which we understand was fulfilled in Christ, by his resurrection. Verse 9 of this chapter then declares: "And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord; (this is Jehovah) we have waited for him; we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation. This verse unequivocally states that Jehovah, God, will come and save us and this salvation will be by the swallowing up of death in victory. Thus, Jehovah, God of the Old Testament, by the overshadowing of his own Holy Spirit upon the Virgin Mary, caused her to be with child and they called his name Jesus.

These verses and others set the stage for GOD to come to the world as a man. He did not change his godhead; he did not change his name. He only changed his sovereign, eternal, invisible glory as the everlasting Father of the universe, to also be a man of human flesh. God, who in his deity fills all matter and all space, is the God who in his humanity chose to condescend to be one of us and to be limited in time and space. That is the God for whom the world waited.

Mt. 3:16-17. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: and lo a voice from heaven saying, this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

This event is used to support a plurality of persons in the godhead, even though that is obviously not the subject at hand. First there is Jesus, who has just been baptized and is said to be the second person of the triune God. He is followed by the Spirit of God lighting on him, which is offered as evidence of the third person of the triune God, the Holy Spirit. (Never mind that the text specifies

that this is the Spirit of “God”, which expression in all other instances Trinitarians interpret as “God the Father”) After this there is a voice from heaven, saying, this is my beloved Son, and this is presumed to be “God the Father”, thus representing the triune God. All of this is mere presumptuousness, at best, or carnal interpretation of an otherwise heavenly event. The one being baptized was the “man” Christ Jesus. There is no possibility under any circumstances of either God the Father, God the Son or God the Holy Ghost being baptized. But God (the only God), in the form of a man, could be and was baptized. The Spirit of God descending upon him, in every other instance, would be interpreted as God the Father. And we already have shown that the Father of the Son was the Holy Spirit. In the absence of scripture that clearly identifies this event as a manifestation of a triune God, it is best to take it as it is: the baptism of Jesus as the (human) manifestation of the (only) God.

Mt. 4:1-11. These scriptures give the account of Jesus being tempted in the wilderness. What it tells us is that Jesus was susceptible to fleshly temptations just as we are. God (whether one or three) could not be tempted. However, Jesus as a man was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin. This event manifests the humanity of Christ. This event vividly illustrates one of the great reasons of God becoming man, so that he could bear our infirmities of the flesh, endure the temptations just as Adam did before his fall, yet not succumb to any of those temptations to commit sin.

Jn. 2:1-11. The story of the first miracle of Jesus, turning water into wine, is not a manifestation of his humanity but of his deity. Without fanfare, great words, not even so much as a prayer, the water was changed to wine. Human power could not do this. It is very important not to interpret this as “delegated” power from the first person to the second person of a triune God. It is simply who he was, both human and divine and in this instance “God” changed the water to wine.

The eleventh chapter of John conveys this “human and divine” nature of Christ in such a very poignant manner. When he is led to the tomb of his friend Lazarus, with Mary and Martha and others grief stricken, the Bible gives us that one compelling verse, 35: Jesus wept! In all his humanity, no event describes any more the deep human experience of grief than this. From the bottom of his heart, he feels the deeply moving pain at the loss of a friend as well as his grief for the others who are also experiencing this sorrow. As a man he broke down and cried. In verse 38, still groaning in himself, he came to the grave.

Next, in verse 41, Jesus prays to the Father, thanking him that he (the Father) had heard him. (If this was a “God the Son” praying to “God the Father”, you would not have such a subordinating conversation) By what expression of theology or wisdom can anyone conclude that “God the Son is praying to God the Father”? The very idea would be ludicrous. If there are three persons, each one co-equal and co-sovereign, the concept of one praying to the other is preposterous. Why not bring into the conversation “God the Holy Spirit” for his “co-equal” contribution. Prayer is always a subordinate posture. Did it ever occur to Trinitarian advocates to ask the question as to why the “Father” never prays to anyone if there is a co-equality in the sovereignty of the godhead. What we

have here is a very human manifestation of Jesus, the man, praying to Jesus, the deity. It is his humanity subordinated to his deity. Now look further -----

In verse 43, Jesus cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth. And, V44, he that was dead came forth. Earlier in this chapter, Jesus had claimed that he was the resurrection and the life; now he proves it. Thus, in one setting, Jesus manifests total humanity when he wept and his deity when he raised Lazarus from the dead. Neither was this a choreographed show; it was Jesus as both God and man.

There are no events recorded in the four gospels that provides a better illustration of the humanity and deity of Christ as the God-man, than those of his crucifixion and resurrection. They stand at two extremes of this union of humanity and deity to manifest to us the wretchedness of all human existence on the one hand, and the magnificent glory of God on the other. The cross of Calvary is the epitome of all ages of sin, misery and death. The resurrection is the glorious triumph over sin and the grave for all who trust in God.

As the night of the Passover drew on and Jesus and the disciples finished the last supper in the upper room, he had already spoken to them of his imminent betrayal and death. As they went out to Gethsemane, the scripture tells us that he began to be "sorrowful and very heavy", a very human reaction to that which was awaiting him. Next he prayed and begged for "this cup" to pass from him, if it was the will of "his Father". Consider this: is he praying to God the Son, God the Father or God the Holy Ghost, or all three? Instead of that, why not see it as it is: the man Christ Jesus praying to the only deity there is, God, the eternal one. Whether you embrace the Trinitarian view or the Oneness view, you still have to deal with "humanity praying to deity. In addition, in the case of a triune God, you must decide which deity he is praying to and why the others were left out. But let us not miss the main point that these events, leading up to his crucifixion, are producing every possible human manifestation and grief. As such they abundantly demonstrate the full reaches of human nature. He was apprehended, brought to a mock trial, accused, insulted, betrayed and blasphemed. These led to condemnation, scourging and every malicious treatment possible. Though he endured this suffering for our sake, yet it must truly be so that no man has suffered any more human pain and anguish. Then there was the cruel cross of Calvary with hours of the most excruciating pain the human nervous system and brain could possibly register. And this, while soldiers gambled for his clothes, Jewish leaders mocked in triumph, an indifferent and unknowing crowd of misery – gazers looked on and a few traumatized mourners stood by as the God who became a man (in that sinless manhood), died! Was he God or was he man? This must have been the question burning in the hearts and minds of his closest believers. What they had just witnessed on Golgotha's hill was, beyond any question, the full measure of every fiber and tissue of manhood. From centuries of innumerable and indescribable wonders and miracles, they knew that "God" their own eternal "Yaweh", sovereign and immortal, could never die; death could not touch him. They also knew by the infallible prophecies of yesteryear that their God, "Yaweh" himself, had so faithfully promised to visit his people and save them. They had hoped that this Jesus was the one which was to come. But, alas, the one in whom they had placed all their hopes, they had just seen him hang on a cross and die. HE WAS, IN EVERY MEASURE, A MAN!

The disciples retreated and waited during the Sabbath day(s) that week (one for the first day of unleavened bread and one for the regular weekly Sabbath), fearful, anxious and disappointed, thinking about visiting the tomb as soon as day break came on the first day of the week. It was some of the women, not the men, who got out early, while it was yet dark, and headed for the tomb, presumably to bring additional burial spices – and mourn. It had been three days and three nights since they had buried him.

Approaching the tomb where guards were stationed and asleep, they wondered how they would be able to roll the heavy stone away from the entrance to the place where Jesus lay. Then to their amazement and bewilderment, the stone was rolled away and the tomb open ---- and empty. They were further startled as two men appeared and asked them, “why seek ye the living among the dead”? Then with words that would electrify and change the entire world forever, they said: “HE IS NOT HERE, BUT IS RISEN”! You mean they have taken our Lord and moved him. NO! Don’t you remember how he spake unto you that after three days he would rise from the grave; and how he said, “destroy this body and in three days “I” will raise it up again”.

As the next few days unfolded and Jesus showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs (Acts 1:3), communing freely and visibly with his disciples concerning the kingdom of God, a powerful and amazing reality gripped their souls, filling them with awe, wonder and an overwhelming feeling of glory and triumph. They had seen him suffer and die as a man at calvary – but now –they were beholding him alive, risen from the dead. It could only be that he was not just a man – HE WAS GOD! -- in all his fullness, glory and power. God, eternal and sovereign, had raised himself from the grave.

We all believe it and know it is true. Yet, it is still too much for the human mind to fathom or explain. The disciples have witnessed the fulfillment of the patriarch’s faith, all the types and shadows of the law and all the words of the prophets, the event of the ages and the greatest miracle God has ever performed. He who was born of a virgin and suffered death as all men do, only more profound, has now risen from the grave, victorious over death for every man who believes. HE WAS MAN AND HE WAS GOD! The Lord Jesus Christ –Kurios, Jehoshua –Messiah -- Jehovah—Jesus, the Lord Christ. The God of the Old Testament, Jehovah, is the God of the New Testament, Jesus (Jehovah – yasha). He became man – the begotten of God – and suffered and died for the sins of man and he has risen again. Behold this is our God; we have waited for him and we will rejoice in his salvation. How could Thomas help but exclaim (Jn. 20:28) “My Lord and MY God!

We will consider one other passage of scripture which describes this God – as – man relationship. Already we have made reference to the salutation which Paul used as he greeted the Christian churches in their many locations through the epistles he wrote to them. Consistently he would include in his opening comments to each epistle a greeting something like: “Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ”. In fact, these are the exact words you find in Romans 1:7, as Paul begins the epistle to the Romans.

I realize that I am being repetitive by using this salutation of Paul to the churches again. However, in the interest of thoroughness and of being sure we have not ignored the unique wording in these greetings to the epistles, as well as many other instances where similar wording is found, it is better to be repetitive than to exclude them. Notwithstanding that, rather than reproduce many such examples, we will use only the one in Rom. 1:7, as representative of the others.

The wording we are addressing, which Trinitarian theology interprets as proof of a plurality of persons in the godhead, is as follows: "God our Father – and – our Lord Jesus Christ". A distinct and separate reference to "God our Father" on the one hand and "the Lord Jesus Christ" on the other hand, constitutes, according to Trinitarian theology, an obvious reference to two of the three persons in the godhead.

The first thing to recognize in these several salutations which are so worded is that Paul is not using them as an expression governing the godhead. He is not stating, neither implying, as he opens each of his epistles with this form of salutation that there is a plurality of persons in the godhead and that every church should be reminded of this. Instead he is expressing to all of these churches, his desire for them to abound in grace and peace and that the source of that grace is "God our Father" and it is mediated to us through "our Lord Jesus Christ". No matter what your view of the godhead is, that is the message Paul is sending. Let us test this application of these several salutations in this manner.

The first test is: why was not the "third person of the godhead" mentioned, if, in fact, there are three co-equal, co-eternal and co-operative persons in redemptions plan and the godhead. If this salutation-wording is intended as a reference to the make-up of the godhead, how and why did Paul manage to totally exclude God, the Holy Spirit in every single instance of its usage in every epistle? This is a question that cannot be casually ignored or turned aside, but must be addressed with scriptural answers. If, as Trinitarians would argue, it was intended as a declaration of the plurality of the godhead, it completely fails this test. To have excluded any reference to "God-the-Holy-Spirit, in every instance of these greetings to every single church he wrote to cannot be explained as simply an inadvertent oversight; instead it would be a colossal blunder, not worthy of divine inspiration.

The next test to the concept that these salutations are evidence of a plurality of the godhead is that of a reliance on the word "and", as evidence of a separate and additional "person". It would be argued by Trinitarian theology that the expression "God the Father" "AND" our Lord Jesus Christ, defines two distinct entities, God the Father and God the Son. But that premise can be dismissed as being full of fallacies and ambiguities.

When the word "and" is used in these instances, such as "Father and the Lord Jesus Christ", it could just as well have been translated "EVEN". That is, "God our Father, "EVEN" our Lord Jesus Christ". It has been translated in this manner in several instances such as the following.

Rom. 15:6. That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, EVEN the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

I Cor. 15:24. Then cometh the end, when he shall delivered up the kingdom to God, EVEN the Father, when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power.

II Cor. 1.3. Blessed be God, EVEN the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort.

II Thess. 2:16. Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, EVEN our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace.

We gave this section a title of "RECOGNIZING BOTH THE DIVINE AND HUMAN NATURES OF CHRISIT". We have attempted to describe the "CHRIST", who was born of the Virgin Mary, as being both, "GOD AND MAN" or the "GOD-MAN". We contend that it is the only scriptural conclusion you can reach considering the inescapable fact that Jesus functioned as God in some instances and as a man in others. Yet, he was only one being. God could become man, while at the same time remain fully and unchangeably God. The Son, as a Son, was begotten and in such case had a distinct beginning. In other words, he did not always exist as a "man". He was God who became man. When you try to divide the functions of God and man into two or more persons, you dissolve the godhood of at least one and you destroy the amazing love and mercy manifested through and by a God who was willing to humble himself and take upon him human flesh just for the chance to redeem even one human being back to a loving relationship with him. In addition you create un-surmountable obstacles in trying to reconcile the GOD-MAN relationship through the interpretation of making them two of a three person, triune godhead, all the while attempting to maintain a position of there being only one God.

God became a man! The relationship this created by the fact of two natures, with one being human and one divine, is a relationship where the "human" component will always be shown as subordinate and the "divine" component will always be shown as sovereign. Thus you have the "Father—Son relationship which is so frequently and necessarily expressed throughout all of the N.T. scriptures. When you also consider the function of mediator which the life, mission and sacrifice of Christ demonstrated, you are again faced with a position which was a subordinate position to the "deity" of the godhead and consequently was described in language which frequently referenced the two natures of Christ. Nowhere, in the entire Bible, is Jesus ever referred to as a "second person of the godhead". This is simply an invention of man's thinking to accommodate a plural view of God. JEHOVAH of the O.T. became a man who was JESUS of the N.T. and he was both God and man; a single being who was both God and man in all of his eternal power, glory, sovereignty and saving grace. AMEN!

C. DIVINE CONDESCENSION.

"DOWN FROM HIS GLORY" is a song, written about 1921, by William E. Booth-Clibborn, with beautiful lyrics which describe the "divine condescension" of God. Following is a reproduction of those lyrics.

DOWN FROM HIS GLORY

Down from his glory, Ever living story, -- My God and savior came, And Jesus was his name. -- Born in a manger, -- to his own a stranger, -- A man of sorrows, tears and agony.

What condescension -- Bringing us redemption; -- That in the dead of night -- Not one faint hope in sight -- God, gracious, tender -- Laid aside His splendor -- stooping to woo to win, to save my soul.

Without reluctance -- Flesh and blood his substance -- he took the form of man -- Revealed the hidden plan. -- O glorious myst'ry -- Sacrifice of Calv'ry -- And now I know thou art the great "I AM".

Ch. O how I love Him! -- How I adore Him! -- My breath, my sunshine, my all in all! --The great creator -- Became my Savior, -- And all God's fullness dwelleth in Him.

Down from his glory ---- the eternal God and creator of the universe, including man, the image of his love and desire, came down to the lowly estate of fallen man. When the human heart and mind has the revelation of this eternal truth, God as man, the soul absolutely pulsates with the passion of its unfathomable beauty. All of the great and wonderful attributes of God, such as his love, mercy, forgiveness, power, grace, kindness, glory, omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence are bound up in the blessed truth of God coming to earth as a man. Not just God with us in divine, providential presence, but God with us in all of his glory splendor and being, clothed in Adam's clay, to be one of us.

Therein is the MYSTERY of godliness and therein also is the revelation of godliness. The "Greatness of God" is nowhere more clearly defined than in the phenomenal truth and precious revelation that God -- himself -- and all that he is -- condescended to earth in human form. He was the one who begat the miraculous child in the Virgin's womb, and he was the child which was begotten of the Virgin Mary. He was both the one who begat and the one who was begotten -- the Father and the Son!

Is. 9:6 declares that a CHILD would be born, a SON would be given -- and he shall be called -- "THE MIGHTY GOD -- THE EVERLASTIN FATHER". The prophet Isaiah had the audacity to call the child which he prophesied would be born (of a virgin) -- the EVERLASTING FATHER. No, Isaiah does not say this out of audaciousness: he says it out of divine revelation. That is why we can read the N.T. of the Son speaking to the Father and know of a certainty that the Father -- and -- Son are one and the same. The Jewish rulers called it blasphemy, Belzebub, and crucified him because "HE BEING A MAN MADE HIMSELF GOD" (JN. 10:33).

Consider again, Jn. 10:30, where Jesus said: "I and my Father are one". That is why in Jn. 10:33 the Jews took up stones to stone him. They did not understand him to say "I am one (along with and equal to) with the Father. They understood him to say that there was no difference, no distinction, no separate person from the Father. They understood him to claim to be the Father. And that is precisely what Jesus claimed in Jn. 14: 6-10, when he told Philip that he was the Father. That is also what Isaiah prophesied in Is. 25:9, "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him and he will save us:

this is the Lord (Jehovah); we have waited for him. Again, In Is. 40:9-10 it says: “O Zion, that bringest good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain; O Jerusalem, that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid, say unto the cities of Judah, behold your God. – Behold, the Lord (Jehovah) God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him.

How shall we interpret Is. 9:6, 25:9, 40:9-10, Mt. 1:23, Jn. 10:30-33, Jn. 14:6-10, Col. 2:8-9 and II Cor. 5:19, and a host of other like scriptures if we do not interpret them to teach that God, in all the fullness of his godhead came to earth as a man – and was both God and man –begetter and begotten - - Father and Son, whose name was Jesus.

GOD IS ONE! NUMERICALLY ONE! AND THIS ONE GOD CAME TO EARTH AS A MAN. HE WAS BOTH HUMAN AND DIVINE! AND HIS NAME IS JESUS!

GOD!

- God -- omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscience.
- God -- who said: Let there be light.
- God -- who created the heavens, the earth, the sea, the sun, moon and the stars;
- God – who put order, function, mystery, glory, synchronization and motion in the universe;
- God – who knew the end from the beginning;
- God – who is perfect, pure, holy, just and king;
- God – whose mercy is everlasting and his truth endures forever;
- God – who is invisible, unchangeable and unsearchable;
- God – who spread out the sky as a tent to dwell in and uses Moab as a wash pot;
- God – who has the heavens as his throne and the earth as his footstool;
- God – who measured the heavens with a span, and puts doors to the oceans;
- God – who alone inhabiteth eternity;
- God – who will not share his sovereignty, glory and godhood with another;
- God – who declared that there is no other God besides him;
- God – who promised: “I will come and save you”;

AND THIS GOD

- God – chose an insignificant, pure girl to bear a special child by divine begettal;
- God – became the father of the child she was to give birth to;
- God -- by divine begettal – not creation – became miraculously joined to human flesh;
- God – thereby became the “GOD—MAN”;
- God – came down from his glory and humbled himself to become a man;
- God – the eternal one became like us so that we could become like him.
- God – was still God but God was also man;
- God – the everlasting Father has now become a Son;
- God – whose name alone is Jehovah is now Jehovah – yasha = Jesus;

- God – who was invisible has now become visible in human flesh;
- God – who could not die, became a man so that he might die for mankind;
- God – as a man died at Calvary while God in his deity remained the eternal God;
- God – who is the eternal Spirit, raised himself as a man from the grave;
- God – with nail prints in his hands and feet, walked and communed with men on earth.
- God – ascended, visibly, from the earth;
- God – invisible, by his Spirit, came at Pentecost to fill his church with himself.
- God – whom no man could approach unto, is now accessible through human mediation;
- God – will come again to usher in our own eternal, immortal life.
- God – will dwell with us and we with him for eternity.
- God – will be our God and we will be his people;
- God – will receive all glory, praise and honor through Jesus Christ the Lord.
- God – invites you to repent of your sins; be baptized in his name and let him save you.

