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† Blessed is our God always, as it is now, was in the beginning, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen. ... in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen. Through the prayers of our holy Ancestors, Lord Jesus Christ our God, have mercy on us and save us. Amen. Glory to You, our God, glory to You.

O Heavenly King, the Comforter, the Spirit of truth, You are everywhere and fill all things, Treasury of blessings, and Giver of life: come and abide in us, and cleanse us from every impurity, and save our souls, O Good One.

† Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us (three times).

† Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit, as it is now, was in the beginning, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

“Ὁ θεός, ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ.” — Luke 18:13

“Ἰησοῦ, μνήσθητί μου ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου.” — Luke 23:42

“David ascended in the Ascent of the Olives, ascending and weeping. With head covered, he went barefoot. Each person with him, each man covered his head. They ascended, ascending and weeping.” — 2 Samuel 15:30

“The ones sowing in tears will reap in exultation. The ones going, went and wept, casting their seeds; yet, the ones coming, will come in exultation, carrying their sheaves. — Psalm 125:5-6 LXX [126:5-6][[1]](#footnote-1)

“Indisputably great is the mystery of good-worship[[2]](#footnote-2): Who was clearly displayed in flesh; was justified by [the] Spirit; was witnessed by messengers; was proclaimed internationally; was believed cosmically; was taken up in Glory.” — 1 Timothy 3:16

“It is necessary [for] that [One] to increase; yet, [for] me to decrease.”[[3]](#footnote-3) — John 3:30

“If we would walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus, His Son cleanses[[4]](#footnote-4) us from all sin.” — 1 John 1:7[[5]](#footnote-5)

### The Trinity

We have adopted the word Trineology[[6]](#footnote-6) to name discussion, logos, study, or words about the Trinity or Tri-unity.

Nature

A first question must be, what is the Divine Nature or Godhead of this Trinitarian Deity? A good many theologians divide this question into two parts: essence and energies.[[7]](#footnote-7)

For such theologians, essence refers to the makeup of God’s internal being, for which they claim that we know absolutely nothing; however, this claim of ignorance can be reduced to a philosophical absurdity.[[8]](#footnote-8)

“διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς, ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφανέρωσεν, τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοούμενα καθορᾶται, ἥ τε ἀΐδιος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους.” — Romans 1:19-20

“Because the known [essence] of God is light[[9]](#footnote-9) in them: for, God enlightened them: for, His invisible [essence] is clearly seen from the world’s creation in the beings’ understanding: specifically, His eternal power and essence, within their excuseless[[10]](#footnote-10) existence.” — Romans 1:19-20

While, we concede that God’s essence is a great mystery, only perceived through the clouded reflection of a poorly polished mirror:[[11]](#footnote-11) for, all human minds and rationality are darkened by sin; this mystery is not so great that people, in their individual free wills, do not realize anything that is happening within the essence of God. People know; they are responsible: they will be punished.[[12]](#footnote-12) This knowledge is described as:

* an internal, φανερόν, a light or illumination;
* an act of God, ἐφανέρωσεν, God enlightened or illumined them;
* something called, ἀόρατα, invisible;
* described, καθορᾶται, clearly seen;
* defined, ἀΐδιος αὐτοῦ δύναμις, His eternal power (an energy)
* proclaimed, καὶ θειότης, and essence (the specific declaration of essence);
* condemning, leaving mankind, ἀναπολογήτους, excuseless, without-apology[[13]](#footnote-13).

In spite of the darkening of reason due to sin, human beings have a clear and bright knowledge of God’s power; they understand the implications of that power in God’s essence.

Energies, as distinct from essence, refer to the attributes of God, which are declared in the Bible. Some theologians find this distinction less useful; the division is not that clear in the Bible: in addition, we have more than a sneaking suspicion[[14]](#footnote-14) that God’s attributes tell us something about the essence of God’s internal being.[[15]](#footnote-15)

If we allow the distinction between essence and energies to stand; then we must add an additional category to describe the artifacts or works, which are a result of God’s energies: namely, all of creation… which is mainly how we understand what the energies mean. For example: had we no human experience of love, we could never begin to understand the statement…

“ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν.” — 1 John 4:8

The claim that, “God is love”, begins to make sense to us because we have tasted both the joy and pleasure of love, as well as its sorrow and pain. When the Evangelist writes that, “God … loved … giving His Son”,[[16]](#footnote-16) we immediately identify with the loss of a child in the innermost chambers of the hidden mystery of our being: this experience leads us to believe, some would say falsely, that we have come to understand something of God’s inner essence through this instrument of empathy or sympathy[[17]](#footnote-17).