D. THE “SUBORDINATION” OF HUMANITY TO DEITY.

Jn. 3:16 describes to us that Jesus is the only “BEGOTTEN” Son of God. To be begotten necessitates a point of beginning. Even if there was an entity such as “God-the-son”, there could be no description of “begotten” and have eternality ascribed to him. Jesus in his humanity did not and could not have always existed. The one begotten is subordinate to the one who begat.

Mt. 4 tells us of the temptation of Jesus in the wilderness. First, “God” cannot be tempted; temptation comes to humanity through the lusts of the flesh. In his temptations he made himself subject to the word of God.

Mt. 5-7 records for us the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus was a master teacher, prophet and preacher. As such, he never preached his own human will but always subordinated his preaching to the will of God – deity. In O.T. times the word of God was proclaimed by patriarchs, priests and prophets chosen of God for that purpose. **Heb. 1:1-2** provides us with a unique perspective on this as it relates to Jesus in subordination to his Father’s will. “God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, -- Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds”. The point is that Jesus, as a man, did not preach his own gospel; he preached the will of his Father. Thus it was that he subordinated his own will (of his flesh) to the divine will of the Father. If this is not the proper application of this then you have to accept the idea of a “God – the – Son, entity in a subordinate position. That would be completely impossible: an eternal deity does not submit to any other deity or entity.

In **Ps. 40:6-9** and **Heb. 10:5-10**, we have a beautiful description of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ as the only means possible of the expiation of sins. Animal sacrifices were not acceptable to God as the process of purging sins. **Heb. 10:5** tells us: “but a body thou hast prepared me”. It would be correct to paraphrase this narrative thus: “God saw that animal sacrifices had no atoning value. He said that the only effective sacrifice would be for me (God) to prepare for myself a body (of human flesh) and

submissively offer this body as the only acceptable offering for the sins of man. Heb. 10:10, states that we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. What a powerful description of the subordination of the “Son-ship” of Christ to the “Father-hood” of God. God was that God – and God was that body. There is no scripturally accurate, theological way to apply this “God clothed with the body of flesh” phenomenon by trying to divide it into a “first and second person” of the godhead. Instead it is a manifestation of the subordination of humanity to deity.

Consider the event which occurred when Jesus was about 12 years old and with his parents in Jerusalem where he became separated from them because he was “disputing with the doctors and lawyers”. When Joseph and Mary discussed their anxiety over not being able to find him, his answer was: “wist ye not that I must be about my Father’s business”? Notice, here, the subjection of his own will to that of his “Father”. Under this posture of one subject to another, you cannot refer to one as God the Father and the other as God the Son. If that was a correct reality, you could not have a posture of one subject to another.

When Jesus entered his ministry he would frequently speak of doing his Father’s will. In fact he studiously and specifically made a point of emphasizing that he had not come to do his own will but that of his Father which sent him. Thus he manifested a position of complete subordination to the “Father’s will”. To think of this on any level as a relationship between a “first person, God the Father”, with a “second person, God the Son”, is nothing short of scriptural ineptitude. Further, it was absolutely essential that the “humanity of God” be completely subject to the “deity of God” in order to overcome sin in the flesh. This submission of the (human) will of the Son to the (divine) will of the Father explains the “God—man” theology and completely denies a plurality of persons’ theology.

Adam failed to obey the Father’s will. That is why Jesus is called the second Adam, so that he might submit in all things to the Father’s will. The repetitive use of language which presents Christ in a subordinate position to the Father cannot possibly be intended as a distinction of “persons” in the godhead, each co-equal and co-eternal with the other. It is a contradictory use of language to have one which is subordinate to another and at the same time co-equal and co-eternal with each other. That kind of theology self- destructs.

When Jesus prayed to his Father in Jn. 17, are we to interpret that as one divine, co-equal person of the godhead, submissively praying to another divine, co-equal person of such godhead? Instead, should we interpret this prayer and others like it, where Jesus prays to his Father, as the humanity of God petitioning the deity of God – with this “God-Man” existing as one and the same being?

Finally, consider Jesus praying in Gethsemane. Three times he prayed and with such fervor and passion that his sweat became as great drops of blood. He was asking of there was anyway his “flesh” could be spared from tomorrows’ cruel and painful death. This was not a put-on or demonstration on his part – it was very real. In each instance of this prayer, he ended it with, “nevertheless, not my will but thine be done”. This is the total and complete submission of the fleshly will of Christ to the divine will of Christ.

In this and all other prayers which Christ prayed to his Father, which we have interpreted as his humanity praying to his deity, while also describing this human-divine relation as belonging to one and the same being, the question is sure to be asked, "Is Jesus praying to himself"? The direct answer to this question is, absolutely yes. The explanation for the answer is that he was God and he was man; yet only one being. You and I get to see and can more precisely relate to the humanity of Jesus and cannot see his divinity. Does this pose a divine enigma? No doubt about. It requires of us to consider the multitude of scriptures which tell us that God would come to the world as a Son and from them to see the marvelous revelation of God as God, but also see God as a human being. If we aren't going to accept that premise, then we do not need the scriptures or the Christ they declare. The alternative is to believe in one God praying to another God, with no scripture at all to support such a thesis.

This prayer in Gethsemane is the moment of truth for God in human form. Either the "humanity" voluntarily, without coercion, accepts the "will of deity" or the plan of salvation is headed for the trash pile. Thanks be unto God, his human will was lovingly, voluntarily subordinated to his "divine will". The greatest and most glorious manifestation of God's eternal mercy, love and forgiveness, is powerfully demonstrated in God – as a man – voluntarily, lovingly sacrificing himself for our sins.

This subordination in this instance is precisely the same as in every other instance throughout the life and ministry of Christ – a subordination of his humanity to his deity.

Let us hear Isaiah the prophet explain this phenomenon one more time: Is. 9:6. **FOR UNTO US A CHILD IS BORN, UNTO US A SON IS GIVEN: AND THE GOVERNMENT SHALL BE UPON HIS SHOULDER: AND HIS NAME SHALL BE CALLED WONDERFUL, COUNSELOR – THE MIGHTY GOD – THE EVERLASTING FATHER – THE PRINCE OF PEACE.** The Son who was to be given was to be the "Mighty God" and the "Everlasting Father". Thus the Father and the Son – the one who begat and the one who was begotten – are one and the same being: **GOD IN HUMAN FORM!**

VIII. A PERSONAL RELATIONSHIP WITH “GOD”

(And what it reveals about the godhead)

Every church and ministry stresses the value and necessity of a “personal” relationship with God. Every church and ministry recognizes the fallen state of man which necessitates being brought back into a personal relationship with God. It may be true that different views abound as to exactly what a personal relationship with God is, but the importance of such relationship is a critical emphasis of every Christian ministry. In the beginning it is evident by the communications that existed between God and Adam that God’s plan was for his creation to have a very close, daily relationship with him, especially with man and woman. It could effectively be argued that the expressions in Gen. 1:26, about God making man in his own image, was for the very express purpose of a personal and loving relationship between God and his creation. Why would God want anything else after he had invested his full creative power and design in creation and then looked upon it and exclaimed, “it is good and very good”.

Notwithstanding the obvious truth that God intended and desired to have a close, loving relationship with man, yet the question obviously could be raised as to why such a topic would be included in a treatise on the subject of the godhead. Can there be any relevance or theological connection between the subject of the godhead and the subject of a personal relationship with God. I think the answer to that question is positively yes, and, further, that there is not only a distinct connection between the two seemingly unrelated subjects, but the reality of a “personal relationship with God” may well be a final and overwhelming proof as to whether or not God is singular or plural in nature. With the possibility of that proof before us, we will explore the personal relationship of man with the God who made the world and is the sovereign ruler over it.

We will begin with the story of the creation in the first three chapters of Genesis. As you read the first chapter of the creation during the six days, you are overwhelmed with the omnipotence of God which is displayed and proclaimed regarding every aspect of all that he created. A sovereign theme is struck in the very first verse where it says: “In the beginning God”. From there and throughout each daily act of his creation, a sense of superlative power, singular action of an undivided being permeates the description of “HIS” own handiwork with a very personal delight in “what I have done”. The awesome creation itself virtually shouts from hill to hill and sea to sea, that: “ONE GOD MADE ME”. Thus the entire creation excludes any sense of reverence or adoration to any God but ONE from the heavens that showed forth his glory and the firmament that declared his handiwork.

As you read further in this creation account into where God begins his communication with man, a strange, yet familiar, scene unfolds. God sets before Adam two trees: (1) the tree of life; and (2) the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Then God gives Adam a choice: you can freely eat of the tree of life but you cannot eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil because if you do you will die. At this point Adam could believe what God said and live or not believe God and consequently die. When you analyze this process you realize that Adam was given exactly the same choice that you and I have presented to us through the gospel of Christ today. It is the choice of believing what God says

and live or not believing it and choosing death. In other words Adam's possibility of life was based upon his faith (and obedience) in what God said. In other words, Adam's personal relationship with God was based upon his obedient faith in the word of the Lord.

It is interesting to note throughout the events following the creation that the story of Adam's fall and punishment is spoken of in a manner of relationship with "THE LORD GOD". That is to say, the reference to God was to JEHOVAH GOD. The word Lord in each instance of its use in these chapters comes from the Hebrew word from which we translate Jehovah. We have emphasized in great detail in this treatise the fact that Jehovah is the name of the God of the Old Testament and that this Jehovah is one. (See section on: "The Name Of God InThe Old Testament).

Triune theology will hasten to call attention that the word "God" in these chapters is translated from the word "elohym", and that this word has also a plural use. We have also treated on this thought as well, pointing out that in each and every case where the word "elohym" is applied to the God of the Bible, that the context will always require a singular application. We have also pointed out that other words in our language have the exact same spelling for both a singular and plural use and that the context is the controlling factor in determining how to apply it.

In all of Adam's relationship and communication with God, even his sin against God, there is nothing inserted in the events or statements that, even in the least, suggests that Adam thought that he was dealing with plural persons within the God that created him. And, lest someone suggests that Adam simply did not have the capacity to recognize what God was or who he was, let me remind you that it was this same Adam that God appointed in charge of the entire creation which he had made. Not exactly a responsibility you would vest in someone where there was an absence of who each was dealing with. Man's ignorance and incapacity came not from God's original creation of him but from his fall into sin and separation from the God that created him.

ABRAHAM had a very personal relationship with God. He was called out by God to go to a land that God would show him, forsaking everything he had before in the process. God gave to him a very special promise for a special seed through which all the nations of the earth would be blessed. While that seed in the immediate can be said to be the nation of Israel, yet in all reality, the seed was a reference to Christ. See Gal. 3:16. So Abraham became the fountainhead or the lineage through which Christ ultimately came into the world. That is precisely why God called Abraham. But there was another very real reason for Abraham's call by God. He lived in a world of idol, heathen gods. God wanted to establish more than just a nation of people; he wanted to establish his own sovereign godhood in the world as the only self-existent God. Throughout all of the journeys and the work God did with Abraham, a personal relationship was established between him and God. So much so that Abraham is called the father of the faithful. In addition to that he was called the friend of God. In the process of fathering Isaac (who was a type of Christ) and in all the other strong spiritual relationship which Abraham had with God, surely, who and what God is, was indelibly inscribed on his life. In all that is said and written and in all that he himself said and did, nothing is said which would cause you to think that he ever thought of God in a manner of a plural identity. From his original call, to his long journeys, through the long years waiting for the fulfillment of the promised child, to the day when

God told him to make a sacrifice of Isaac, not once is there anything that God did or said to Abraham which would have caused him to think that God had a plurality of persons in his godhead. God came to Abraham on several occasions to renew his promise to him. Examples of these appearances of God to Abraham can be found in Gen. 12, 15, 17, 18 and 22. In all of the great work God did in Abraham's life, nothing suggests that Abraham was ever taught to believe that God was plural, while all of God's dealings with him strongly emphasize the singular being of God. Abraham's relationship with God, his prayers to God and the appearances of God unto him, never reveals anything other than the singular nature of the one, almighty God.

ISAAC was the beloved son of Abraham; an especially promised son whose birth was possible only by the miracle of God to Abraham and Sarah. As such, Isaac is recognized as a type of Christ, the only begotten son of the Father. The powerful story of Abraham taking Isaac to offer as a sacrifice to God reveals to us so much of what God's ultimate plan through the seed and lineage of Abraham was about through Christ. Inasmuch as Isaac is recognized as a type of Christ, it follows that, in this typology, Abraham is a type of God. If Abraham is a type of God and Isaac is a type of Christ, then we have two options to choose from in reconciling this to God and the godhead. One is that we can recognize that Abraham and Isaac are both humans and, as such, Abraham is not of the invisible, eternal substance of God's being. He is only a type. Thus in Abraham and Isaac, naturally speaking, you obviously have two beings representing this typology. The other choice we have is that we could conclude that God is made up of two visible, human beings and therefore his godhead consists of two. Obviously the first choice is the one which best represents God in type through Abraham, the father of the faithful. Nothing else can be made of this.

JOB was a perfect man and one that loved righteousness and abhorred evil. This is how God described him. In addition God showed the utmost confidence in Job by allowing him to endure testing so severe that few men would ever have endured it. In all of the loss, pain and suffering and challenges of Job, he remained true to God and his faith and hope in him. The dialogue that takes place regarding Job and his relationship with God shows abundantly that there was a very close and personal relationship between God and Job. If you read the entire book of Job and observe the many communications of God, you will fail to find even one that could be interpreted as recognizing God as a plural being instead of a singular being. It is GOD alone who has shown the highest regard for his servant Job. It is with one God that Job has communicated throughout his great loss. And it was the Lord (Jehovah) God who restored twice as much as Job had lost. There is no information in the entire book of Job that suggests or intimates that Job knew God as a plural being.

MOSES was the great law giver and covenant bearer. Moses met God on Sinai and received the covenant of the law. Moses was the great leader of God's people from their bondage in Egypt. He was cautioned by God to be sure that he did everything according to the pattern shown to him on the mount. And Moses did all that God commanded him to do. The center piece of the law that God gave to Moses is the commandment to: "Hear O Israel, Jehovah thy God is one Jehovah. The relationship between Moses and God was so strong that on one occasion Moses prayed and changed God's mind about destroying Israel. Through the servitude of this humble man, God wrought such miracles that are indelibly inscribed, not only in the Bible, but also on the conscience of the entire world. No one

who has studied any of the writings of Moses can question that his relationship with God was on a highly personal level. Likewise, no one who has studied his writings can successfully interpret them as revealing a plural godhead.

When God first called Moses to deliver Israel from Egyptian bondage, Moses was very concerned that Israel would not accept him unless he could give adequate credentials that the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had sent him on this monumental endeavor. So he asked of God to tell him who he was. God's answer is recorded in the third chapter of Exodus, wherein God confirmed unto Moses that he was Jehovah and that was his name and memorial to all generations. So Moses undertook one of the greatest tasks of all history of delivering Israel from Egyptian bondage, confident in the exclusive fact that the one and only, self-existent God who made the world, was he that had commissioned him for such task, and that his name alone was Jehovah. In 40 years of Moses' relationship and service to God, nothing ever suggests that he had any notion or concept of God as a plural being; only a singular God whose sovereignty he trusted and obeyed.

Even a cursory look at the journey over which Moses led Israel with the amazing events along the way, should be sufficient to convince the most casual student that he had an amazing relationship with God. From the miracles in Egypt, the crossing of the sea, the receiving of the law, the manna and the water, the organization and all the daily details demanded that Moses be in close touch with God. Who would question that he was? With such a dynamic and personal relationship with God over so long a period of time, Moses was bound to have an acquaintance with the Lord which would have been sufficient to reveal God and his godhead in its fullness to him. Moses knew no God other than Jehovah, God; singular in every transaction between them and in every single representation of God to him.

DAVID gave us the beloved 23rd psalm, which begins: "The Lord (Jehovah) is my shepherd. David, the sweet psalmist of Israel and the man after God's own heart, knew the Lord very personally and had a long and intimate relationship with him. God sent Samuel to the house of Jesse, David's father, and chose him to be the king over all Israel, passing by his older brothers in the process. Through about 13 years of Saul chasing David, God protected him, waiting for the day that he would, indeed, become the ruler over all Israel.

Every child who has ever attended church at all knows the thrilling story of David and Goliath. This Philistine giant had defied the armies of Israel, with Saul at their head, challenging them daily to send one Israelite soldier to fight with him. But the army of Israel was filled with fear at the very voice of the giant. That is until David visited the army to find out how his brothers were doing. When he understood the circumstance with Goliath, without any hesitation, he offered to go fight with him, not having the least of fear for him. As David approached the giant (with his little sling shot in his hand) the giant roared his disdain at him, threatening to feed David to the fowls of the air. David's response in I Sam. 17:45, was: "Then said David to the Philistine, thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield: but I come to thee in the name of the Lord (Jehovah) of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast denied. David knew who God was and what his name was.

More than just being chosen to be the king over the 12 tribes of Israel, his kingship was the establishing of a dynasty of kings, the Davidic Dynasty. It was through this dynasty or lineage of kings that every succeeding king of Judah could trace their ancestry. However it was much more than that. Zedekiah, who was king over Judah from about 597 B.C. until 586 B.C., when Judah was taken captive by Babylon and Zedekiah carried away into Babylon where he died, was the last king to reign over Judah in Jerusalem for the next 586 years. Then a child was born of a virgin in Bethlehem who was of the house and lineage of David (see Mt. ch. 1). Jesus, of David's own household, was in the royal line to be king. His kingdom was not for an earthly throne, but for a spiritual throne. By his resurrection from the dead and the establishing of the church, his kingdom, Jesus is the Lord of Lords and king of kings, the one and only potentate over the dominion of his kingdom.

In Psalms 16:8, David said: "I have set the Lord (Jehovah) always before me; because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved". Think of that: God at the right hand of David. Then David says in verse 10: "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption". Peter quotes this scripture in the second chapter of Acts and tells us that David is talking about Christ. In Ps. 45:6-7 David declares: "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever: the scepter of thy kingdom is a right scepter. Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness; therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness. Essentially David is referring to the relationship which he has with God through the Davidic dynasty and through Christ, the king, who would come into the world. The point is that David had a very close relationship with God and knew God and who he was. His writings are replete with so many references of David's God and who he was and what his godhead was that it leaves no doubt that David's relationship was with one singular God with no facts or essence of plurality attached to it.

We will quote one other passage of scripture from David's writing, showing his profound commitment to "Jehovah" as his God. Ps. 24:7-10. "Lift up your heads O ye gates, and be ye lift up ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of Glory? The Lord (Jehovah) strong and mighty, the Lord (Jehovah) mighty in battle. Lift up your heads, O ye gates, even lift them up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? The Lord (Jehovah) of hosts, he is the King of glory. David knew who the King of glory was; the everlasting God, the one and only Jehovah. While Ps. 83 is not attributed to David (it is attributed to Asaph) yet it reiterates the same conviction as all the writings of David. Verse 18 says: That men may know that thou whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth.

ISAIAH is known as the "Messianic prophet" because he had more to reveal about the coming of the Messiah and of the kingdom of Christ than other prophets did. His words are so emphatic and clear, leaving no doubt at all that he was personally acquainted with the God of eternity and that this God was one.

In the 6th chapter of Isaiah, he writes of an amazing and graphic vision he had of God. In verse one he said "I saw also the Lord (Jehovah) sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up". He goes on to describe the majesty of this scene as seraphims exclaimed one to another, "holy, holy, holy is the Lord (Jehovah) of hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory. The vision caused Isaiah to see how undone he

was “for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord (Jehovah) of hosts. Further he declares that he heard the voice of the Lord (Jehovah). From this great encounter with God, he received a message to “go and tell this people, hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not.

As you continue on into the book of Isaiah, over and over he provides us with amazing detail relative to the coming of God himself to the world as our savior. Following are some familiar examples.

Is. 7:14. “Therefore the Lord (Jehovah) himself (not themselves) shall give you a sign; behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. And Mt. 1:23 gives us the fulfillment of this prophecy, telling us that “Immanuel” means God with us.

Is. 9:6-7. For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, counselor, THE MIGHTY GOD, THE EVERLASTING FATHER, the Prince of peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord (Jehovah) of hosts will perform this.

Is. 25:8-9. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord (Jehovah) God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth: for the Lord (Jehovah) hath spoken it. And it shall be said in that day, lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord (Jehovah); we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation.

Is. 35:4-5. Say to them that are of a fearful heart, be strong, fear not: behold, your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompense; he will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. This is a direct reference to Jesus and his work.

Is. 40:3, 10-11. The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, (John the Baptist) prepare ye the way of the Lord (Jehovah), make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Behold, the Lord (Jehovah) God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him; behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him, He shall feed his flock like a shepherd: he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young.

Is. 42:8. I am the Lord (Jehovah): that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images.

Is. 43:10-11. Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord (Jehovah), and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am the Lord (Jehovah); and beside me there is no savior.

So clear and definitive are the writings of Isaiah as they pertain to who God is and also that it is God that shall come to the world and save us. He even declares that the child that would be born would be the mighty God. Many more examples could be cited from his prophecy. From those we have given there can be no doubt who Isaiah believed God was and that he was singular in his being.

Further, the marvelous declaration that (Jehovah) God would come to the world and save us; that is, that he, himself, robed in Adam's clay, would be born of a virgin and be both God and man among us. In that day (when he shall come) it shall be said, lo, this is our God, we have waited for him. The language is so compelling that it demands the conclusion that, if there are three persons in the godhead, then, of divine necessity, under scriptural requirement, it would have been essential that there be three walking on the earth, visible and distinct. God leaves no doubt and Isaiah had such a personal relationship with him, that he has written more clearly and conclusively about him than any others.

We have considered several Old Testament giants of faith in God in this process of showing their personal relationship with the Lord. We have done this so as to glean from their experiences and their statements exactly how they understood God and what they believed his godhead to be. In much of the writings of triune theologians, the opinion will be expressed that the Old Testament writers did not make much (not any, in fact) references to a trinity godhead. The explanation they give is that the godhead, of a triune nature, was not clearly revealed to them; that was reserved for New Testament revelation. That explanation and opinion simply is not true, as we have seen from the Old Testament examples. They knew God; they knew who God was and they knew what his godhead was made up of. And they surely did not declare or describe it as a plural godhead, that is, a trinity. The emphasis on God being one and his name one and that there is no other is so emphatic that you have to wonder why learned men have looked to other descriptions for what and who God is. In addition to all of that, it was Old Testament writings that the New Testament ministers used to preach the gospel of Christ. The Old Testament is the New Testament concealed. The overwhelming truth from the entire Old Testament is, that: GOD IS ONE.

We could have used many from New Testament writings and their personal relationship with God to further show the makeup of the godhead. But our purpose, which we have stated, was to show that the Old Testament faithful were not at all in the dark as to who God was; what his name was and what his godhead consisted of.

IX. SUMMARY

In this section we will summarize each section with a brief synopsis describing its contents, beginning with:

A. II. HOW DOES GOD REVEAL HIMSELF?

We offered five ways in which God has and does reveal himself to mankind.

- a. He has revealed himself in all of his wonderful creation. The universe with all of its majesty, mystery and organizational marvel, tells us that surely there is a God and he is the one who has created it. The scripture says, "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament shows his handiwork". They say of man that, "he is fearfully and wonderfully made". And Mal. 2:10 declares, "Hath not one God made us"? Indeed the creation reveals to us a sovereign God; omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient.
- b. God has revealed himself by divine theophanies. These are occasions and manners wherein God chooses, for his own purposes, to appear in a form with some similarity to man. An example of this is the story of the furnace of fire into which the three Hebrew children were thrown because they would not bow down to the kings' image. God is certainly capable of appearing in any form he chooses.
- c. God is revealed through the church. I should say that it is God's will that he be revealed through the church. So often the church has not been a revelation of God. Paul told the Corinthian Christians that they were living epistles, known and read of all men. What he meant was that Christians should exemplify the gospel which they have received by the life they live. This same principal is true of the church being a revelation of God. The church should be the place where people come and learn of God. Then they should be made over in his likeness and image, thereby being a true revelation of all that God is. It is through the saving power of the gospel that we can become a new creation, reflecting the nature and likeness of God in all we are.
- d. God is revealed through the Bible. For us today, since we do not have Christ personally with us, the Bible is the sole and final authority of all that God is and wants from us. It tells us about God; who he is and what he is and what his will is. Every concept of God must be measured by the composite revelation of the word of God. We cannot understand God by our own intellect, no matter how learned. We must seek God for him to reveal himself to us, and he does that through the Bible.
- e. God is revealed through Jesus Christ. He is the full, complete revelation of who God is and what he is. In him dwells the fullness of the godhead bodily. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself. All the glory of God was made to shine forth in the face of Jesus Christ. He is the express image of his substance. Jesus Christ was the eternal God in human form. He is the human manifestation of the eternal God. God was manifest in the flesh. Jesus Christ is the everlasting Father, the mighty God. In him we see God and through him we reach God. He is the full revelation of God in a body.

A. III. THERE IS ONLY ONE GOD.

There is only one God – numerically one. This fact is emphasized so clearly and overwhelmingly throughout the entire Bible that it is absolute, conclusive and stands as the benchmark of all divine truth. “Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord”. “There is no God beside me”. “I, even I, am the Lord, and beside me there is no savior”. “We know that there is none other God but one”. “Who shall show in his time who is the blessed and only Potentate, King of Kings and Lord of Lords”. “In the beginning God”. “That men may know, that thou, whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth”. “Thou shalt have no other Gods before me”

There are literally hundreds more such affirmations as those written above all confirming that there is only one God. The only correct, divine conclusion which a fair and comprehensive study of scriptures will lead to is that there is one God – numerically one. The singular way in which God is addressed all through the Bible is so thorough that it leaves no room for any plural application to the godhead. In fact, to be sovereign and omnipotent demands a singular application. If, in fact, there was a plurality of persons in the godhead it would not be possible for each of them to be “all powerful” that is, to possess all power in heaven and in earth. If one held and exercised all power, the only power left for any other “person” would be a delegated power. If you make “all power” a joint possession, applicable to the joint control of the total plurality of persons, then, in such case, you have removed from each “person”, as an individual, the status of being “all powerful” and thus neither would be all powerful or omnipotent. **THERE IS ONE GOD AND GOD IS ONE!**

B. IV. THE GOD OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The works, the claims, the manifestations and exclusive attributes which are ascribed to God, as recorded in the Old Testament, leave no possible support of any formation of the godhead but that he is one. Further, that one, as set forth by all Old Testament testimony, leaves no room for any other to be God or even a part of the godhead. If the God of the Old Testament is not God alone and entirely, then you can completely discount the testimony of the Old Testament and therefore the entire Bible. The God who is manifested throughout Old Testament scripture is, the Holy One, the Just One, the Eternal One, the one creator, one judge, one sovereign, one savior and more. The language does not leave any room or grounds for including a plurality of persons or beings in the godhead. Moreover, in all of the writings, books and presentations about a triune God, I am yet to read even one which deals with the massive amount of biblical evidence revealing that God is one – numerically. That is grossly unfair and erroneous. Every possession of the eternal God, every character, every power, every sovereignty and any other attribute duly belonging to a sovereign, omnipotent God, are claimed by the one, exclusive God of the Old Testament.

C. V. THE NAME OF GOD.

This is without doubt the one most conclusive fact, compared to all others, that leaves no room for a plurality of the godhead. And yet it is also a fact that is grossly overlooked or ignored by plurality supporters. Throughout the Old Testament the name of God is recorded, with all of its exclusive attributes, more than 6000 times. That name is Jehovah. The translators of the King James Bible used

the English word "LORD" for this. No doubt it would have been clearer if they had retained some relevancy of the original, as many more recent translations have done. But the fact remains, translations notwithstanding, that the one and only name of God in the Old Testament is Jehovah. I will repeat only one verse for this (which verse the KJBV preserved the original). Ps. 83:18. "That men may know that thou, whose name alone is JEHOVAH, art the most high over all the earth". The name (not title) of God which is repeated over and over throughout the entire Old Testament over 6000 times is JEHOVAH. Why is this fact ignored? The reason is that theologians just don't know because they have not fairly studied the matter or they will not study it because it will completely eliminate a plurality of the godhead.

When you turn to the New Testament the name of God in the Old Testament, Jehovah, is not found there. That is, it appears not to be found there. However the reality is that the name of Jesus, which fills the New Testament just as the name Jehovah fills the Old Testament is the same. JESUS is JEHOVAH –YASHA, Jehovah-yasha = Jesus. Jehovah of the Old Testament is Jesus of the New Testament. The God of the Old Testament came down to earth as a man to be the savior of the entire world and his name is Jesus.

What a marvelous and phenomenal truth which should cause ever believer in the world to bow in humble adoration unto a God so merciful and loving as to lay aside his eternal, divine glory and become one of us to give his (human) life for the sins of the world. This does not divide God into persons; it honors and glorifies the one God who himself took upon him the seed of Abraham for our salvation. Jehovah, God of the Old Testament, became Jehovah-savior of the New Testament.

God's one and only name, signifying his self-existent being, identifies, distinguishes and absolutely confirms that there is only one God – numerically one – and that name is JESUS.

D. VI. THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE FATHER AND SON

In this chapter we discussed many of the verses of scripture which speak in terms of "God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ". There is a great number of references in the New Testament to the relationship of "FATHER AND SON". Since there is, undeniably, the capacity of a Father and a Son, it is concluded by triune advocates that there simply must be a plurality in the godhead. In other words, as they see it, it is not possible for one being to be both Father and also Son. However that conclusion will not stand biblical scrutiny on two levels. First, I am both a father and a son but there is only one of me. Secondly, and more importantly, God, the eternal Father and creator of the world, could and did become a man through the process of the virgin birth. As the eternal God he is Father; as God as a man, he is the Son. Even triune theology teaches that God became man. So the question becomes, did three separate and distinct persons of the godhead become man or did the one only God become man? We addressed the various components and manners in which the "man Christ Jesus" spoke and acted in a subordinate capacity to "God the Father". All of this dialogue and action between the Father and the Son is a reference to the function of mediator of the man Christ Jesus. If you interpret this to mean a plurality of persons in the godhead, you are faced with a maze of insurmountable questions for which there is no scriptural answers. Jesus distinctly said that "I and my Father are

one". To try to make that mean that the Father and Son "agree as one" is adding to the scripture to accommodate a theological agenda and is completely unacceptable.

Everyone recognizes that God became a man, while remaining God. The only way to maintain the enormous amount of scriptures which emphatically declare that God is one, is to interpret this as the "GOD—MAN", which is exactly the truth. God became a man so as to have a medium (mediator) between God and man, the man Christ Jesus. This is the teaching of the entire New Testament. We can only come to God (deity) through the mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus. There is no other interpretation that will maintain the absolute integrity of scripture and the absolute oneness of God.

E. VII. GOD AS MAN.

One of the greatest truths, if not the greatest of the Bible, is the amazing wonder that the eternal, infinite, sovereign God who created all things, came to earth as a man. Born as a baby of the Virgin Mary and grew up in Nazareth under the varying limitations of a human being. Yet he was God – fully and completely God! The same God who said "let there be light", chose, for the sake of man's only means of redemption to come to earth as the seed of Abraham to give his humanity for our sins. There is no greater truth, for all other truths are contingent upon this one.

He was God – and – He was man. As such there were times he manifested a totally human attribute, and there were times when he manifested his absolute godhood. He was both "Father" and "Son". He walked as a man upon earth, yet he walked upon water as God. He hungered and grew weary, yet he miraculously fed the multitude who themselves were weary. He gave his humanity on the cross for our sins, yet he raised himself from the dead, never to die again. The biblical way to honor both his deity and humanity is not by dividing him into two (or three) persons, but by ascribing to this one being the capacity of both human and divine.

The story of redemption is revealed through the God that could not die, who became a man so that he could die and thereby he could mediate God to all mankind. GOD WAS A MAN, and that man was God.

F. VIII. A PERSONAL RELATIONSHIP WITH GOD.

The primary purpose of this chapter was to show that great patriarchs and faithful people of Old Testament times, through their intimate personal relationship with God, knew God and were not in ignorance as to the makeup of his godhead. The kind and degree of relationship that people like Abraham, David or Isaiah had with God is only possible if God has, indeed, revealed himself to them. Since, as Trinitarian commentators recognize, there is no references or emphasis to a triune God in the Old Testament, then you must conclude that either they had no revelation of this concept of God, or theologians of today have no revelation of who God is. Which begs the question to whom is God better revealed, to Isaiah and Abraham, or to current seminary graduates?

David was a king over Israel, distinctly chosen and anointed by God for such position. However, it was not just to make David a king, but, more importantly, to establish a royal lineage through which God could be born into the world as the “king of glory”. David often spoke of the coming Messiah in prophetic terms, and saw himself as the type of such coming. Only a personal relationship with God could have revealed to him such destiny of his life as king. And that kind of personal relationship with God could only be possible with a revelation as to who and what God was. The Old Testament faithful may have longed for the day when the Messiah would come to bring eternal redemption, but they longed for it because they knew the God who would bring that day. It is undeniable that Old Testament worthies had a personal relationship with God. How could they have a close, personal relationship with a God whom they did not know or could not understand his godhead? Who is going to claim that they have a greater revelation of God than Abraham had? There may have been many things Abraham could not fully see pertaining to the faith he was given to live by. So also it is with us today as well. It is demeaning to Old Testament scriptures and Old Testament saints as well to conclude that they did not know the God who led them on their journey. Even New Testament truth is confirmed by an Old Testament foundation.

IN SUMMARY, GOD, THE SELF-EXISTENT ONE, CREATED THE WORLD; HIS SELF ACCLAIMED NAME IS “JEHOVAH”. THIS SELF-EXISTENT ONE, CAME TO THE WORLD AS A MAN AND HIS NAME IS “JEHOVAH-YASHA”, OR JESUS. HE IS NUMERICALLY ONE.

CH. X. THE TRINITARIAN TESTIMONY OF GOD

a. VARIOUS QUOTES AND COMMENTS.

Throughout this treatise on the godhead I have often made reference to Trinitarian views of the godhead and have even, in some instances, quoted from them. This section will be devoted to a broader reference to the specific view of the godhead by learned proponents of that view. We will basically use quotes from their writings and from commentaries and doctrinal statements, along with my own comments regarding such information as I see fit. I am doing this for two reasons: (1) to show precisely what their understanding and thinking concerning the godhead is; and, (2) to point out where there are inconsistencies and biblical questions regarding the same. I have withheld none of my own personal convictions on this subject and this, justifiably, exposes me to questions and accountability. I think the same degree of responsibility should be expected of the Trinitarian view.

The International Bible Encyclopedia by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., of Grand Rapids, Mich., where a lengthy description of the Trinity is found, will be our first major source of information on this subject. This is a worthy company which will be recognized and accepted by those who support the Trinitarian view of the godhead. We will begin on page 3012 under "TRINITY" with the following quotes and comments, with all quotes provided in capital letters, while comments I offer on the various statements will be in lower case and in parentheses.

"THE TERM TRINITY IS NOT A BIBLICAL TERM, AND WE ARE NOT USING BIBLICAL 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". (They not only recognize that Trinity is not in the Bible, but also that it is not a biblical term, and, further that it is not biblical language when it is used to express this doctrine. Neither does the Bible say that there are "persons" in the godhead and that they are coequal and coeternal.)

"THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY IS GIVEN TO US IN SCRIPTURE NOT IN FORMULATED DEFINITION, BUT IN FRAGMENTED ALLUSIONS". (The doctrine of the Trinity is not given in formulated definition? We have to depend on "fragmented allusions" in order to extract it from scripture and believe it? The Bible does not address any subject in fragmented allusions, most especially the subject of GOD and who he is. Do we have to depend on fragmented allusions in order to understand the resurrection, the crucifixion or the path to eternal life? If so, we are hopeless.

"THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY IS PURELY A REVEALED DOCTRINE. THAT IS TO SAY, IT EMBODIES A TRUTH WHICH HAS NEVER BEEN DISCOVERED AND IS INDISCOVERABLE. (Just think about that statement. It has never been discovered, neither can it be. You know what my response is? "That is exactly what I have been saying all along". There is no such thing as three persons, or a Trinity, in the godhead, so obviously it cannot ever be discovered; it doesn't exist. Let's focus on the statement above that "the Trinity is purely a revealed doctrine". On the one hand it cannot be discovered and on the other hand it is purely a "revealed" doctrine. Just which is it? It sounds so plausible, that is,

that it must be revealed. However they do not mean by “revealed” what you think they mean. This is a statement which is used over and over in all theological writings about the trinity. That is, it is a revealed doctrine. Now I fully concur that the doctrine of the godhead can only be known as God reveals it to us. But I believe this revelation comes through the content of the Bible as the Holy Spirit opens up our understanding when we compare a body of scripture such as is involved in the study of God. In other words, I am saying that God reveals it to the hungry, seeking heart through the specific precepts and written truths of his word and, further, that it is knowable, discoverable and distinctly defined in the countless pages of God’s word. But that is not what they are saying by the necessity of the Trinity being revealed. They are saying that it is not written and declared in definitive language and verses of scripture. Instead, they are saying that as you read all through the Bible, O.T. in particular, you derive an essence from which you are supposed to glean from it a preponderance of your “perception” that there is an “underlying” “suggestion” about a trinity. Is this what we must rely upon as a “revelation” of a doctrine which they contend that you are not a Christian if you don’t believe it, and we have no “discoverable” way to “search the scriptures whether these things are so”? Just take their word for it, inspired writers notwithstanding? If this is their basis for a revelation of the godhead, then their argument of a trinity is over).