A fourth category has now emerged: conversation. The fact of creation, the third category, makes communication possible. The Spirit comes in this creation environment and enables us to listen to, and talk with, God. Furthermore men recorded this conversation, which we call Scripture, and study it.

“…: for, when prophecy came, not by human will: but, being carried by [the] Holy Spirit, humans, spoke from God.” — 2 Peter 1:21

“Now, these [Bereans] were better begotten than the [people] in Thessaloníki; they welcomed the word with all enthusiasm: daily examining the writings if it might have these things in this way.” — Acts 17:11

Possibly, the next thing that catches our attention, is the Creator-creature distinction: more specifically that God is uncreated, which sets God apart from everything else. At least as far as our minds can grasp, this means that God is not physical, not natural: for, even the word nature[[18]](#footnote-18) cannot properly be applied to God. This is why we avoid words like substance[[19]](#footnote-19), and much prefer the word essence[[20]](#footnote-20): because, essence sounds more uncreated and other worldly.

However, our purpose here is not to examine human mystical thinking; but, rather to search out as much as we can find in the Bible, indirectly or specifically, about the Trinity: so, our interest is in the biblical statements themselves, not in our own vain philosophizing.

God has things to say about Himself, among them this…

“Πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν.” — John 4:24

“God is Spirit. It is necessary for the worshippers to worship Him in spirit and truth.”[[21]](#footnote-21) — John 4:24

God’s essence is not earthly or physical; the encounter with God’s essence cannot be separated from His worship. Someone will say that the word, πνεῦμα, is just the common Greek word for breath, or wind, and it sometimes refers to the cardio-pulmonary systems of mammals. We reject this line of thinking on at least two grounds:[[22]](#footnote-22) one: we know that God is uncreated,[[23]](#footnote-23) this line of thought falsely tends to make the Creator into a creature; two: God is distinguishing Himself by the word Πνεῦμα, so, it makes no sense to tear apart the distinction that has just been made. We believe that God is The All Creating Uncreated Πνεῦμα.

We also believe that there is a parallel created universe that is properly called πνεῦμα: which is where the created angels dwell; which is also the domain wherein we worship.[[24]](#footnote-24)

Furthermore, we believe that humans possess a created πνεῦμα, as well as a created φύσις: that the human πνεῦμα may communicate within the parallel created πνεῦμα universe, and may even communicate with God.[[25]](#footnote-25) In other words, human beings are part material and part immaterial: but both parts are created.

God also describes Himself as θεῖον, θειότης, θεότητος, and θείας.[[26]](#footnote-26)

So, we have a set of biblical words to describe the Divine-nature; we prefer these words to other words that might be used; specifically, these words are: πνεῦμα, θεῖον, θειότης, θεότητος, and θείας. In theological discussions we also find the words, οὐσίον[[27]](#footnote-27) and ὑπόστασις.

Sound theology begins here, with the study of the Θεῖον, the God-essence.

Scripture

We move on to whatever Scripture we can find discussing the Trinity or related issues.

“In the beginning, God made the heaven and the earth; the earth was invisible and shapeless; darkness was above the abyss. The Spirit of God carried Himself above the waters.” — Genesis 1:1-2

Here, at the very least, the probability of two distinct persons already exists: namely, God, and the Spirit of God. In Hebrew, the word for God is also, invariably plural.

“And God said, ‘We should make[[28]](#footnote-28) man according to Our image, according to likeness; They shall have dominion[[29]](#footnote-29) over the fish of the sea, the birds of the air, animals, over all the earth, and all creepers that creep on the earth.’ God made the man; He made him according to [the] image of God; He made them[[30]](#footnote-30) male and female.” — Genesis 1:26-27

Grammar

It is very popular to falsely pass off these plurals as plurals of majesty or plurals of royalty; meaning that they are really singulars: Gods really means God; We simply means I; and Our merely means, My. We accept God because the English language will not tolerate the plural, Gods: yet we know that a plurality is there.[[31]](#footnote-31) On the other hand, is it true that, We, and, Our, are majestic or royal plurals? We would suggest that this is so much Judaizing nonsense in an attempt to deny the witness of the Trinity in the Old Testament. Since Moses was raised as royalty in the Egyptian court, let us look to the Egyptian court for examples of majestic and/or royal plurals.



In this monument of Amenhotep Ⅲ (circa 1401-1351 BC), Tiye, and one of their daughters; we get an idea of the Egyptian royal plural from about the time of Moses and the Exodus (1406-1366 BC). If, as our gainsayers claim, we, really means, I; why would an Egyptian monument immortalize the family? Are we to believe that any king who so honored his queen, did not also consult with her on most, if not all affairs of state? If the queen were not really the king’s equal and partner in the affairs of state, why would she be elevated to the status of Great Royal Wife, immortalized on a monument, and enthroned at an equal level with the king? If such a king said, we, did he not really mean, we?[[32]](#footnote-32)

Menkaure (circa 2532-2500 BC) flanked by goddesses.[[33]](#footnote-33)

Seti Ⅰ (1290-1279 BC) being nourished by the goddess Mut.[[34]](#footnote-34)

Isis protects Osiris with her wings.[[35]](#footnote-35)

It is not enough that we do not believe in such idolatry;[[36]](#footnote-36) all of the pharaohs believed it. Pharaohs wore crowns integrating them with this religious system; which crowns also identified the extent of their domain.[[37]](#footnote-37) Pharaohs were also major system priests; their political power was in no small part dependent on the Egyptian priesthood: they fully believed that they themselves were gods, or would become gods. Are we to believe that when a pharaoh said, we, he did not intend to include the backing of the entire Egyptian priesthood, as well as the deities in which he, and all other Egyptians believed?

Egyptians understood the meaning of the word, we, and used it appropriately. Pharaoh had no inclination or need to embellish his sagging ego by political pretense: he truly believed that his dependence upon Mut was as real as that of his own nursing mother, or wet nurse.

Ashurnasirpal Ⅱ (reign 886-859 BC) protected by eagle headed figure.[[38]](#footnote-38)

In Mesopotamia, dignitaries might be buried with many escorts; so, that they would not be alone in the underworld: thus, proving that Mesopotamian concepts of the royal we, did not differ from those of Egypt.[[39]](#footnote-39)

Both YHWH[[40]](#footnote-40) and Moses were fully aware of the complexity and plurality of world idolatry when YHWH directed that Moses confront the pharaoh, as well as all the idols of Egypt, employing ten plagues. Neither YHWH nor Moses had any inclination or need to embellish their sagging egos; both fully comprehended the nature of the conflict with idolatry: to err over, Elohim, We, and Our, is simply beyond comprehension… it could not have happened. The terms, Elohim, We, and Our, were specifically chosen as part of the confrontation with Egypt: their presence in Genesis 1:26 is no accident. We will soon discover that both YHWH and Moses know how to say, I:[[41]](#footnote-41) we can only conclude that, We, meant, We; Our, meant, Our; Elohim was intentional. There is a True plurality to God’s essence which is already evident in Genesis 1:1-2, 26.

Furthermore, any plural of majesty or plural of royalty would require consistent use throughout Scripture, in order to conform to any consistent form of good grammar and syntax. Since these, We and Our, forms of plurals are rare in Scripture, we are only further compelled to take them at face value, not as some sort of figure of speech: We, Our, and Elohim are all intended to be actual plurals.

Septuagint

Throughout this section, we will use the Septuagint and the Masoretic text to test each other. We are now firmly committed to the idea that LXX, being a good five hundred years older than MT, preserves a far better witness to the Hebrew language circa 4 BC to 33 AD. What we call the Hebrew language today, is only known to exist from around 516 to 200 BC; after which it becomes a dead language: so, Moses (1406-1366 BC) most certainly did not write in Hebrew. Paleo-Hebrew is in primary use from no earlier than 1200 BC; yet, it is also a dead language by 200 BC: so, it is very unlikely that Moses wrote in paleo-Hebrew either. The prevailing evidence suggests that Moses wrote in Akkadian cuneiform. However, we must be very cautious here, not to draw or leap to unwarranted conclusions: we have no evidence of Torah in Akkadian; any evidence of paleo-Hebrew is sparse; most Hebrew evidence is relatively modern; while the Dead Sea Scrolls are limited in scope and without provenance. All the prevailing evidence points to the LXX in the hands of Jesus and the Apostles. Since Jesus is our sole canonical authority, we have every reason to embrace LXX with great confidence.