“TRIADS OF DIVINITIES, NO DOUBT, OCCUR IN NEARLY ALL POLYTHEISTIC RELIGIONS, FORMED UNDER VARIOUS INFLUENCES. SOMETIMES AS IN THE EGYPT TRIAD OF OSIRIS, ISIS AND HORUS, IT IS THE ANALOGY OF THE HUMAN FAMILY WITH ITS FATHER, MOTHER AND SON WHICH LIES AT THEIR BASIS. SOMETIMES, AS IN THE HINDU TRIAD OF BRAHAMA, VISHNU AND SHIVA, THEY REPRESENT THE CYCLIC MOVEMENT OF A PANTHEISTIC EVOLUTION AND SYMBOLIZE THE THREE STAGES OF BEING, BECOMING AND DISSOLUTION. OF LATE YEARS EYES HAVE BEEN TURNED TO BABYLONIA, AND H. ZIMMERN FINDS A POSSIBLE FORERUNNER OF THE TRINITY IN A FATHER, SON AND INTERCESSOR, WHICH HE DISCOVERS IN ITS MYTHOLOGY. IT SHOULD BE NEEDLESS TO SAY THAT NONE OF THESE TRIADS HAS THE SLIGHTEST RESEMBLANCE TO THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY. AMONG THESE (ATTEMPTS TO RATIONALLY PROVE A TRINITY) THERE ARE TWO WHICH ARE PARTICULARLY ATTRACTIVE, AND HAVE THEREFORE BEEN PUT FORWARD AGAIN AND AGAIN BY SPECULATING THINKERS THROUGH ALL THE CHRISTIAN AGES. THESE ARE DERIVED FROM THE IMPLICATIONS, IN THE ONE CASE, OF SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS, IN THE OTHER, LOVE. BOTH SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS AND LOVE, IT IS SAID, DEMAND FOR THEIR VERY EXISTENCE AN OBJECT OVER AGAINST WHICH THE SELF STANDS AS SUBJECT. IF WE CONCEIVE OF GOD AS SELF-CONSCIOUS AND LOVING, THEREFORE, WE CANNOT HELP CONCEIVING OF HIM AS EMBRACING IN HIS UNITY SOME FORM OF PLURALITY. SO STRONGLY IS IT FELT IN WIDE CIRCLES THAT A TRINITARIAN CONCEPTION IS ESSENTIAL TO A WORTHY IDEA OF GOD, THAT THERE IS ABROAD A DEEP-SEATED UNWILLINGNESS TO ALLOW THAT GOD COULD EVER HAVE MADE HIMSELF KNOWN OTHERWISE THAN AS A TRINITY”. (I hear this saying that since God is self-conscious and loving, that he necessarily must be a plural God. So, if we add to those two, forgiveness, mercy, kindness, generosity, longsuffering, and countless other attributes which God possesses, then, we do, indeed, have a God of endless plurality. Pardon me, but how utterly ridiculous to state that, because God is loving and self-conscious, that he therefore must be a plural God. And that is supposed to be “revelation”? And don’t overlook the reference to “speculating thinkers” and “implications” which we are pointed to in this “revelation” process. And don’t dismiss

the influence of the fact that it is so generally felt that there is a strong and deep-seated unwillingness to allow that God could ever have made himself known otherwise than as a trinity. Since when does a strong and broad public opinion and unwillingness to think of God in any other form than as a trinity, have any weight at all on what the Bible has to say about the matter?)

ACCORDINGLY, I. A. DORNER, REASONS THUS: "IF, HOWEVER A LIVING IDEA OF GOD MUST BE THOUGHT IN SOME WAY AFTER A TRINITARIAN FASHION, IT MUST BE ANTECEDENTLY PROBABLE THAT TRACES OF THE TRINITY CANNOT BE LACKING IN THE O.T". WHETHER THERE REALLY EXIST TRACES OF THE IDEA OF THE TRINITY IN THE O.T., HOWEVER, IS A NICE QUESTION. CERTAINLY WE CANNOT SPEAK BROADLY OF THE REVELATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY IN THE O.T. IT IS A PLAIN MATTER OF FACT THAT ONES WHO HAVE DEPENDED ON THE REVELATION EMBODIED IN THE O.T. ALONE HAVE NEVER ATTAINED TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY. (I. A. Dörner reasons, that there must be "traces" of the idea of a trinity in the O.T., if, in fact, we are to think of God in some way after a Trinitarian fashion._ Then the compilers of the material question this by saying, "whether there really are "traces" of the idea of a trinity in the O.T. is a nice question". Then they proceed to state that they cannot speak broadly of the revelation of the doctrine of the trinity in the O.T., which, in effect, says that their conclusion is that it is not there. Then they follow that with this: "It is a plain matter of fact that ones who have depended on the revelation embodied in the O.T. have never attained to the doctrine of the trinity". I want my readers to consider what this says. It says that you cannot study the O.T. and find (even a trace) of the doctrine of the trinity. Do they not know that every word of God is inspired by the Holy Ghost, O.T. and N.T? Do they not know that every single writer of the N.T. had no scriptures from which to preach Christ except the O.T? Even Jesus used the O.T. to preach from. If it isn't in the O.T., it isn't in the Bible or God's total will. The N.T. is the O.T. revealed. To say that the studious reading of the O.T. will not reveal God, who he is and what he is, is a revelation within itself; a revelation that one does not understand the composite makeup of the entire word of God. It also says that for one to read and study the O.T. and not be able to find volumes about God, his being, his attributes, his name, his oneness and more, has a very serious problem in their personal relationship with God. And Christians are supposed to believe a doctrine which they propound and which they contend is the absolute truth of God, but of which they cannot find even traces of their doctrine in the O.T. So we can, effectively, toss the entire O.T. scriptures insofar as the subject of God is concerned: He just didn't reveal himself there. It sounds more like the fact that theologians, in studying the O.T., can see how thoroughly and voluminous God is revealed therein as one divine being and not a trinity, and therefore they must circumvent its plain and repetitive truths or their hoary tradition has an insurmountable problem. Now notice the next quote).

THE TENDENCY OF MORE RECENT AUTHORS IS TO APPEAL, NOT SO MUCH TO SPECIFIC TEXTS OF THE O.T. AS TO THE VERY "ORGANISM OF REVELATION" IN THE O.T., IN WHICH THERE IS PERCEIVED AN UNDERLYING SUGGESTION THAT ALL THINGS OWE THEIR EXISTENCE AND PERSISTENCE TO A THREEFOLD CAUSE. (Trinitarian theologians would have you to believe that you don't go to the "specific text" of O.T. scripture to learn the meaning, especially as it relates to who God is and what his godhead is. It is better, they say, to appeal to the "organism of revelation in the O.T.", whatever that might be. That is, they seem to be saying there is no need to read the O.T. thinking you can find

out directly from its pages what God is. You just read it, and totally apart from its specific textual wording, you will gain an “organism of revelation”, which you will then not be able to go back to the actual text and verify your “organism of revelation”. If that is what they are saying, and I think that it is, then the best advice would be to discard such “organism of revelation” as pure intellectual imaginations? And don’t forget that I pointed out that when they speak of “revelation”, they are not referring to specific truth as revealed from specific texts of scripture, but an “essence” of what you feel you have gleaned from it. Now cap this inability to find out God in the O.T. with the following).

THE UPSHOT OF IT ALL IS THAT IT IS VERY GENERALLY FELT THAT, SOMEHOW, IN THE O.T. DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA OF GOD THERE IS A SUGGESTION THAT THE DEITY IS NOT A SIMPLE MONAD, AND THAT THUS A PREPARATION IS MADE FOR THE REVELATION OF THE TRINITY YET TO COME. IT WOULD SEEM CLEAR THAT WE MUST RECOGNIZE IN THE O.T. DOCTRINE OF THE RELATION OF GOD TO HIS REVELATION BY THE CREATIVE WORD AND THE SPIRIT, AT LEAST THE GERM OF THE DISTINCTIONS IN THE GODHEAD AFTERWARD FULLY MADE KNOWN IN THE CHRISTIAN REVELATION. (In this portion of quote, we are asked to rely on our “feelings”, “somehow”, “suggestions”, “preparations” and what “seems” to be, even if we want to find as much as a “germ” of the doctrine of the trinity in the O.T. But listen now to the next quote).

WE CANNOT SPEAK OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY, THEREFORE, IF WE STUDY EXACTNESS OF SPEECH, AS REVEALED IN THE N.T., ANY MORE THAN WE CAN SPEAK OF IT AS REVEALED IN THE O.T. THE O.T. WAS WRITTEN BEFORE ITS REVELATION; THE N.T. AFTER IT. (This is not a misquotation. It says that you cannot read either the O.T. or the N.T. and find in the specific text of scripture the revelation of the Trinity. The reason is, they say, that one was written before the revelation and the other after!! So if we cannot depend on the specific, exact text of either O.T. or N.T. to reveal God to us, where do we go from there? We must have to go back to our “feelings, suggestions, somehow, seems, and germs” to obtain an “essence” for an “organism of revelation”. What are those often quoted verses of scripture found in Jn. 5:39 and Jn. 8:32? “Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me”. “And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free”. I believe it is much safer and a more solid foundation to depend on the specific text of God’s word than any of the discombobulated rambling of theologians. Any doctrine that is not specifically revealed in the written text of both the O.T. and the N.T., combined, is a false doctrine. From the quotes we have thus far provided, there is no doubt which source of eternal truth we should depend on.

I have given several quotes derived from the “THE INTERNATIONAL BIBLE ENCYCLOPEDIA”. There is much more there, but what we have considered shows the thrust of the understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity as offered therein.

Next, I would like to draw a few quotes from the LEWIS SPERRY CHAFER SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY, a work of considerable depth and reputation on the subject at hand. Dr. Chafer, among other things is a late President and Professor of systematic Theology at Dallas Theological Seminary. His work on systematic theology shows much learning and skill on the subject of which he writes. I am sure that his views on the doctrine of the Trinity are highly respected among all those who agree with that

doctrine. In no way do I compare myself with Dr. Chafer. I do, however, have a strong difference of opinion regarding the doctrine of the godhead. Let us look at some of his declarations of faith.

Our focus is primarily on Vols. 1 & 2, beginning at page 262.

THE PRIMARY O.T. TITLES DO NOT PRESENT AN INDIVIDUALIZED REVELATION OF THREE PERSONS, BUT RATHER THREE CHARACTERIZING REALITIES WITHIN THE GODHEAD. (And what are those three characterizing realities? He does not say. Rationally speaking, when you consider realities that characterize God, there surely are vastly more than three).

THE NAME JEHOVAH EXHIBITS THE INNERMOST DEPTHS OF THE DIVINE BEING. (Indeed it does, since it is the only name of God given over 6000 times in the O.T. The name means or references “the self-existent God”).

Then he says: **THE NAME ELOHIM, BEING PLURAL IN ITS FORM, INTIMATES THE FACT OF THREE PERSONS”. (In the first place, Elohim is not a name, it is a title. It is a fact that the word elohim has a plural use, depending on that use and the context of its use. I have already dealt with this at length earlier in this treatise. The word elohim applies to all gods and gods many. It also is used to designate the God, but always with a text or context that requires a singular application. In fact, in its multitude of uses in the O.T., when applicable to GOD, the overwhelming and absolute use of the word is for a singular use. Further, even if you allow the word in its plural form to be applied to GOD, there is absolutely nothing in its “plurality” to confine it to three or three hundred).**

Nevertheless he continues (p266): **‘THIS THESIS PROCEEDS ON THE BASIS OF THE ANCIENT AND WORTHY BELIEF THAT THE TRINITY OF PERSONS IS IMPLIED IN THE PLURAL NAME ELOHIM. (In such case, we can just as well conclude on the basis of ancient belief of Pagans, that the name “implies” any god you wish to choose. But no matter how you construe the word, it does not say there are three persons in the godhead).**

DEUTERONOMY 6:4 IS A PASSAGE OF GREAT IMPORTANCE IN THE PRESENT DISCUSSION, “HEAR, O ISRAEL: JEHOVAH OUR GOD (ELOHIM) IS ONE JEHOVAH.” PERHAPS THE KEY WORD TO THE MEANING OF THIS PASSAGE IS ‘ehadh, HERE TRANSLATED ONE”. THIS WORD, OFTEN FOUND IN THE O.T. TEXT, IS NEVERTHELESS SOMEWHAT SPECIFIC IN ITS MEANING. WHILE IT IS USED MANY TIMES WITH PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON THE DISTINCT SOLIDARITY OF THE THING REPRESENTED, IT IS THE WORD UNIVERSALLY USED WHEN A THING IS IN VIEW WHICH IS COMPOUNDED OUT OF UNIFIED PARTS, AS, “THEY TWO SHALL BE ONE FLESH”. IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO PROVE THAT EHADH AS USED IN THE PASSAGE IN QUESTION REPRESENTS UNIFICATION OF PARTS, WHICH IN THIS CASE WOULD INDICATE THAT THE PLURALITY IN THE GODHEAD IS ONE ESSENCE”. (Apparently God was so incapable of inspiring scripture text so as to make it mean what it says, that theologians have to find “loop holes” so as to circumvent what it’s obvious and apparent meaning is. This is a case in point. Sure, husband and wife are to be one flesh and “one” does have applications whereby something with parts is considered to be one. But God is not a “husband – wife unity. Note also, in this quote that he knows that he cannot use “one” in this case to prove more than one. I think you call that “fuzzy” math.

“RECOGNIZING THAT THE WORD TRINITY IS NOT FOUND IN THE SACRED TEXT AND THAT THE DOCTRINE WHICH IT REPRESENTS IS NOT DIRECTLY TAUGHT THEREIN, DR. W. LINDSAY ALEXANDER STATES: BUT THOUGH A TRUTH BE NOT FORMALLY ENUNCIATED IN SCRIPTURE, IT MAY BE SO IMPLIED IN THE STATEMENTS OF SCRIPTURE THAT IT BECOMES THE PROPER AND NECESSARY EXPRESSION OF THESE STATEMENTS. IN THIS CASE THE DOCTRINE IS A CONCLUSION DRAWN INDUCTIVELY FROM WHAT SCRIPTURE ANNOUNCES”. (First of all, there is an admission that the doctrine of the trinity is not formally enunciated in scripture. Then, the idea expressed is that there are statements made throughout scripture from which you can “imply” that the doctrine is “somehow” present in the amassing of scriptures. In such case, he continues, the doctrine is a conclusion drawn “inductively” from what scripture announces. Induction or inductively, means an “inference of a generalized conclusion from particular instances”, or “a conclusion arrived at by induction”. In other words you read a lot of scripture and you conclude that a trinity is found somewhere in all of them even though there is no mention of it whatever. At what exact point in this process of induction can you know and safely conclude that you have received the proper revelation that there is a trinity, since you cannot verify it by specific scriptural enunciation? And that is what Trinitarian theologians are basing their doctrine on? I prefer the only safe method, an absolute dependence upon exactly what scriptures have to say. You don’t base your Christian doctrine on an “induction” process; you base it upon the process known as “scripture divinely inspired by the Holy Spirit”, directly, emphatically, overwhelmingly and uncompromisingly available in the abundance of scriptural text).

“THOUGH NO FINITE MIND HAS EVER COMPREHENDED HOW THREE PERSONS MAY FORM BUT ONE ESSENCE THAT PRECISE TRUTH IS THE TESTIMONY OF ALL PARTS OF THE BIBLE. IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO DEFINE THESE DISTINCTIONS AND ALL THEY IMPLY. NO DOUBT THERE IS A DISTINCT CONSCIOUSNESS WHICH IDENTIFIES EACH PERSON. THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY IS DRAWN WHOLLY FROM REVELATION. THE DOCTRINE AS PRESENTED IN THE SCRIPTURES IS THEREFORE BELIEVABLE IF NOT EXPLICABLE. THE HOW OF ANY SUPERHUMAN REALITY IS NOT, AND PROBABLY COULD NOT BE, APPREHENDED BY THE FINITE MIND. IT IS ENOUGH TO KNOW FROM A TRUSTWORTHY SOURCE THAT IT REALLY DOES EXIST. DEAN SMITH: “GOD COMMANDS US TO BELIEVE THERE IS A UNION AND THERE IS A DISTINCTION; BUT WHAT THAT UNION IS OR WHAT THAT DISTINCTION IS ALL MANKIND ARE EQUALLY IGNORANT; AND MUST CONTINUE SO, AT LEAST TILL THE DAY OF JUDGMENT. --- BUT THIS UNION AND DISTINCTION ARE A MYSTERY UTTERLY UNKNOWN TO MANKIND”. (The content of this quote is repeated often in theological writings of Trinitarian proponents. What they appear to be saying is, that there are three distinct persons in the godhead, and that scripture does not enunciate this in clear, textual content; which means that we must accept the fact that it is implied in all the parts of the Bible and inductively receive it. The reason being that no one has or ever will be able to understand or explain it: you just accept it. Which I would interpret to mean that they have no absolute proof of a trinity or three persons in the godhead, but advise that we must be among that company of people who are unwilling to accept that God cannot exist except in a three-fold subsistence, regardless of the fact that specific scriptural definition of such does not exist. This is exactly the same manner in which the church of the dark ages kept people from reading and studying the Bible. It is too deep for the average human to comprehend, so you must leave it to the priests to

interpret and apply it for you because if you don't you are anathema. Therefore don't expect to understand how there are three persons in the godhead; that cannot be. I would be among the first to uphold the idea that the only way to "know God", who he is and what he is, rests completely upon the specific revelation of this by the Holy Spirit, through the medium of the Bible. But I would also contend that he can reveal (make it known) to a humble fisherman; a man watching sheep in the desert of Midian or some hungry, though unlearned soul, seeking God's word for truth. And it won't be revealed through the sum of its parts but through the direct statements of God's own holy word. God is just that capable and has said that all shall know me from the least to the greatest. The godhead is not an "essence" of parts but is one sovereign being who will have no other before him).

"THE PROOF OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TINITY IS WRITTEN LARGE IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH. THE CONCLUSION OF THE CHURCH AS TO THE TEACHING OF THE BIBLE CONCERNING RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN THE GODHEAD IS WELL STATED BY HERMANN VENEMA IN HIS *INSTITUTES OF THEOLOGY*: " WE SAY THAT THERE ARE THREE SUBSISTENCIES, TRULY AND PROPERLY SO-CALLED, WHO ARE MUTUALLY DISTINCT – EACH POSSESSED OF INTELLIGENCE, SUBSISTING BY ITSELF AND NOT COMMUNICATED OR COMMUNICABLE TO THE OTHERS, WHOM WE CALL PERSONS. WE SAY MOREOVER, THAT THE THREE PERSONS PARTAKING OF ONE AND THE SAME ESSENCE STAND IN CLOSE RELATION TO EACH OTHER – THE SECOND PERSON BEING FROM THE FIRST AND THE THIRD FROM THE FIRST AND SECOND. THIS RELATION IS IMPLIED IN THE NAMES FATHER, SON AND SPIRIT – THE FATHER BEING THE SOURCE OF THE ONE ESSENCE WHICH IS PARTAKEN OF BY THE OTHER TWO. THIS PARTICIPATION OF ESSENCE, IN REFERENCE TO THE SON, IS CALLED GENERATION – AND, IN REFERENCE TO THE SPIRIT, PROCESSION. SUCH IS A SIMPLE AND, AS FAR AS WE CAN ATTAIN TO IT, A CLEAR EXPLANATION OF THE MYSTERY OF THE TRINITY". P. 285-286. THE ATHANASIAN CREED: THE CATHOLIC FAITH IS THAT WE VENERATE ONE GOD IN TRINITY, AND TRINITY IN UNITY, NEITHER CONFOUNDING THE PERSONS NOR SEPARATING THE SUBSTANCE. THE PERSON OF THE FATHER IS ONE, OF THE SON ANOTHER, OF THE HOLY SPIRIT ANOTHER. BUT THE DIVINITY OF FATHER, SON AND SPIRIT IS ONE, THEIR GLORY EQUAL, COETERNAL THEIR MAJESTY THE FATHER IS NEITHER MADE, NOR CREATED, NOR BEGOTTEN: THE SON IS FROM THE FATHER ALONE, NOT MADE, NOR CREATED, BUT BEGOTTEN: THE HOLY SPIRIT IS FROM THE FATHER AND THE SON, NOT MADE, NOR CREATED, NOR BEGOTTEN, BUT PROCEEDING. ---- THAT THE FATHER GENERATES THE SON, ETC., AND BREATHES THE SPIRIT; THAT THE SON IS BEGOTTEN OF THE FATHER, AND WITH THE FATHER BREATHES THE SPIRIT; THAT THE SPIRIT PROCEEDETH FROM THE FATHER AND THE SON". (WOW! Like Isaac to Jacob: How hast thou found it so quickly? How?, because it was goat meat and not real venison. Pun intended. Is God so abstract, conglomerated and vague that we must use craftily formed words and terminologies in an attempt to explain and understand him, all the while mixing the terms in such a manner that the poor child of God must languish in a labyrinth of theology which at best is some form of an essence which must be acquired by a process of induction, none of which, by the Trinitarian's own admission, is specifically enunciated in textual scripture, but is a derivative of a perceived message obtained from revelation which is no more than an opinion formed by those who are unwilling to accept God in any form but in a Trinity? The Father "generates" the Son and "breathes" the Spirit and the Spirit "proceedeth from the Father and the Son"? What happened to their claim that they were coequal, coeternal, God of very God? Now one person is generated by another person

while the third person proceeds from the first two? With all the vehemence I possess I declare that this is no more than man-made theology which is unscriptural and unworthy of the great name of God. In matter of fact, if one of the three persons is generated by another person and a third person “proceedeth” from the other two, then the unavoidable conclusion, based upon this totally unscriptural language which they have employed, is, that you have two persons which are not eternal, but in fact, have a point of beginning. Thus, they are in no sense – God. I must say it: the very idea of one of the three persons being generated by or proceeding from the others is preposterous. Either all three persons have an eternal existence equal to each other with absolutely no dependence of such existence upon another, or all three disintegrates into oblivion).