Genesis

“For God knows that on the day you eat from it, your eyes will be opened, and you will be as God[[42]](#footnote-42), knowing good and evil.” — Genesis 3:5

“God said, See, Adam has become as one of Us, to know good and evil. Now, lest he should ever stretch out his hand, and would take from the tree of life, and could eat, and will live forever….” — Genesis 3:22[[43]](#footnote-43)

“[YHWH Elohim] ….[[44]](#footnote-44) The Lord said, ‘What have you done? The voice of your brother's blood cries to Me out of the ground.” — Genesis 4:10

“This is the book of mankind’s begetting, in the day God made Adam, He made him in the image[[45]](#footnote-45) of God: He made them male and female. He blessed them. He called his name Adam, on the day He made them.” — Genesis 5:1-2

“YHWH Elohim said, ‘My Spirit shall never ever remain among these men into the ages: because, they are flesh; yet their days[[46]](#footnote-46) will be one hundred twenty years.’ ” — Genesis 6:3

“The one who sheds man’s blood, his blood will be shed in recompense: because I made the man in the image of God.” — Genesis 9:6

“The Lord[[47]](#footnote-47) said, ‘See, all have one race, and one lip. They begin to do this. Now, nothing will fail from them of all which they could have attempted to do. Come, descending, We[[48]](#footnote-48) should garble their language there, so that they could not have heard the voice of each neighbor.’ ” — Genesis 11:6-7

“Melchisedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine;[[49]](#footnote-49) he was priest of God the Most-high.” — Genesis 14:18

“Now Angel of the Lord[[50]](#footnote-50) discovered her by the spring of water in the desert, by the spring in the Sur road.” — Genesis 16:7

“The Angel of the Lord said to her, ‘Return to your mistress, and submit yourself under her hands.’ The Angel of the Lord said to her, ‘Multiplying, I will multiply your seed. It will not be numbered for multitude.’ The Angel of the Lord said to her, ‘See, you have in belly. You will bear a son. You will call his name Ismael: because the Lord attended[[51]](#footnote-51) to your humiliation.’ ” — Genesis 16:9-11[[52]](#footnote-52)

Astonishingly, the Angel of the Lord is said to attend to Agar, a nobody in the theological salvation history, to attend to her needs personally and individually: we are reminded of the Syrophoenician and Samarian Women (Matthew 15:21-28; John 4:1-42). To put a sharper point on this extraordinarily remarkable contrast, even Aaron cannot approach God without the atoning sacrifice, without priestly garments, without Ephod, Urim and Thummim. Moses alone, speaks with God face to face, as later will Samuel: but, not Eli, or other high priests. Here, the Angel of the Lord, who does the things that only God does, who is called both YHWH and God in the close context (Genesis 16:13), who, evidently, is both YHWH and God, attends to a seemingly insignificant woman without the intervention of a priest.

Hopefully, we will have more observations to make under the topic of Christology. This being said, if the Christology is proved from the Old Testament: then the Trineology is also proved, and that conclusively.

“When Abram was ninety-nine years old, YHWH appeared to Abram. He said to him, ‘I am El-Shaddai[[53]](#footnote-53); walk before me, and be perfect.” — Genesis 17:1

It appears that this name is also plural (אֵ֥ל שַׁדַּ֛י | Θεός). NB that the adjective שַׁדַּ֛י is missing from LXX indicating that this instance at Genesis 17:1 is a MT addition.

Nevertheless, the name is of interest to us, both because of its plurality and also because of its meaning.

The root word, שָׁדַד, means to be violent, destroy, devastate, empty, lay waste, oppress, plunder, ruin, spoil, waste, wreck. Of a woman, it indicates a mistress, the destroyer of the marriage covenant and homewrecker. Of God, it is usually translated Almighty; yet, we have trouble understanding this in any good sense: we suspect that the denotative and explicit meaning of the root is lost….

Possibly, it denotes to pour out, which, by connotative and implicit meaning, eventually takes on the meaning of the nature of that pouring out.

NB how the subtle change in pointing in Deuteronomy 32:13 directs us to a completely different root, שָׁדָה, which does mean pour. We will need to understand more of the Canaanite language (Isaiah 19:18) before we can speak definitively: for, what we call paleo-Hebrew, is at best Canaanite or a minor dialect of Canaanite; which is virtually indistinguishable from Phoenician, except as a way of separating various corpuses of literature from each other: Ugaritic, for example.

But, God pours out kindness and mercy as well as judgment and punishment.