While reviewing the writings found in Eerdman’s “International Bible Encyclopedia” and Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer’s “Systemic Theology” on the doctrine of the Trinity, we encountered a large variety of vague and unacceptable terms or expressions in an effort on their part to explain the doctrine. Because these terms or words are diffused over many pages, I feel that it would help us focus more completely on their use if they were brought together in a manner where their impact can be more obvious. Thus we offer the following congregating of many of these terms.

1. They refer to **FRAGMENTED ALLUSIONS** of scripture.
2. They employ **SPECULATING THINKERS** in the process of verification.
3. They say the O.T. only has **TRACES** of the doctrine of the trinity.
4. They define a revealed doctrine as one that has **NEVER BEEN DISCOVERED AND IS INDISCOVERABLE**. But a revelation is a “making known”.
5. They speak of “**UNDERLYING PERCEIVED SUGGESTIONS**” as explaining the trinity.
6. The doctrine of the trinity is not **DIRECTLY TAUGHT IN THE O.T.**
7. The process of **INDUCTION** is how you obtain the doctrine of the trinity in the O.T.
8. They acknowledge that **EXACTNESS OF SPEECH OF THE TRINITY IS NOT IN THE O.T. OR N.T.**
9. The doctrine is not **ENUNCIATED IN SCRIPTURE BUT IS IMPLIED THEREIN**.
10. They speak often of **SUBSISTENCIES OR SUBSISTENCE**, which refers to the living existence of 3 persons.
11. They state that the 3 persons are **NOT COMMUNICATED OR COMMUNICABLE** to each other.
12. They state that **THE SCRIPTURES ASSUME THE TRIUNE MODE OF EXISTENCE OF DEITY**.
13. **ESSENCE** is a word used repeatedly in Trinitarian language. It is an attempt to explain that, while there are three distinct persons, yet in **ESSENCE** they are one. Stated frankly, this says that any “**oneness**”, such as “one God” relating to the trinity is only a “**oneness**” derived by or in **ESSENCE** with each other. It’s the old wording of being 3 but agreeing as one. The real problem with this is that **GOD** is not an **ESSENCE** of anything: He self exists.
14. **ELOHIM** is another word heavily relied upon to prove a plurality of persons. I have treated on this word at length in this treatise, to which I refer you. Trinitarians are taking this word which has both a plural or singular meaning, depending on its use, text and context, and trying to prove a plurality of persons in the godhead thereby. When you refer to many gods, the word is **elohim**; when you refer to the one, only God, the word used is **elohim**. The text and context will define the difference.

15. After numerous pages of writing at length on all areas of the trinity, I find it extremely unusual and very insufficient, that you never find a full comparison of scripture with scripture. This is especially egregious when there is so much scripture on the subject of God, his name, his numerical status and every other attribute. Instead it is page after page of theological terms and explanations, without a thorough scriptural analysis. Then to make the statement that the scriptures, O.T. and N.T. do not directly enunciate (explain) a 3 person trinity (#8 & 9 above), is, in my opinion fatal to their doctrine.
16. The N.T. is filled with expressions about the Father and the Son, with a constant view of the “subordinated” posture of the Son to the Father. I dwelt on this fact at length in this treatise because it is relevant to the study of God and must be addressed. I explained this kind of scripture as relating to the human and divine natures and also as the work of mediator of Christ, and yet as produced by one being who was both God and man. The Trinitarians claim to also believe in the two natures of Christ, so why did they not use this reality which so thoroughly permeates the N.T.? Maybe it is because that to do so would serve to diminish or destroy the idea of 3 persons, which it, in fact does.
17. Allow me to offer my own observations in a particular area involving “three persons”. If, in fact, there are three coequal, coeternal, co-omnipotent beings, there is no way to avoid there being three deities or Gods. As much and as vehemently as Trinitarians contest this fact, yet it is an unavoidable reality. If each person is absolute God in subsistence, all their denial and all of the employment of terms such as “essence”, “agreement”, “unity” and “substance-sharing”, etc., are mere window dressing, a façade. You cannot claim these attributes and also demand that there be “three persons”, “distinctiveness”, “individuality”, “non-communicable”, “separate functionality” and still be numerically one. Further, if you have three persons, each possessing individual omnipotence you have, in reality, three deities or Gods. If each person is not individually omnipotent, then you have no God at all. You cannot combine partial omnipotence of each to obtain complete omnipotence. In fact, I doubt there can be such a thing as partial omnipotence, and no such thing as shared omnipotence. Thus there is no such thing possible as three persons, each being “very God”, without the result being three Gods. The same is true of the possession of sovereignty. There can be no such thing as three persons, each with individual sovereignty. Sovereignty, of its very distinction must be vested in one – numerically. No doubt but on this point the Trinitarian will respond that you can have a “sovereign board of directors” etc. And that is exactly the condition I am inferring that they have: a board or group or “persons” in whom or in which sovereignty is “vested”. However no one (numerically) of such group or “persons” has any claim to sovereignty. In the case of GOD you cannot divide sovereignty between three persons with each sharing equally. With GOD you are not discussing earthly, delegated or shared sovereignty; you are referring to the absolute ruler of the universe. There can be no “shared” sovereignty in such case. This is where the Trinitarian use of the terms “essence”, “induction” and “subsistence”, etc. come into use. The only “oneness” or one God which they describe is one in essence; not one numerically. That is a position which I would describe as being completely unscriptural.

18. In an attempt to explain and describe the “three persons” of the Trinity, Dr. D. James Kennedy uses the analogy of the universe. No doubt but what the universe is the handiwork of the God who created it. But Dr. Kennedy’s analogy is drawn from the scientific demonstration that the universe consists of three separate and distinct items. They are: space, time and matter no more and no less, Dr. Kennedy reminds us. And I have no question with the scientific accuracy of this statement. However I do have serious questions about it being a proof that there are three persons in the godhead. First, the universe is a creation of God and as such has a beginning. Thus it does not reflect, as he says, the fingerprint of God. Secondly, each of these, space, time and matter have definite limitations. Here again, this is not representative of the God who created the universe. Thirdly, there is nowhere in scripture where we are directed to compare and understand God by the components of the universe. God also made the pine tree which consists of bark, body and sap. It is a created object and one property without the other and you don’t have a pine tree. Neither does the Bible compare God to a pine tree. All of this probably offers good scientific models for God; but they do not offer, even in the least, a scriptural model.

19. The resources which we have quoted herein, which we feel sure the vast majority of churches would endorse, have also called upon history in their support of the doctrine of the trinity. I have no position against the use of history as a means of tracing the events, people and powers which have impacted this doctrine. I am of the opinion, however, that history is not all that favorable to the doctrine of the trinity. Let us briefly review some accounts of the past to see just what it has to say to us today.

To begin with I will use one example which Dr. Chafer’s Systematic Theology referenced, that of St. Augustine. With all of the veneration placed in Augustine, it should not be overlooked that he, too, was an advocate, whether willingly or not, of the decline into pagan beliefs as much of the rest of his generation and following certainly was. One example was his testimony of belief in miracles being wrought by departed saints. This was a practice that was wide spread but certainly of no scriptural authority.

It is everywhere recognized the impact which the Council of Nicea had on the doctrine of the godhead. This council was held in 325 AD. The Roman Emperor Constantine, who had made what historians refer to as a very questionable conversion to Christianity, presided over this council. The problem seemed to be over whether or not Jesus was divine or if he was only human with no divine nature. The outcome of the conference was the establishing of the core position of the Trinitarian doctrine as it is today. The Holy Spirit, as a person of the godhead, did not get much attention until a later council. Regardless as to whether you think this is where the Trinitarian view got started or if you think it originated with the apostles, the fact remains that the fundamental declaration of the Trinitarian belief became solidly fixed in the rules of much of the existing church at that time. The only problem, as every historian writes, is that this was the age when “baptized paganism” was the description given to the church of that day.

Following this, in 529 AD, the Emperor Justinian revised all Roman law, both civil and ecclesiastical. In this revision two very major things took place. First, he made it Roman law that the only state recognized religion was the church. He made it a point of law that the

doctrine of the trinity was the only authorized and acceptable doctrine of the godhead, with any other excluded and with absolutely no privilege to promulgate any deviation from the trinity. In addition and at the same time, he declared that the "Holy See of Rome", was vested with all spiritual authority. Thus the power of the Roman church ruled from there throughout the dark ages. She was the advocate and enforcer of the Trinitarian doctrine.

When the reformation came along, most protestant organizations carried on the doctrine of the trinity as it is still today.

There is neither time nor space to go into detail of the history of the church as it relates to this doctrine. Suffice it to say that such history has had some very unsavory company. However, history is not the authority over the doctrine of God, whether good or bad, Trinitarian or Oneness. The only rule acceptable for this very vital subject is the Bible. It is more than a capable and verifiable resource and any other source which does not conform to the Biblical text is unacceptable.

There is so much more that we would like to include from the writings of Trinitarian theologians, which time and space do not justify.

20. MT. 28:19. GO YE THEREFORE AND TEACH ALL NATIONS, BAPTIZING THEM IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER AND OF THE SON AND OF THE HOLY GHOST:

We have not commented on this passage of scripture throughout this entire treatise on the godhead. In all of the prominent writings by Trinitarians, they will invariably depend upon this passage of scripture as the cornerstone of their doctrine. This passage is, to the Trinitarian, the final, absolute proof that there are three distinct persons in the godhead. They are sure that the only reason the Lord used this expression in this manner was to affirm to everyone that there are three persons of the godhead. Never mind that the subject of the godhead, by their own admission, is not what this passage is about. They are sure that the fact that a "FATHER, A SON, AND A HOLY SPIRIT" are mentioned here serves as overwhelming proof of the doctrine of the trinity.

We are going to take a good look at this passage of scripture to see if that really is what it is telling us. This verse gives divine instruction for baptism to be administered in the "NAME" of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. We have emphasized at great length the name of God, both O.T. and N.T. We have also pointed out the difference in a title versus a name, even though this should be obvious. The name of God is so overwhelmingly emphasized in the Bible, that there is no real reason to mistake its absolute identity. Words like husband, king, son, father, judge, president, prophet, apostle, Holy Spirit, etc., are all titles, not names. The interesting point here is that one person or one being can have several title designations. For example, I am a husband, a son, a father, a minister, etc., but there is only one of me by any definition of rational thinking.

The passage of scripture in question commands us to baptize in the "NAME"; singular. That is, in the one name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. Father is not a name; Son is not a name, and Holy Spirit is not a name. They are all three titles of position. One is a Father; one is a Son; and one is the Holy Spirit. This raises the question: What is the name of the Father. The answer the Trinitarian will give is something such as: God, God the Father; Almighty God, etc.; neither of which is a name but a title of position. Next question: What is

the name of the Son? The immediate answer by the Trinitarian and all others is: JESUS. This is obviously correct. But why could the Trinitarian not give a proper name for the Father and for the Holy Spirit? The answer is because there is only one being in the godhead and his name is JESUS. (If you are reading from the O.T., his name is JEHOVAH). They are one and the same. Jehovah is the one eternal God who became a man, while remaining God, and as such he was called Jesus, not because he was a different being but because it is being translated from a different language and also because he has now become our savior (yasha).

The one name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit is Jesus. Of course Trinitarians will go into orbit over this but that does not change the truth. Even the Trinitarian will answer the question as to what is the name of the Son, by declaring that it is: JESUS. Why don't we just call the one who bled and died for our sins, "SON"; that is what the Trinitarian does with this passage of scripture? The name of the Everlasting Father (Is. 9:6) is Jesus; the name of the Spirit of the mighty God (Is. 9:6) is Jesus, and the name of the Son is Jesus. They are not three persons but three titles of the one, eternal and mighty God, who came to this earth in the form of a man, the only begotten Son.

Now the real subject matter of this verse of scripture is water baptism. Without going into great detail on this subject, let's just make a few simple observations to confirm what I have written above about this passage of scripture. First, no one can produce a single verse of scripture suggesting or proving that a single N.T. convert anywhere was ever baptized using the Trinitarian baptismal formula. It just is not in the Bible. Secondly, every single N.T. record of water baptism where the baptismal name is mentioned, it is always, without exception, in the name of Jesus. After all, the name of Jesus is the highest name in heaven or earth given among men by which salvation can be obtained and whatever we do in word or deed is commanded to be done in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. The only way to fulfill Mt. 28:19 is to baptize in the (singular) name of the Lord Jesus Christ. **INSTEAD OF MT. 28:19 BEING THE MAJOR PROOF OF A TRINITARIAN GOD WITH THREE DISTINCT PERSONS, IT IS EXACTLY THE OPPOSITE. THE ONE NAME OF FATHER, SON AND HOLY SPIRIT IS JESUS. THEREFORE WHAT THIS SCRIPTURE DOES IS PROVIDE UNQUESTIONABLE VERIFICATION THAT JESUS IS THE TRUE GOD AND ETERNAL LIFE!**

Ch. XI. CONCLUSION

Having already given a summary of the different chapters of this treatise, we will use this ‘Conclusion’ section to do just that: present the conclusions we have herein arrived at.

First of all, the paramount conclusion embraced in all that we have presented is the fact of ONE DEITY in every degree of numerical consideration, leaving absolutely no possibility of any form of a distinct plurality within the godhead. An omnipotent, sovereign being cannot, of its very distinction and possession of such attributes, be, in any sense, divided into a plurality of persons.

A second and equally conclusive reality of this one God is his one name. Throughout scripture his singular, self-existent name, with thousands of undeniable scriptural references, lauded, hallowed and glorified as his alone, is JEHOVAH – JESUS. That is, Jehovah in O.T. language and Jesus in N.T. language – yet one and the same God. The scriptures of both O.T. and N.T. are so repetitive, absolute and revealing about God’s name that we can unequivocally declare this name as the single best and most absolute proof of the fact of one divine being of the godhead. This is the one name – not title – which is above every name which is named in heaven and in earth and is the only name in which there is salvation. No other name in the universe qualifies to be the embodiment of self-existence and the embodiment of savior: JESUS = JEHOVAH – YASHA.

Another conclusion we can uncompromisingly draw from this study is the phenomenal and marvelous condescension of the one and only eternal and mighty God, from his sovereign, invisible being to become a man – visible and dependent upon his deity. This he has done out of his great love and unquenchable desire to reconcile sinful, fallen man back unto himself by the sacrifice of his humanity at Calvary. Thus, we have concluded that God was both God and man – acting or functioning in both human and divine capacities – yet being one and the same being. God came to save us – all there is of God – not just a third of God – came to save us. God died as a human and yet God raised his lifeless humanity from the grave for our hope. And it is God who will return to reward his children with everlasting life. God – as deity – is from eternity to eternity. God as a man was begotten in the womb of the Virgin Mary – and they called him Immanuel, which by interpretation is God with us.

We discussed at some length the numerous expressions in the N.T. such as: God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ; the subordinate relationship of the Son to the Father; the Son praying to the Father and the Son on the right hand of the Father, etc. We concluded these numerous accounts of such relationship to be the work of redeeming grace through the MEDIATORIAL office and function by which fallen man may again be united in covenant relationship with God – through our Lord Jesus Christ. These expressions do not describe plural persons of the godhead; they demonstrate the relational function of the GOD—MAN. Even the Trinitarian view is that God became man, and as man, was the mediator between God and men. This human capacity of mediator, therefore, necessitates language that, on the one hand is God speaking and, on the other hand is his manhood speaking. This fact, of God becoming and being man, necessarily results in expressions that show the fatherhood of his deity and the manhood of his humanity. In no way does this require or suggest a division of being into persons of the godhead. God – through his manhood – mediates God to man. There is no other

scriptural or rational explanation for such expressions as: “God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ”. God (was) the Father AND (God was) the Lord Jesus Christ. The only alternative to this conclusion is that the man Christ Jesus was man (only) with no divine component or capacity which is what some denominations teach.

Our conclusion is that, the one, eternal, almighty God, himself, became a man and as such he functioned in both capacities of God and man. And his name is Jesus.

We consumed several pages quoting from Trinitarian published writings of their explanation of their view of the godhead. The first and most serious question regarding their description of the godhead is that they do not rely on the enormous amount of scripture texts to explain their view. In fact their exact admission is “you cannot use exactness of speech in describing the Trinity. From this admission they proceed to philosophize with an abundance of vague non-biblical expressions, illustrations and definitions which only increase the enigma of the Trinitarian doctrine. Expressions such as “revelation” – but not from direct scriptural text but as an “essence” are used to describe God as a Trinity. By “revelation” or “essence” they mean a derivative or result of Triune actions; not specific scriptural verses. Other expressions used to describe Trinitarian conclusions are “induction”, “speculative thinking”, “time, matter and space which are components of the universe, traces, underlying suggestions, assumptions – and – even “three persons and trinity”, are admittedly, non-scriptural expressions.

God as one is not an essence of “three persons” or for that matter anything else. God is the one and only self-existent, sovereign of the universe. He is identified, clearly and unquestionably as “JEHOVAH” under O.T. language, and as “JESUS” under N.T. language.

GOD IS NUMERICALLY ONE.

HE ALONE IS THE OMNIPOTENT SOVEREIGN OF THE UNIVERSE.

GOD AS THE ETERNAL FATHER BECAME A MAN BY THE “ONLY BEGOTTEN” PROCESS AND THUS THE FATHER WAS THE SON (IS. 9:6).

AS A MAN, GOD SACRIFICED HIS HUMANITY FOR THE SINS OF THE WORLD.

GOD RAISED HIS OWN HUMANITY FROM THE GRAVE.

HIS NAME THROUGH OUT ALL AGES IS: JESUS – THE SELF-EXISTENT SAVIOR.

GOD – AS MAN – NOW MEDIATES REDEMPITIVE RECONCILIATION BETWEEN SINFUL MAN AND DEITY.

AND GOD, EVEN THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, WILL RETURN TO THE EARTH FOR THE ULTIMATE REWARD FOR HIS PEOPLE OF ETERNAL LIFE AND WE SHALL LIVE ETERNALLY WITH HIM.

THIS DOCUMENT PREPARED BY:

Tommy Blanton

5030 Willard Rd.

Willard, N.C. 28478

910-285-3802

St.blanton79@gmail.com

5-28-13

"COPY RIGHTS".

Anyone may freely copy any part of this treatise on the godhead, providing that:

- 1. There are no changes in its wording or content without written consent.**
- 2. That there is no monetary exchange in the process.**
- 3. No other claim of ownership or other contribution is attached to such copying.**

“ADDENDUM”

TO THE STUDY OF

“GOD”

The study of “GOD” is inexhaustible. For that reason it is a frequent occurrence that additional thoughts and verses of scripture come to our attention which should be incorporated in it. This “ADDENDUM” section will provide a place to add these, making them an integral part of the overall document. Inasmuch as these additions have no specific or anticipated terminus, the entire document thereby becomes a “living work”, open for appropriate additions, applicable to any previous section at any time. Hopefully this will provide for the continual extended growth and strengthening of the entire document. For this reason this addendum will be positioned after the signature page of the original document, thereby allowing for either its inclusion with or separation from the document itself. The addendum items will each be sequentially numbered for easy reference.