In spite of the paucity of firm evidence[[54]](#footnote-54); in spite of the fact that “El-Shaddai” appears to be a complete fiction, it is useful in this single respect: it is curious that a Hebrew scribe would add notations supporting the plurality of Deity. It seems to be, just another case, of “God in the hands of an angry sinner.”[[55]](#footnote-55)

“Now God appeared to him by the oak of Mambre, as he was sitting at his tent door in [the] noon heat; looking up with his eyes he saw, ‘Look, three men had been standing above him. Having seen them, he ran joining them from his tent door. He prostrated on the earth.” — Genesis 18:1-2[[56]](#footnote-56)

“Now he[[57]](#footnote-57) said to him, ‘Where [is] Sarah your wife?’ Replying, he said, ‘Look. In the tent. So, He said, ‘Returning, I will come to you according to this time in season. Sarah your wife will have a son; Sarah heard at the tent door, being behind him.” — Genesis 18:9-10[[58]](#footnote-58)

“Two messengers came into Sodom at vespers; Lot sat by the gate of Sodom; Lot, seeing, stood to meet them. He prostrated with his face upon the earth. He said, ‘Look, lords, turn aside into your servant’s house. Rest and wash your feet. Waking early, you will depart into your road.’ They said, ‘No; but, we will lodge in the square.’ ” — Genesis 19:1-2[[59]](#footnote-59)

“Abraham planted a grove at The Well of the Oath; there he called on the name of the YHWH, God Everlasting.”[[60]](#footnote-60) — Genesis 21:33

“The Angel of the Lord called to him out of heaven, and said, ‘Abraham, Abraham.’ and he said, Here I am….[[61]](#footnote-61) The Angel of the Lord called to Abraham out of heaven the second time….”[[62]](#footnote-62) — Genesis 22:11, 15

“Except the God of my father, the God of Abraham, and the fear[[63]](#footnote-63) of Isaac, had been with me, surely you would have sent me away empty now. God has seen my affliction and the labor of my hands, and rebuked you last night.” — Genesis 31:42

“Jacob was left alone. A man wrestled with him until daybreak. When He saw that He had not prevailed against him, He touched the hollow of his thigh, numbing the hollow of Jacob’s, as He wrestled with him. He said, ‘Let me go, for day has dawned.’ He replied, ‘I will not let you go, until you bless me.’ So, He said to him, ‘What is your name?’ He replied, ‘Jacob.’ He said, ‘Your name will be no longer called Jacob; but Israel will be your name: for you have prevailed with God; and will have power with men.’

“Jacob asked Him in response, ‘Please declare Your name to me?’ He said, ‘Why do you ask for My name?’[[64]](#footnote-64) He blessed him there.

“Jacob called the name of the place, Peniel: for, ‘I have seen God face to face, and my life was spared.’ As the sun rose above him, he passed Penuel[[65]](#footnote-65), limping on his thigh.[[66]](#footnote-66) — Genesis 32:24-31[[67]](#footnote-67)

“Pharaoh said to all his servants, ‘We will not, will we… be able to find a man like this, who has the Spirit of God[[68]](#footnote-68) in him?’ ” — Genesis 41:38

“Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass’s foal to its branch; he will wash his robe in wine, and his garment in the blood of the grape.” — Genesis 49:11[[69]](#footnote-69)

Throughout the Book of Genesis, we have observed evidences of God’s plurality in Unity. While these, do not, in and of themselves prove a doctrine of Trinity; they certainly leave room for that possibility to develop in the progress of doctrine. The plurality of Divinity expressed in Genesis cannot and must not be denied. If a complete Christology and Pneumatology are developed from the Old Testament: then, the Trinity is firmly established.

Exodus

“[The] Angel of the YHWH appeared to [Moses] in a fire of flame from the bush: and he sees that the bush burns with fire: but, the bush is not consumed.” — Exodus 3:2[[70]](#footnote-70)

“God said to Moses, ‘***I Am That I Am***.’ He said, ‘You will say to the children of Israel, “***I Am*** has sent me to you.” ’[[71]](#footnote-71) God said again to Moses, ‘You will say to the children of Israel, “the Lord God of your ancestors, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you: this is My Name forever, and My memorial to generations of generations.” — Exodus 3:14-15