“ADDENDUM ITEMS”

1. THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD PROVE HIS ABSOLUTE ONENESS.
 - a. ETERNALITY. (Is. 57:15) “One” inhabits eternity.
 - b. OMNIPOTENCE. Only one can truly possess “all power”.
 - c. OMNISCIENCE. Only one can possess all knowledge.
 - d. OMNIPRESENT. One all-present God precludes others.
 - e. AUTHORITY. It is not possible to have three persons, co-equal, co-eternal, co-powerful, and yet one of the three have the prerogative and jurisdiction to “send”, “subordinate” or in any function excel the other two.
 - f. CREATIVITY. Mal. 2:10 declares that we all have one father; one God has created us. Thus the question becomes, did all three persons simultaneously speak the world into existence? If not, were two of such three persons left standing on the side lines while the Father, alone, spoke the world into existence?
 - g. DIVINE MIND – THOUGHT PROCESSES – DECISIONS. Would Trinitarian theology expect us to believe that, in the three persons, there are three co-equal, co-eternal, co-omniscient minds – and that each eternal, perfect thought or will of their minds simultaneously conceive the exact same thought – or is there some form of deliberation between them, or does the “Father” control the process? If there are stated to be three minds – the Bible does not say so or allow it – and secondly by what (superior) authority and process did “God the Father” send “God the Son” – and exactly what function did “God the Holy Spirit” have in this eternal event?

2. PRAYER AND OTHER “SUBORDINATED” COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN THE “THREE PERSONS” OF THE TRINITY.

a. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is constantly seen offering prayers to the “Father”. I have interpreted this as a manifestation of “humanity praying to deity”. Trinitarian theology interprets it as a proof of a plurality of persons in the godhead. That is to say, that “God the Son” (the second person) is praying to “God the Father” (the first person). Trinitarian theology interprets Rom. 8:34, that speaks of Christ making intercession for us to the Father, as proof of a plurality of persons and that God the Son is kneeling before a throne to God the Father, interceding on our behalf. To make this interpretation more complex and completely frivolous, Rom. 8:26-27, speaks of “God the Holy Spirit” (the third person) interceding with “God the Father”. Prayer or intercession is asking for something you do not have or cannot supply. The question becomes therefore, what can God the Father supply that the co-equal God the Son or God the Holy Spirit have no power to supply. The only possible, scriptural way to interpret this or any other act, appearance or function of subordination to “God the Father” is to recognize the humanity of God interceding to his deity. When you recognize this you have eliminated a three-person God and acknowledged one God as both human and divine.

3. “THE ONLY BEGOTTEN SON”.

- a. There should be no question in anyone’s mind as to who the “only begotten Son of God” is. The questions arise in regards to what is meant by “BEGOTTEN”. Inasmuch as Trinitarian theology identifies the “Galilean” as “God the Son”, the consequence of that is that “begotten” gets clothed with the attribute of “eternal”. That is that the begotten has existed since eternity for as long as the “Father” has. This completely disregards the unavoidable fact that to be “begotten” demands a point of beginning for the one begotten. Further, the title and position of “Son” is inappropriate unless there is a point of beginning for the element of “son-ship”. Otherwise how do you deal with the emphatic scriptures in the gospels which describe the process of the begetting and birth of Christ if there is no beginning point for the one begotten.
- b. In Acts 13:33, Heb. 1:5 and Heb. 5:5, we have provided for us a unique and absolute description of this thought of the “begotten” Son, as it relates to a point of beginning. They are as follows: *Acts 13:33. God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. Heb. 1:5. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son? Heb. 5:5. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee.* These verses leave absolutely no room for any alternative other than the “begotten one” has a specific point of beginning. Accordingly the books of Matthew and Luke give abundant evidence to the begetting of the Christ child and to his birth. How can this fact, so important to the entirety of Christianity, be overlooked or, as Trinitarian theologians do, twist this obvious act of the begetting of the Christ as somehow possessed of eternal existence and yet be an undeniable fact of the virgin birth. To be sure, God, the eternal ONE had in his forethought and therefore his

predetermination, that a child would be born who would be the Son of the Highest. But to say that the act of begetting is just a way of describing the co-eternal Son in some co-equal relation with the "Father" makes a mockery of language and events relating to the birth of the Savior. It goes right to the core of the problem in trying to have three persons in the godhead instead of one God who, of his own loving volition chose to become a man by way of the virgin birth, thereby becoming the God-man who gave his humanity at Calvary for our sins.

- c. In dealing with this "BEGOTTEN" process and act, you must choose from the following. (1) you take the position of many, Jehovah's Witnesses, Arius and a host of others who teach that God created or begat a son who was totally separate from himself, with no element of deity in him; just a subordinate, human being with a designated mission to fulfill. (2) You can take the Trinitarian position that "BEGOTTEN" only refers to a position, existing through eternity, applied to "God the Son" as the second person of the godhead, whom "God the Father" sent from eternity's abode to the earth. How this (already) "begotten" being from eternity, became the only begotten Son from the womb of the Virgin Mary, born in Bethlehem some 2000 years ago, of whom the above scriptures specify, "thou art my Son; this (specific, time bounded) day have I begotten thee, is a total prevarication of truth. (3) You can take the position, as we have done, that the ONE, eternal God, whose name alone is Jehovah (Ps. 83:18) in the O.T. and is Jesus in the N.T., made a promise to come to the world and save us. That his coming would be by way of the virgin birth, (Is. 7:14) and that the "Child" which would be given (Is. 9:6) would be the "MIGHTY GOD AND THE EVERLASTING FATHER". God became man by the process of divine begetting through the Virgin Mary. Anything else will not fit the mold of all scripture!
4. "QUESTIONS DRAWN FROM THE EXPRESS STATEMENTS AND TEACHING OF TRINITARIANS.
- a. The following series of questions are taken from books of systematic theology written by very learned proponents of the Trinitarian view which, in our view, deserve a more scriptural and specific explanation. Their writings are so proliferated with incoherent statements which have no scriptural support or are so imaginary, indiscernible and an attempt at proving a point which is un-provable to begin with, that their theological basis is drawn more from tradition rather than divinely revealed truth from the scriptures.
1. Is each person of the Trinity, in their own right and capacity, fully omnipotent, omniscience and omnipresent?
 2. Does each "person", of their own individual attribute, have complete mental thought, perceptivity and all-knowing capacity in all things?
 3. Does each person, individually, have the capacity and power to individually "speak" worlds into existence as the "Father" did in the beginning?
 4. Does each "person", individually, have the ability to transform and save a human life from sin and eternal condemnation?
 5. Is it possible for our prayers to be offered, unselfishly and inclusively to either of the three persons – or – must they ascend unto all three without distinction? If prayers cannot be offered to one or the other of the three persons exclusively, then in that case, explain why and also does this not cancel any otherwise distinction of "three persons"?

6. In the process of bringing salvation to a lost world, did God become man? – If so, was it one person of the three, or all three which became man? Please explain.
7. Did the Father (as the first person) raise the Son (as the second person) from the grave? If not, then did all three persons in concert perform the resurrection? Provide scripture for your answer.
8. Was the conception in the virgin's womb of the Christ child accomplished by the specific act of begetting by the power of the Holy Ghost, Mt. 1:20 (as the third person) or was the Christ child begotten by the Father, Jn. 1:14 (as the first person) – or – was the Christ child begotten by the Son (as the second person) – or – did all three persons act in concert through their divine sovereignty to cause a human embryo to form in the virgin's womb? Explain your answer and provide scripture.
9. Describe and define the individuality, person-hood and specific distinctions which exists between the "three persons" of the Trinitarian godhead: specifically whether their distinctiveness derives from their separate sovereign beings, or whether their specific person-hood only derives from an essence of their function related to their attributes and capacities rather than as to individual beings. Provide scripture adequately supporting your answer.
10. Describe the process of "God" sending his only begotten son. Was it a process of the Son being specifically sent from a place or throne of central command somewhere above the earth, or was it a divine pro-creative act which occurred within the womb of the Virgin Mary without any form or manner of "descent" or "sending" from some specific geographic location? Provide scripture for your answer.
11. What is meant by the "act of being begotten" and does its meaning include a point of beginning for the "son-ship of the Son"? If it does not mean a point of beginning, then explain what happened in the Virgin's womb, if it was not the begetting of the "Son of God".
12. If the "Son" (as the second, co-equal person of the godhead) existed as the "Only begotten Son of the Father" from eternity, then what does it mean for this "second person" to be begotten? What does "begotten" mean in such case? Also, at what point did the Son become the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth?
13. What is the Trinitarian's interpretation of Is. 9:6, which calls the "child" which was to be born, "THE EVERLASTING FATHER"? In what sense and capacity could a human child which was to be born of the Virgin Mary, be scripturally referred to as "THE MIGHTY GOD, THE EVERLASTING FATHER"?
14. If "God the Son", the second person of the Triune God, has always existed throughout all eternity, the same as "God the Father", the first person of the Triune God, did he possess the exact same capacity, power and will to beget the child in the Virgin's womb? If so, then why does the scripture declare, on the one hand, Mt. 1:18-20, that the child was of the Holy Spirit, the third person, and on the other hand, that the child was begotten of the Father, and why, in no instance, is God the Son ever declared to have a part in the process of this only begotten son?

15. If Jn. 3:16 correctly declares that “God” so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son , then, in such case, does “God” refer to “God the Father”, “God the Holy Spirit”, or brother? If, in this verse, “God”, refers only to God the Father, then by what divine sovereignty were God the Son and God the Holy Spirit excluded from the process?
16. What reason does Trinitarian theology give for the “three persons” bearing the appellations or titles Father designated for the first person; Son, designated for the second person; and Holy Spirit, designated for the third person, and what scriptures support these specific designations and numerical application?
17. By whose authority and conclusion was the designation – “the Father is the first person”, “the Son is the second person”, and “the Holy Spirit is the third person” of the godhead, inasmuch as not a single inspired writer, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, throughout all 66 books of the Bible ever made any designation of “persons” in the godhead or ever specified a first, second or third person, personality, position or other such plurality of being or distinction?
18. Trinitarian theology proponents rely virtually exclusively on their concept of “revelation” in order to affirm a scriptural support of their doctrine. However, in some of the major prominent writings of systematic theology their idea of “revelation” does not mean a specific search of the Bible, comparing scripture with scripture, until a body of irrefutable texts, identified by chapter and verse, are produced which unequivocally describes, explains, and commands the doctrine. Instead they propose and would have us believe that they have read the Bible sufficiently and, while acknowledging the absence of specific triune declarations or references therein, they offer an explanation that they have (to use their terms) obtained an “essence, a germ, a trace, an induction or illusive thoughts, etc., which they call a revelation and from which they unequivocally proclaim the doctrine of the Trinity, without which, they say, no one can be a Christian. Question: (1) Explain this process of revelation so that the ordinary person in the pews of their churches do not have to believe in a trinity because learned minds tell them it is right, but that they can – through their own search of scriptures – come to this unquestionable “revelation” themselves; (2) Provide abundant scriptural texts to support the use of terms such as: trinity, triune, persons, essence, induction, O.T. writers had to wait on the N.T. to know God, co-equal, co-eternal, etc.
19. Trinitarian theology affirms that there is one God, but hasten to explain that this one God is comprised of three co-equal, co-eternal, sovereign persons. Explain the exact distinction between the three persons and exactly how this can be described as numerically one.
20. Romans 8:34 describes the “Son” as making intercession to the “Father” on behalf of Christians. (1) Explain the process and purpose of this intercession. (2) Why must a “God the Son” deity pray to a “God the Father” deity? (3) If you do not believe that each is a distinct “deity”, then explain how one is able to pray, distinctly and specifically to another. (4) What is the relevance and necessity of “God the Son” interceding for us if we ourselves are commanded to pray to “God” with the assurance he will hear us? (5) Romans 8:26-27 tells us that God the Holy Spirit intercedes for us. Thus God the Son and God the Holy

Spirit are interceding with God the Father for us. Since all prayers, invocations, intercessions are a subordinate practice, explain the nature and reason for this act of subordination by God the Son and God the Holy Spirit to God the Father.

21. Trinitarian theology describes "God the Son" as kneeling before the throne (of God the Father). (1) Is this correct Trinitarian theology? (2) Why must one divine person petition another equally divine person? (3) Is this a description of the "man Christ Jesus who ascended from earth" bowing in some geographic location physically before the divine invisible, omnipresent Father?
22. Is the distinction between the "three persons" a distinction as to being? That is, are there 3 distinct beings; or is the distinction applicable only to "office" and attributes?
23. If the distinction is defined by differences in attributes, then identify which attributes apply to each respective "person".
24. Did Moses, David, Abraham and Isaiah preach and believe that there were 3 persons in the godhead? If not, why not? If you say they did, provide at least 2 scripture references for each one which distinctly delineates such teachings.
25. Did Peter, John and Paul believe and teach that there were 3 persons in the godhead? If not, why not? If you say they did, provide at least 2 verses for each one which clearly delineates their belief and teaching that there are 3 persons in the godhead.
26. Under questions 24 and 25, if you do not provide the requested, definitive scriptures clearly identifying the teaching of 3 distinct persons in the godhead, then, in such case, identify whether your answer is based upon "essence", "induction", or non-verifiable, undiscoverable derivatives of the whole body of scripture, without specific scriptural texts propounding such a form of godhead.
27. When Paul's writings speak of "God" – "and our Father" – "and our Lord Jesus Christ", interpret and apply this expression under the Trinitarian concept of the godhead. In addition explain the distinction made between "God – and – the Father", "and" our Lord Jesus Christ.
28. Are there any "superlative" or "subordinate" positions, conditions or actions between the "3 persons" of the godhead? Explain what they are and to which person.
29. If your answer to the above question was yes, then, in such case, explain how co-equal, co-eternal sovereigns can have either a superlative or subordinate relation to each other.
30. Trinitarian theology emphatically declares that there is but one God, but that this one God exists in 3 distinct persons. The explanation this theology gives is that this "oneness" is an "essence", that is, the "one" God they know is "one" in essence, not numerically one. Question: Of the multitude of scriptures, O.T. and N.T., which emphatically declare God to be one (or that there is but one God), why is it that not a single inspired writer of the entire Bible, endowed specifically of the revelation, knowledge and authority of God, to record God's own word, never once gave such an expression or explanation of their many declarations that there is but "one God"?
31. If God-the-Son, as one of the co-equal, co-eternal persons of the godhead, came into the world as a man, clothed in human flesh, what would be the function and manifestation of his humanity and how would this differ from his deity?

32. How would his humanity address his deity and how would his deity under these circumstances respond to his humanity?
33. Does God-the-Father and God-the-Holy Spirit have any function in this “God-man” manifestation, other than supportive functions? If so, describe what they are?
34. Explain the Trinitarian interpretation and application of the function ascribed to Christ as the mediator between God and man as it relates to the godhead.
35. In all of Paul’s epistles (except Hebrews), he begins them with some form of the expression: “Grace and peace from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ”. What does this expression mean with relation to the godhead?
36. On P277 of Dr. Chafer’s systematic theology, Vol. 1 & 2, under item #4, he embraces a quote from one Herman Venema’s “Institutes of Theology, as follows: “We say moreover, that the three persons partaking of one and the same essence stand in close relation to each other – the second person being FROM the first and the third FROM the first and second. This relation is implied in the names Father, Son and Spirit – the Father being the source of one essence which is partaken of by the other two. This participation of essence in reference to the Son, is called generation – and, in reference to the Spirit, procession or spiration”. Then the said “Herman Venema” adds: “such is a simple and, as far as we can attain to it, a clear explanation of the Trinity”. Then further, on page 286 of the referenced work, Dr. Chafer extends this theology by saying: (1)“That the Father generates the Son, etc., and breathes the Spirit; (2) that the Son is begotten of the Father and with the Father breathes the Spirit; (3) that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father and the Son”. Several questions arise from these quotes. 1. What chapter and verses of the Bible use such terminology to explain the godhead? 2. When he writes that the Father is the source of the one essence which is partaken of by the other two, explain this “source” and also how the other two partake of it. 3. How does the eternal Father generate the equally eternal Son, if they both possess simultaneous eternity? 4. How does the first person, Father, and second person, Son, combine to “breathe” the third person, Holy Spirit? 5. What specific scriptures verify this “process”?
37. Why has Trinitarian theology completely overlooked or ignored the specific NAME OF GOD so distinctly and repetitiously used throughout the Bible?
38. What does the word or term JEHOVAH (or Jhwh without vowels) mean in the O.T.?
39. Does Trinitarian theology acknowledge that “JEHOVAH” is the name of God in the O.T.? If not, why not?
40. Is the name JESUS in the N.T., the highest name in heaven and in earth and the only name wherein there is salvation for anyone?
41. According to Ps. 83:18, is JEHOVAH the highest name in all the earth?
42. Are these two separate names, applying to two distinct persons, or are they one and the same, applying to the one and only God?
43. What is the name of the Holy Spirit, or doesn’t He have one?
44. Are words such as God, Father, Son, Lord, Savior, Shepherd, Prince of Peace, etc., titles of position or names? Provide evidence of your answer if you say they are names.

5. “ABRAM – TO – ABRAHAM. AND JEHOVAH – TO – JESUS.

In Genesis chapters 11 through 17:5, all of the references to “Abraham” are with the spelling of “Abram”. From there throughout the rest of the Bible, any mention of the name is with the spelling of “Abraham”. Every Bible student knows exactly why there is this difference in the spelling of his name. It is because of God’s promise to Abraham that he would become “the father of the faithful”, by way of the promised seed of Isaac, through whose ultimate lineage Christ came as our savior. Thus the change in Abraham’s name did not change him as an individual; it simply added the promise that would be fulfilled through him, thus making him the father of the faithful.

6. “JEHOVAH – TO JESUS.

In all of the O.T., the one and only name of God, repeated over 6000 times, is Jehovah. When you come to the N.T., there is no direct mention of the name “Jehovah”. That is, unless you find it in the name of Jesus. The name “JESUS”, as I have shown at length, comes from two words: “JEHOVAH AND YASHA”. Yasha means savior. Thus Jehovah became our savior and the addition to his name, Jehovah, of the term yasha (savior), does not make him a different being and neither does it make him multiple beings. It simply adds the function of savior to him. Throughout the O.T., Jehovah is described as the only savior. In the N.T., Jesus is described as the only savior. The only possible way to reconcile this exclusiveness is to conclude, as the scriptures verily teach, that Jehovah of the O.T. is Jesus of the N.T. This does not make Jesus a separate person from Jehovah; it verifies that Jehovah of the O.T. has come to save us. The one and only God, manifested in one supreme being, not divided into “persons”, has become the savior of the world: JEHOVAH—YASHA = JESUS.

In addition to the above, there are instances in the O.T. where the name Jehovah has another descriptive word attached. Three examples of this are as follows:

- Gen. 22:13-14. In this scripture we have the word “Jehovah-Jireh”. This is the occasion where Abraham was about to offer Isaac as a sacrifice and God provided a ram as a substitute. Abraham called the place Jehovah-Jireh, meaning it was the Mt. of the Lord where this was seen.
- Ex. 17:15. In this scripture we have the word “Jehovah-nissi”. It means Jehovah is my banner. It was so named because God had told Joshua that he would forever have war with Amelek.
- Judges 6:14. In this scripture we have the word “Jehovah-shalom”. It means Jehovah is peace.

In each of these instances the addition of a descriptive word or term to the name Jehovah does not change the name or the being of Jehovah at all. They simply show some aspect or action on the part of Jehovah. The same kind of effect is true with the name “Jesus” as it is derived from “Jehovah-

yasha". It shows that Jehovah is our savior. It does not change his being or for that matter even his name.

7. THE AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION RENDERING OF "JEHOVAH".

The American Standard Version of the Bible was published in 1901. In the description of the various versions of the Bible over the centuries as put forth in the "THOMPSON CHAIN REFERENCE SURVEY OF THE BIBLE", the following is written about the American Standard Version. "The American committee used the term Jehovah instead of Lord as the translation for the Hebrew YHWH, the term Holy Spirit instead of Holy Ghost and love instead of charity. The ASV lacked some of the literary beauty of the KJV, but it excelled in accuracy and was based upon a superior Greek text. It has been widely used by scholars as a study Bible". The American Standard Version is basically the same as the King James Version with the exceptions noted above. There is no reason to avoid its use other than personal preference. On the other hand, by the retention in the ASV of the word JEHOVAH instead of the word LORD, the real meaning of the text is better preserved. Moreover, by this means, students of the Bible are made more aware of the name of God which might otherwise be obscured through the KJV use of the word LORD instead of the more proper use of JEHOVAH.

We are going to use this version to emphasize that which we have repeated many times, namely, that the word "LORD" in the majority of times (not all) in the O.T., is translated from Jehovah or the original Hebrew of YHWH (with vowels supplied by the translators). What we have done is highlight this word as found in several O.T. books, chosen at random: Deut., Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Zech. Now we have chosen some chapters from this and will now type those chosen chapters, capitalizing the word JEHOVAH so that our readers can see just how much it is used in O.T. texts.

DET. 6. Now this is the commandment, the statutes, and the ordinances, which JEHOVAH your God commanded to teach you, that ye might do them in the land whither ye go over to possess it; that thou mightest fear JEHOVAH thy God, to keep all his statutes and his commandments, which I command thee, thou, and thy son, and thy son's son, all the days of thy life; and that thy days may be prolonged. Hear therefore, O Israel, and observe to do it; that it may be well with thee, and that ye may increase mightily, as JEHOVAH, the God of thy fathers, hath promised unto thee, in a land flowing with milk and honey. Hear, O Israel: JEHOVAH thy God is one JEHOVAH: and thou shalt love JEHOVAH thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be upon thy heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thy hand, and they shall be for frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the door posts of thy house, and upon thy gates.

And it shall be, when JEHOVAH thy God shall bring thee into the land which he swore unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give thee, great and goodly cities, which thou buildest not, and houses full of all good things, which thou filledst not, and cisterns hewn out, which thou hewedst not,

vineyards and olive trees, which thou plantedst not, and thou shalt eat and be full; then beware lest thou forget JEHOVAH, who brought thee forth out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt fear JEHOVAH thy God, and him shalt thou serve, and shalt swear by his name. Ye shall not go after other gods, of the gods of the peoples that are round about you; for JEHOVAH thy God in the midst of thee is a jealous God; lest the anger of JEHOVAH thy God be kindled against thee, and he destroy thee from off the face of the earth.

Ye shall not tempt JEHOVAH your God, as ye tempted him in Massah. Ye shall diligently keep the commandments of JEHOVAH your God, and his testimonies, and his statutes, which he hath commanded thee. And thou shalt do that which is right and good in the sight of JEHOVAH; that it may be well with thee, and that thou mayest go in and possess the good land which JEHOVAH swore unto thy fathers, to thrust out all thine enemies from before thee, as JEHOVAH hath spoken.

When thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, what mean the testimonies, and the statutes, and the ordinances, which JEHOVAH our God hath commanded you? Then thou shalt say unto thy son, we were Pharaoh's bondmen in Egypt: and JEHOVAH brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand; and JEHOVAH showed signs and wonders, great and sore, upon Egypt, upon Pharaoh, and upon all his house, before our eyes; and he brought us out from thence, that he might bring us in, to give us the land which he swore unto our fathers. And JEHOVAH commanded us to do all these statutes, to fear JEHOVAH our God, for our good always, that he might preserve us alive, as at this day. And it shall be righteousness unto us, if we observe to do all this commandment before JEHOVAH our God, as he hath commanded us.

PSALMS 118:1-29. O give thanks unto JEHOVAH; for he is good; for his loving kindness (endureth) forever. Let Israel now say, that his loving kindness (endureth) forever. Let them now that fear JEHOVAH say, that his loving kindness (endureth) forever. Out of my distress I called upon JEHOVAH: JEHOVAH answered me (and set me) in a large place. JEHOVAH is on my side, I will not fear: what can man do unto me? JEHOVAH is on my side among them that help me: Therefore shall I see (my desire) upon them that hate me.

It is better to take refuge in JEHOVAH than to put confidence in man. It is better to take refuge in JEHOVAH than to put confidence in princes. All nations compassed me about: in the name of JEHOVAH I will cut them off. They compassed me about; yea, they compassed me about: in the name of JEHOVAH I will cut them off. They compassed me about like bees; they are quenched as the fire of thorns: in the name of JEHOVAH I will cut them off. Thou didst thrust sore at me that I might fall; but JEHOVAH helped me. JEHOVAH is my strength and song; and he is become my salvation. The voice of rejoicing and salvation is in the tents of the righteous. The right hand of JEHOVAH doeth valiantly. The right hand of JEHOVAH is exalted: The right hand of JEHOVAH doeth valiantly. I shall not die, but live, and declare the works of JEHOVAH. JEHOVAH hath chastened me sore; but he hath not given me over unto death. Open to me the gates of righteousness. I will enter into them, I will give thanks unto JEHOVAH. This is the gate of JEHOVAH. The righteous shall enter into it. I will give thanks unto thee; for thou hast answered me, and art become my salvation.

The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner. This is JEHOVAH'S doing; it is marvelous in our eyes. This is the day which JEHOVAH hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it. Save now, we beseech thee, O JEHOVAH: O JEHOVAH, we beseech thee, send now prosperity. Blessed be he that cometh in the name of JEHOVAH. We have blessed you out of the house of JEHOVAH. JEHOVAH is God, and I will give thanks unto thee: thou art my God, I will exalt thee. Oh give thanks unto JEHOVAH; for he is good; for his loving kindness endureth forever.

ISAIAH 45. Thus saith JEHOVAH to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him, and I will loose the loins of kings; to open the doors before him, and the gates shall not be shut. I will go before thee, and make the rough places smooth; I will break in pieces the doors of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron; and I will give thee the treasures of darkness, and hidden riches of secret places, that thou mayest know that it is I, JEHOVAH, who call thee by thy name, even the God of Israel. For Jacob, my servant's sake, and Israel my chosen, I have called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me. I am JEHOVAH, and there is none else; besides me there is no God. I will gird thee, though thou hast not known me; that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none besides me; I am JEHOVAH, and there is none else. I form the light and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil. I am JEHOVAH, that doeth all these things. Distil, ye heavens, from above, and let the skies pour down righteousness: let the earth open, that it may bring forth salvation, and let it cause righteousness to spring up together; I, JEHOVAH, have created it, woe unto him that striveth with his maker! A potsherd among the potsherds of the earth! Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, what makest thou? Or thy work, he hath no hands? Woe unto him that saith unto a father, what begettest thou? Or to a woman, with what travailest thou? Thus saith JEHOVAH, the Holy One of Israel, and his maker; ask me of things that are to come; concerning my sons, and concerning the work of my hands, command ye me. I have made the earth, and created man upon it: I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens; and all their host have I commanded. I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will make straight all his ways; he shall build my city, and he shall let my exiles go free, not for price nor reward, saith JEHOVAH of hosts. Thus saith JEHOVAH, the labor of Egypt, and the merchandise of Ethiopia, and the Sabeans, men of stature, shall come over unto thee, and they shall be thine; they shall go after thee, in chains they shall come over; and they shall fall down unto thee, they shall make supplication unto thee, saying, surely God is in thee; and there is none else, there is no God. Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself, O God of Israel, the Savior. They shall be put to shame, yea, confounded, all of them; they shall go into confusion together that are makers of idols. But Israel shall be saved by JEHOVAH with an everlasting salvation; ye shall not be put to shame nor confounded world without end. For thus saith JEHOVAH that created the heavens, the God that formed the earth and made it, that established it and created it not a waste, that formed it to be inhabited; I am JEHOVAH; and there is none else. I have not spoken in secret, in a place of the land of darkness; I said not unto the seed of Jacob, seek ye me in vain: I, JEHOVAH, speak righteousness. I declare things that are right. Assemble yourselves and come; draw near together, ye that are escaped of the nations; they have no knowledge that carry the wood of their graven image, and pray unto a god that cannot save. Declare ye, and bring it forth; yea, let them take counsel together; who hath showed this from ancient time? Who hath declared it of old? Have not I, JEHOVAH? And there is no God else besides

me, a just God and a Savior, there is none besides me. Look unto me, and be ye saved all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. By myself have I sworn, the word is gone forth from my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Only in JEHOVAH, it is said of me, is righteousness and strength; even to him shall men come; and all they that were incensed against him shall be put to shame. In JEHOVAH shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory.

JEREMIAH – CH. 23. Woe unto the shepherds that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture! Saith JEHOVAH. Therefore thus saith JEHOVAH, The God of Israel, against the shepherds that feed my people: ye have scattered my flock, and driven them away, and have not visited them; behold, I will visit upon you the evil of your doings, saith JEHOVAH. And I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all the countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds; and they shall be fruitful and multiply. And I will set up shepherds over them, who shall feed them; and they shall fear no more, nor be dismayed, neither shall any be lacking, saith JEHOVAH. Behold, the days come, saith JEHOVAH, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called JEHOVAH our righteousness. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith JEHOVAH, that they shall no more say, as JEHOVAH liveth, who brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, as JEHOVAH liveth, who brought up and who led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north, and from the countries whither I had driven them. And they shall dwell in their own land. Concerning the prophets, my heart within me is broken, all my bones shake; I am like a drunken man, and like a man whom wine hath overcome, because of JEHOVAH, and because of his holy words. For the land is full of adulterers; for because of swearing the land mourneth; the pastures of the wilderness are dried up. And their course is evil, and their might is not right; for both prophet and priest are profane; yea, in my house have I found their wickedness, saith JEHOVAH. Wherefore their way shall be unto them as slippery places in the darkness, they shall be driven on, and fall therein; for I will bring evil upon them, even the year of their visitation, saith JEHOVAH. And I have seen folly in the prophets of Samaria; they prophesied by Baal, and caused my people Israel to err. In the prophets of Jerusalem also I have seen a horrible thing: they commit adultery, and walk in lies, and they strengthen the hands of evil-doers, so that none doth return from his wickedness: they are all of them become unto me as Sodom, and the inhabitants thereof as Gomorrah. Therefore thus saith JEHOVAH of hosts concerning the prophets: behold, I will feed them with wormwood, and make them drink the water of gall; for from the prophets of Jerusalem is ungodliness gone forth into all the land. Thus saith JEHOVAH of hosts, hearken not unto the words of the prophets that prophesy unto you: they teach you vanity; they speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of JEHOVAH. They say continually unto them that despise me. JEHOVAH hath said, ye shall have peace; and unto everyone that walketh in the stubbornness of his own heart they say, no evil shall come upon you. For who hath stood in the council of JEHOVAH, that he should perceive and hear his word? Who hath marked my word, and heard it? Behold, the tempest of JEHOVAH, even his wrath, is gone forth, yea, a whirling tempest: it shall burst upon the head of the wicked. The anger of JEHOVAH shall not return, until he have executed, and till he have performed the intents of his heart: in the latter days ye shall understand it

perfectly. I sent not these prophets, yet they ran: I spake not unto them, yet they prophesied. But if they had stood in my council, then had they caused my people to hear my words, and had turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings. Am I a God at hand, saith JEHOVAH, and not a God afar off? Can any hide himself in secret places so that I shall not see him, saith JEHOVAH? I have heard what the prophets have said, that prophesy lies in my name, saying, I have dreamed, I have dreamed. How long shall this be in the heart of the prophets that prophesy lies, even the prophets of the deceit of their own heart, that think to cause my people to forget my name by their dreams which they tell every man to his neighbor, as their fathers forgot my name for Baal. The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream, and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the straw to the wheat, saith JEHOVAH? Is not my word like fire, saith JEHOVAH; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces? Therefore, behold, I am against the prophets, saith JEHOVAH, that steal my words everyone from his neighbor, behold I am against the prophets, saith JEHOVAH, that use their tongues, and say, he saith. Behold, I am against them that prophesy lying dreams, saith JEHOVAH, and do tell them, and cause my people to err by their lies, and by their vain boasting: yet I sent them not, nor commanded them; neither do they profit this people at all, saith JEHOVAH. And when this people, or the prophet, or a priest, shall ask thee, saying, what is the burden of JEHOVAH, then shall thou say unto them, what burden? I will cast you off, saith JEHOVAH. And as for the prophet, and the priest, and the people, that shall say, the burden of JEHOVAH, I will even punish that man and his house. Thus shall ye say everyone to his neighbor, and everyone to his brother, what hath JEHOVAH answered, and, what hath JEHOVAH spoken? And the burden of JEHOVAH shall ye mention no more: for every man's own word shall be his burden; for ye have perverted the words of the living God, of JEHOVAH of hosts our God. Thus shalt thou say to the prophet, what hath JEHOVAH answered thee, and, what hath JEHOVAH spoken? But if ye say, the burden of JEHOVAH; therefore, behold, I will utterly forget you and I will cast you off, and the city that I gave unto you and to your fathers, away from my presence: and I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and perpetual shame, which shall not be forgotten.

8. "THE IMPORTANCE OF GOD'S NAME".

In the study of the godhead, Trinitarian theology places little to no emphasis upon the name of God, even to the point of saying that he doesn't have a specific name. In addition, they will use all manner of titles and call them proper names, which is incorrect. This avoiding or de-emphasis or even denial of a specific name for God has been the cause of gross abuse of countless scriptures which emphatically employ and set out God's singular name. In this section, we will simply reproduce several scriptures which show the high and exalted use of the name of God and the honor due unto it. To fail to honor it for what it is and its specific name is, in our opinion, bordering on blasphemy against God. All that he is and all that he has done is embraced in his name. In fact, his name simply translates into "the self-existent God". No other god in all the world of any people and any time can boast of that appellation; indeed, no other god can be called "the self-existent god". That is the name of the one God of the Bible, exclusively. JEHOVAH of the O.T. means "to exist" or self-existent".

JESUS in the N.T. means the self-existent/savior. Consider the following verses which reflect the importance of the "NAME"

- *Gen. 13:4. Unto the place of the altar, which he had made there at the first: and there Abram called on the NAME of the Lord.*
- *Ex. 3:15. And God said moreover unto Moses, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, the LORD, God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my NAME forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.*
- *Ex. 20:7. Thou shalt not take the NAME of the LORD thy God in vain; for the LORD will not hold him guiltless that taketh his NAME in vain.*
- *Det. 5:11. Thou shalt not take the NAME of the LORD thy God in vain; for the LORD will not hold him guiltless that taketh his NAME in vain.*
- *I Kgs. 5:5. And, behold, I purpose to build an house unto the NAME of the LORD my God, as the LORD spake unto David my father, saying, thy son, whom I will set upon thy throne in thy room, he shall build an house unto my NAME.*
- *I Chron. 16:10 & 29. Glory ye in his holy NAME: let the heart of them rejoice that seek the LORD. Give unto the LORD, the glory due unto his NAME: bring an offering, and come before him: worship the LORD in the beauty of holiness.*
- *Ps. 8:1. O LORD our LORD, how excellent is thy NAME in all the earth! Who hast set thy glory above the heavens.*
- *Ps. 44:20 & 21. If we have forgotten the NAME of our God, or stretched out our hands to a strange God: Shall not God search this out? For he knoweth the secrets of the heart.*
- *Ps. 72:17. His NAME shall endure forever: his NAME shall be continued as long as the sun: and men shall be blessed in him: all nations shall call him blessed.*
- *Ps. 83:18. That men may know that thou whose NAME alone is JEHOVAH, art the most high over all the earth.*
- *Is. 42:8. I am the LORD (JEHOVAH): that is my NAME: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images.*
- *Jer. 23:6. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his NAME whereby he shall be called, THE LORD (JEHOVAH) OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.*
- *Mt. 1:21. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his NAME Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins.*
- *Lk. 2:21. And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, his NAME was called Jesus, which was so NAMED of the angel before he was conceived in the womb.*
- *Jn. 14:14. If ye shall ask any thing in my NAME, I will do it.*
- *Acts 2:21. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the NAME of the LORD shall be saved.*
- *Acts 2:38. Then Peter said unto them, repent, and be baptized every one of you in the NAME of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*
- *Acts 4:12. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other NAME under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.*

- *Acts 9:15. But the LORD said unto him, go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my NAME before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel. (Compare this with Mal. 1:11).*
- *Eph. 1:21. Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every NAME that is NAMED, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.*
- *Ph. 2:9-10. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a NAME which is above every NAME: That at the NAME of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.*
- *Col. 3:17. And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the NAME of the LORD JESUS, giving thanks to God and the Father by him.*
- *Heb. 1:4. Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent NAME than they.*

9. "THE NAME OF JESUS".

Throughout this study of "GOD" we have frequently made reference to the name of God and its importance. We have emphasized that the name of God in the O.T. is JEHOVAH, and is mentioned over 6,000 times. We have also reproduced chapters from Det., Psalms, Isaiah and Jeremiah, showing the extensive use of the name JEHOVAH. We have done this to show that the word "LORD" used by most translations, comes from the word "JEHOVAH", and is, in fact, the Hebrew national name for God. We have also noted that the name JEHOVAH is not mentioned in the N.T., unless you recognize it in the name of JESUS.

That is an undeniable fact: that the name of JESUS in the N.T., is, in all reality and application, the name of JEHOVAH in the O.T. Yes, there is a difference. That difference is the high and holy calling which JEHOVAH placed upon himself alone. JEHOVAH took upon himself the otherwise non-existent capacity of savior. There could be no savior apart from God in anyone's definition of the position. Therefore, JEHOVAH of the O.T., took upon himself the object of man's redemption: his savior. Thus when you add savior to the name of JEHOVAH, what you have is JESUS.

The name JESUS comes from the Greek word = IESOUS.

The Greek word IESOUS is of Hebrew origin.

IESOUS comes from the Hebrew word YEHOSHUA.

The Hebrew word YEHOSHUA comes from two Hebrew words: JEHOVAH – YASHA.

YASHA is Hebrew for savior.

Thus, what this means is that JESUS IS JEHOVAH-SAVIOR.

He is JEHOVAH of the O.T., come down to earth in human form to save us from our sins. As Mt. 1:21 records: "thou shalt call his name JESUS for he shall save his people from their sins".

To further emphasize this we are going to reproduce verses from the N.T. which include the name "JESUS", simply that we may observe the context of its use.

- *Mt. 1:21. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins.*
- *Mk. 1:1. The beginning of the gospel of JESUS Christ, the Son of God.*
- *Mk. 10:18. And JESUS said unto him, why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God.*

- *Lk. 1:31. And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS.*
- *Lk. 2:21. And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, his name was called JESUS, which was so named of the angel before he was conceived in the womb.*
- *Lk. 24:3. And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord JESUS.*
- *Jn. 6:35. And JESUS said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.*
- *Jn. 8:19. Then said they unto him, where is thy Father? JESUS answered, ye neither know me, nor my Father: if ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also.*
- *Jn. 20:26-28. And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came JESUS, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, peace be unto you. Then saith he to Thomas, reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God.*
- *Acts 1:11. Which also said, ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same JESUS, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.*
- *Acts 2:38. Then Peter said unto them, repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of JESUS Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*
- *Acts 4:10&12. Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of JESUS Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.*
- *Acts 9:5. And he said, who art thou Lord? And the Lord said, I am JESUS whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.*
- *Acts 16:31. And they said, believe on the Lord JESUS Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.*
- *Acts 19:4-5. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people; that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ JESUS. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.*
- *Rom. 8:1. There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ JESUS, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.*
- *I Cor. 15:57. But thanks be unto God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord JESUS Christ.*
- *Eph. 5:20. Giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord JESUS Christ.*
- *Ph. 2:9-10. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of JESUS every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth and things under the earth.*
- *Col. 3:17. And whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord JESUS, giving thanks to God and the Father by him.*

- *1 Thess. 4:14. For if we believe that JESUS died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him.*
- *1 Tim. 6:14. That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord JESUS Christ.*
- *Tit. 2:13. Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior JESUS Christ.*
- *Heb. 13:8. JESUS Christ the same yesterday, and today and forever.*
- *1 Jn. 4:3. And every spirit that confesseth not that JESUS Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.*
- *Rev. 22:20. He which testifieth these things saith, surely I come quickly, Amen. Even so, come, Lord JESUS*

10. THEY CALLED HIM JESUS!

They called him what? JESUS! What do they mean, calling their new born baby child – JESUS? Don't they realize what this name is?

We have written at length about the name of God. We have provided a great amount of scripture for the use of God's name in both testaments. We have emphasized several times that the O.T. records the name JEHOVAH over 6000 times. Is it theological tradition or theological deception which prevents people from recognizing the name of God which is so prolific in all scripture?

We have also emphasized with abundant scripture, that JEHOVAH in the O.T., is JESUS in the N.T.

In all of the volumes written in defense of the Trinitarian concept of God, where is there any recognition that God even has a name, let alone what it is? To read both the O.T. and N.T. and not perceive the profound and constant replication of the name of God therein amounts to gross inattention to the word of God, or else a theological agenda and tradition which utterly prevents the light of truth from shining through.

All O.T. writers convey the point over and over, that the name of God is hallowed, sacred, to be honored, revered, worshipped, never used in vain, exclusive, singular and as a dominant fixture among God's people, centered in his chosen dwelling place, the temple, i.e. the church. The notion which is promoted by some theologians and apparently by some Jewish leaders, that the name of God is so sacred that it must not be repeated or verbalized, is ludicrous nonsense. You can't read the Bible and proclaim it without speaking the name of God. The excuse of not pronouncing the name of God for fear of committing sacrilege is a deception to get around acknowledging his name and what it is and means. If there is one word God would have us to speak, in truth and sincerity, it is his name. Why is not this same excuse used regarding the name of JESUS? It is the highest and most glorious name ever named in heaven or earth.

Rather than not knowing, mentioning or speaking God's name, it was the most referenced word in the Jewish vocabulary; the most profound, with the deepest respect and love and contained the greatest meaning to their lives of any word in their hearts or on their lips.

All of this raises a very interesting point as it relates to the name JEHOVAH in the O.T., which is not mentioned in the N.T., that is, unless you acknowledge that JESUS is, in fact, JEHOVAH. The point to be made here is brought out when you consider such godly people as Mary, Joseph, Zacharias, Elizabeth, Simeon, Anna, etc., and what their concept of God – and his name – was to them. And the point to be made here expands when you include the early Jewish disciples, apostles, Paul and others.

These people knew the scriptures – (the only scriptures available – the O. T.) and all the law and prophets had written for them to obey. Further, the point we will make is magnified even further when you take into account the many prophecies which stipulated that JEHOVAH would come to be their savior, or that the child which was to be born would be called THE MIGHTY GOD AND THE EVERLASTING FATHER. They were familiar with the scripture in Jeremiah, 23:6, where the BRANCH which was to come, would be called JEHOVAH. They had read Ps. 83:18, which told them that JEHOVAH was the most high over all the earth. They were keenly aware of and very devoted to the importance of the name JEHOVAH in their history, their law, their lineage and their individual lives. To accuse these earliest disciples of the Galilean of being ignorant, non-caring, indifferent and not profoundly devoted to JEHOVAH, would be cynical sarcasm. These were godly people, believers in his word, obedient to his calling and students of his promises from Abraham and forward.

HERE IS THE POINT I WANT TO MAKE. With all of the above as an undeniable reality in their lives, God sends a message to Mary and Joseph: Mary, a virgin, will bear a child and THOU SHALT CALL HIS NAME JESUS! The fact that Mary (and Joseph) were startled greatly is not confined to the overwhelming realization that she, a virgin, is going to bear a child; the promised child at that. That is only part of the announcement.

What Mary hears the angel, Gabriel, say next is stunning. It provides a clear explanation as to why she, the handmaid of the Lord, was so humbled before the angel. She is emphatically told that she would call his name – JEHOVAH-YASHA! Mary who was a devoted worshipper of Jehovah, along with all her ancestors, is told that her baby's name is to be JEHOVAH. This is not some name picked up from some family journal; this is the name of the God of the world. Further, she did not, of her own free will, come up with the name. She is divinely directed to name it thus. The reason for that is two-fold: (1) It had been prophesied that his name would be thus; (2) This baby was God, the one and only God of the universe, in human form.

Until Christians come to the place that their impression of the name "JESUS" is more that the next available name for a Hebrew child but, instead, is the name of the God of the universe, the name JESUS will never have its full purpose and meaning to them. Further, this is not a "God the Father" person, naming a "God the Son" person after himself. It is God "himself" with his unchanging name which he alone still bears, and now he is born as a human being whose name has not changed from the eternities.

No doubt this declaration about the name of JESUS being, in fact, the name JEHOVAH – SAVIOR, will shock theologians into raging madness, just as it did the Jewish religious leaders in the day of Christ.

Where did this name come from and who made the decision to name the baby in Bethlehem JESUS? The answer is simple: JEHOVAH did. It was his name as the self-existent God of the ages and now that he has come to the world in human form, nothing about his name changes, except that now he is taking the position of savior of the world. Thus JESUS = JEHOVAH-(as our) SAVIOR. Over and over we have stated that God became a man. The only God who could become a man was JEHOVAH. Even the Trinitarian proponents teach that God was man; why should it be so incongruous for me to herald that same theology. The difference is that I am declaring that the one and only God, JEHOVAH, is he that has now become man.

When JESUS is born and is eight days old, according to the teaching of the law (which was still at this point in time effective for Hebrew families) he was circumcised. Upon his circumcision he was officially named JESUS (that is – JEHOVAH-YASHA).

What were these dear faithful Hebrew people thinking when they realized that Mary and Joseph have named their baby JEHOVAH? They knew exactly what the name of JESUS meant. This was no accident; they had been commanded to name their child thus. “Thou shalt call his name JESUS”, they were commanded. It was not overwhelming pride for their baby which the angel had announced to her she would bear? There was no choice in the matter. Their thoughts, since the day she was told she would bear the son of the “Highest”, were reveling in the veritable maze of scriptures about his coming to the world. Not one single verse anywhere had the slightest suggestion that the “child which would be given” (Is. 7:14 & 9:6), would, in any sense of expression or reality, be a second person of a multiple godhead. The preponderance of all scripture was that JEHOVAH would come and save them. They were surely meditating on these blessed scriptures and the “PROMISE” their people had held so dear to their hearts since it was made to Abraham. They were thankful and filled with praise to God that he was coming to save them.

These godly people knew the O.T. scriptures and their overwhelming emphasis on JEHOVAH their God; they were well acquainted with his repeated promise to come and save them. When they were told that this child would be called JESUS, there were no blank places in their minds as to what it meant. Immediately they knew this was JEHOVAH (their) SAVIOR. Hallelujahs must have poured from their souls at the profound and joyous exclamation that their child was JEHOVAH GOD AS A BABY BOY!

Are we ready for the next proclamation of this truth? The chorus of angels came with their announcement to shepherds watching their flocks of sheep. They told them that a Savior had been born in Bethlehem, which was Christ the Lord. They made haste and found the child as they had been told and rejoiced with great joy. They didn't leave their sheep on the hill side and go to Bethlehem just to see a new baby. That would not have been a new, exhilarating experience in their lives. They had looked down at a baby wrapped in swaddling clothes and knew they were looking in the face of God as a baby child. Moreover they knew that this child was JEHOVAH (their) SAVIOR. We seem to

have so restricted this child to just “another baby boy”, rather than think of him as he truly was, **GOD IN HUMAN FORM**. And if he was indeed God in human form, and if his name was to be called **JESUS**, how do we escape the awesome, overwhelming truth that this child, wrapped in humble swaddling clothes in a cattle stall, was **JEHOVAH—(our) --SAVIOR**.

After the days of Mary’s purification according to the law, they took the child to Jerusalem to make the offering of the first born as the law directed. There was in Jerusalem a man named Simeon, a just and devout man full of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost had revealed unto him that he would not see death until the long-promised Messiah had come. When they brought the child in, Simeon took him in his arms and blessed **GOD**, saying, Lord let thy servant depart in peace for mine eyes have seen thy salvation. Is there any doubt that Simeon knew who he was holding in his arms – **JEHOVAH-GOD**, in human form?

Is there any wonder that the Jewish rulers later branded him a blasphemer, Baalzebul, imposter and set their minds on killing him? They knew what the name **JESUS** meant: **JEHOVAH-SAVIOR**. It was not only that they rejected him as not being a human messiah. They rejected him because he, being a man, made himself God. They knew that the name **JESUS** identified him as the God of the O.T., **JEHOVAH**, and they did not believe that and would not stand for it.

When **JESUS** began his ministry, one of the first things he did was change the water to wine. After this he heals the sick, opens blind eyes, calms the storms, raises the dead, multiplies the loaves and fishes, forgives sin, cleanses lepers and defied every limitation of humanity. It is for sure he was **JEHOVAH** in human form. No **MAN** could do those miracles except that **GOD** was with him. And they all knew that there was no God but **JEHOVAH**.

When they crucified him the Roman authorities ordered a sign over his cross, declaring that he was “**JESUS, KING OF THE JEWS**”. It incensed the Jewish rulers. Not because he was called a king, but because it emphatically stated that he was **JESUS (JEHOVAH) KING OF THE JEWS**. A close survey of the gospels and the book of Acts will reveal that the thing the Jewish rulers hated most about this Galilean was not the mighty works he did. It was the name! Always it was about the name. They knew that the name **JESUS** unmistakably declared that he was **JEHOVAH**, the one and only God of every writer of Hebrew law and prophets and to them that was impossible. Their only alternative to **JESUS** being **JEHOVAH** in human form as their long-awaited Messiah was that **JESUS** was somehow an imposter whom they simply must have put to death. To admit that **JESUS** was, indeed, **JEHOVAH** meant their utter and complete condemnation and spiritual abomination. And that is precisely what it did mean.

On the day of Pentecost, Peter spoke to Jews out of every nation under heaven and what he said to them must have sent shock waves through their deeply rooted Jewish faith. He told them that this **JEHOVAH-SAVIOR** whom they had crucified was both Lord and Christ. He was both God and the anointed one for their salvation. Then he called on all of these devout Jewish people, whose hearts his message had deeply convicted, to be baptized every one of them in the name of **JEHOVAH-SAVIOR** for the remission of their sins. Yes, they heard him right because the power of the Holy Ghost in that

service had worked mightily, convicting them from the (O.T.) scriptures that the message of Peter was true.

Later when Peter and John went to the temple to pray, they met a lame man begging and healed him completely. Of course this spread like wildfire. Soon the pious priests got wind of it and pompously inquired as to the authority for such a healing as this at their door steps. First the occasion provided Peter and John the opportunity to preach the saving gospel of Christ to the multitude that immediately gathered. But the priests put them in detention and later questioned them about it. Peter answered them that it was by the NAME of JESUS, THE CHRIST OF NAZERETH, whom ye crucified that this man stands before you whole. Think in your minds and listen to Peter speak these words to them in his Hebrew tongue and you will understand their rage. Peter answered them that it was by the name of JEHOVAH-YASHA, the ANOINTED one of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, that he is whole. No wonder they commanded them not to teach or preach in “this name” again.

Paul was one of the most devoted and learned followers that JEHOVAH ever had and touching the law he was blameless. He verily believed that this “sect of Galileans” were blasphemers who must be stopped, even if it took death. He verily thought he was obeying JEHOVAH’S law in seeking them out to completely exterminate them. That is why he was on the Damascus road when he was smitten down as if by a bolt of lightning. He immediately knew that God was somehow dealing with him for some reason. So he asked the obvious question: “who art thou Lord”. The answer he got leaves us no wonder as to why he was so powerfully converted on this occasion. “I AM JEHOVAH WHOM THOU PERSECUTEST”. And the rest, as we say, is history. He went to Damascus and Ananias, in obedience to the vision God gave to him, came to Paul and said: “Brother Saul, the Lord, even JESUS (JEHOVAH) that appeared to thee in the way, hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost. Paul knew the language very well. When he was told that it was JESUS who had met him in the way, he didn’t have to ask for an interpreter. He knew it meant that JEHOVAH had appeared unto him and he was so well versed in O.T. teachings that he immediately discerned that this JESUS was JEHOVAH which was to come and save them. Afterwards Paul traversed the Roman world teaching that this JESUS (JEHOVAH) is the Christ. (See Acts 18:28)

What we have been trying to say is that the earliest followers of Jesus knew, believed and taught that their O.T. JEHOVAH had become their Christ and was JEHOVAH-YASHA – JESUS OUR SAVIOR. It is exactly the same as saying that God became man – God became the Christ. Otherwise, they could not have followed him because their O.T. law and prophets had repeated over and over that their God (JEHOVAH) would come and be their Savior. Moreover, they knew that their MIGHTY GOD AND EVERLASTING FATHER would be born as a child to become the sacrifice for their sins.

Now, one final thought.

They were on the Mt. of Olives, where the great commission had just been given to them and now the disciples watched as Jesus ascended out of their sight. As they stood there, transfixed by the moment, two men in white appeared unto them with the following message. “Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same JEHOVAH, (JESUS) which is taken up into heaven shall so

come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven. Choose for yourself: if you use the Hebrew language, you have JEHOVAH-YASHA; if you translate it from the Greek language you have JESUS. There is no difference as to whom it applies.

Later when Paul wrote to the Thessalonians in 4:14, he said: “For if we believe that JEHOVAH died and arose again, even so them also which sleep in JEHOVAH will God bring with him. (After all, there is no one else to come again.

Then Titus, 2:13, puts an even greater emphasis on the thought with these words: “Looking for that blessed hope and glorious appearing of THE GREAT GOD AND OUR SAVIOR “JEHOVAH (the) CHRIST”. I can almost hear the anathemas of theologians, screaming their accusations of blasphemy at this. Then they will turn right around and declare that if we don’t believe that Christ was God in human form that we are not even Christians. Well, just who then, was this God, as Christ, in human form? Paul knew what he was writing to Titus. He also knew both the Hebrew and the Greek language. He had no misgivings or doubts about the fact that the Christ whom he had preached to the world was JEHOVAH –JESUS.

Rev. 22:20 closes out the book of Revelation and for that matter the Bible, with these words. “He which testifieth these things saith, surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come Lord JEHOVAH-YHASHA.

To conclude this thought that it was JEHOVAH of the O.T. who was born of a virgin, to live as a man on this earth, and was called JEHOVAH-YASHA, I will provide several verses of scripture references which specifically speak to the truth that it was, indeed, JEHOVAH—GOD who came to earth as a man. They are as follows:

Isaiah 25:8-9; 35:2-4; 40:9-11; 43:10-11; 61:11-3

Psalms 16:8-10; 132:11

Zech. 9:9; 12:8-10; 14:3-9

Mal. 3:1

11. THE PRE-EXISTENT JESUS.

There are several passages of scripture which have thoughts in them about some form of a pre-existence of Christ. These verses are used to prove that there was not only “God” in eternity, but also that Christ was from eternity. Let us take a look at these scriptures to see what they have to say about this idea of a pre-existent Jesus.

First, we will review Is. 57:15, which will give us a clear view as to who was in existence in eternity. Is. 57:15. For thus saith the high and lofty ONE that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy; “I” dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones. This verse tells us that ONE inhabits eternity. If

that is a proper application of this verse, and we are sure that it is, then it leaves no room for any other to dwell with God in the eternal realm.

The various scriptures which make a reference to a pre-existent Jesus are as follows.

Rev. 13:8. And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the LAMB SLAIN FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD. This verse captures the true meaning of this pre-existent condition of Jesus. It speaks of him as being slain from the foundation of the world. Really? Shall we interpret this to mean that Calvary actually occurred back in the eternities, or shall we interpret it to say that Christ was slain in the predetermined will of God from the eternities? That would make sense of scripture. We know when he was "slain"; it was at Calvary about 30 A.D., not in the eternities. However, before the world was ever created, God knew and had "predetermined" that there would be the Messiah to be slain for the sins of the world.

Heb. 7:3. "Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually. This is a reference to the priesthood of Melchisedec, who in the days of Abraham, was a priest, not of the Levitical order which was not yet in existence, but a type of priesthood which had no beginning of days as the Levitical priesthood had. Melchisedec, whoever you think he really was, was not in any sense an eternal being. However, his order or manner of priesthood was a continual practice of the function of godly things. Jesus, as our great high priest, likewise, has a priesthood, not after the pattern of Levi, but of an unchangeable nature. It has nothing to do with him offering anything in the eternities.

Jn. 8:58. Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am. This is a wonderful passage conclusively proving that Jesus was "THE GREAT I AM", just as Jehovah told Moses he was in Ex. 3:14. What it proves is that THE GREAT I AM of Ex. 3:14, is the same GREAT I AM of Jn. 8:58. As I have often repeated, Jesus of the N.T. is the same as Jehovah of the O.T.

Jn. 17:5 & 24. Jesus is praying to the "Father" (deity) thus: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. – Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world". The first necessary observation from these verses is that it is the "MAN" Christ Jesus praying. If you deny that, you are then forced to conclude that it is "God-the-Son", praying to "God-the-Father", which is completely untrue. It is the condition of the "human" Christ, as mediator, interceding on behalf of his disciples to the "Father" or to deity. I realize this does not support the Trinitarian plurality of the godhead but what else can you truthfully make of it.

Col. 1:15. Who (Christ) is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature. A pre-existent eternity is eliminated from this verse by the statement that he is the "firstborn" of every creature. Being "firstborn" demands a point of beginning and precludes the possibility of any eternal existence. Christ was begotten in the womb of the Virgin Mary. He was, indeed, in the predetermined mind and purpose of God, but obviously had not been begotten at that point. Further, it says he is the image of the invisible God. You can put that "image" capacity in God's pre-

determined will, and/or you can put it in his capacity as Savior, firstborn into the family of God. In any case, it is not about an eternally pre-existing Jesus.

Mic. 5:2. But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. A beautiful testimony of exactly what I have been declaring throughout all of this document: that Jesus, the Son of God, is also Jesus the everlasting Father, the Mighty God and the Prince of Peace. As such, he is the God that was, is, and is to come. There would be a vast amount of scriptures to strike out of the Bible if it is not true that the God of creation did not, himself, condescend to this earth in the form of a man, Mary's son, to be the Savior of the world.

Jehovah, God, alone inhabited eternity; he alone spoke the world into existence. Man, whom he created, fell from his grace and needed a plan of redemption. Jehovah, God of eternity, came to the world in human flesh, and they called him Jesus (Jehovah-Savior).

End of Addendum as of 12-27-13. More may be added later.