It is difficult, yet, not completely impossible to get, YHWH, from,
אֶֽהְיֶ֖ה אֲשֶׁ֣ר אֶֽהְיֶ֑ה, or from, אֶֽהְיֶ֖ה. אֶֽהְיֶ֖ה אֲשֶׁ֣ר אֶֽהְיֶ֑ה,[[72]](#footnote-72) means “***I Am That I Am***.” אֶֽהְיֶ֖ה, means “***I Am***.” Neither, Ehyeh, nor, Ehyeh asher Ehyeh, sound anything like YHWH. It is not out of the question that the Masoretes have stirred up all the fuss about YHWH to mask the true Name. אֶֽהְיֶ֖ה and יְהוָה֙ only share ה, and י in a different letter sequence; א, and ו are unique to their words; the sound of ו cannot be made into the sound of י. Even the pointing of יְהוָה֙ [[73]](#footnote-73) is fabricated: for, it belongs to the word, אֲדֹנִ֔י. It is a strange fact that LXX always translates YHWH as Κύριος: if YHWH was that significant, we would expect a transliteration of the name, as is common in other instances, rather than a translation. It is possible that the unrevealed name is not YHWH at all: but, rather, “***I Am***”, which would be a significant Christophany.[[74]](#footnote-74) YHWH has the suspicious look and feel of a complete Masoretic fabrication: but, who knows for sure?

“I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as El-Shaddai, but by my name YHWH, I was not known to them.” — Exodus 6:3[[75]](#footnote-75)

Text Criticism

According to the following article, both El-Shaddai and YHWH stand on uncertain ground. If WLC is the only surviving Hebrew manuscript evidence for Exodus 6:3, we have very little reason to accept it at face value. LXX has Θεὸς: but, as we have already seen, LXX was perfectly capable of transliterating Σαδδαΐ (Ezekiel 10:5): so, why doesn’t the Greek text read Θεὸς-Σαδδαΐ? LXX translates the ostensible YHWH as Κύριος; which could as easily be אֲדֹנִ֔י as יְהוָה֙. We are left with a whole hypothesis of an unspeakable name hanging by a single thread: by the mouths of two or three witnesses let every fact be established.[[76]](#footnote-76)

“It is important to note that differences were found among fragments of texts. According to *The Oxford Companion to Archaeology*:

“While some of the Qumran biblical manuscripts are nearly identical to the Masoretic, or traditional, Hebrew text of the Old Testament, some manuscripts of the books of Exodus and Samuel found in Cave Four exhibit dramatic differences in both language and content. In their astonishing range of textual variants, the Qumran biblical discoveries have prompted scholars to reconsider the once-accepted theories of the development of the modern biblical text from only three manuscript families: of the Masoretic text, of the Hebrew original of the Septuagint, and of the Samaritan Pentateuch. It is now becoming increasingly clear that the Old Testament scripture was extremely fluid until its canonization around A.D. 100.”[[77]](#footnote-77)

Gleason Archer expresses the opposite opinion: but, in light of the present evidence, his glowing report is premature and seriously outdated. We are forced to look to LXX for text critical support, and we find none. If “the Old Testament scripture was extremely fluid until its canonization around A.D. 100”, as Fagan and Beck claim; then all the Masoretes do, is lull us into a false sense of security about a literature that has no sound evidence. Who canonized what in 100 AD? The quasi-Council of Jamnia has been discredited: it never happened. Judaism has no canonical authority. Only Jesus Christ has canonical authority; all the evidence points to the idea that He canonized the Septuagint (LXX) circa 33 AD: today, the Church has sole custody of that canonical record.

“In conclusion, we should accord to the Masoretes the highest praise for their meticulous care in preserving so sedulously the consonantal text of the Sopherim which had been entrusted to them. They, together with the Sopherim themselves, gave the most diligent attention to the accurate preservation of the Hebrew Scriptures that has ever been devoted to any ancient literature, secular or religious, in the history of human civilization...

“Because of their faithfulness, we have today a form of the Hebrew text which in all essentials duplicates the recension which was considered authoritative in the days of Christ and the apostles, if not a century earlier. And this in turn, judging from Qumran evidence, goes back to an authoritative revision of the Old Testament text which was drawn up on the basis of the most reliable manuscripts available for collation from previous centuries. These bring us very close in all essentials to the original autographs themselves, and furnish us with an authentic record of God’s revelation. As W. F. Albright has said, ‘We may rest assured that the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible, though not infallible has been preserved with an accuracy perhaps unparalleled in any other Near Eastern literature.’ ”[[78]](#footnote-78)

Rubbish. Summing up, we claim, contrary to Archer, that in the MT we could not possibly be farther away from the text that was “authoritative in the days of Christ and the apostles”. MT is not, and never has been, a canonical document; it is not “close in [any] essentials to the original autographs”: it is not even a quality archetype. There is no substitute for LXX studies. YHWH is very possibly a myth. ***I Am***, on the other hand, shouts from every corner of the universe.

“For now, I will send all my plagues in your heart, [in] your servants’ [heart(s)], and [in] your people’s [heart]: so, you will know that there is not another such as I in all the earth.” — Exodus 9:14[[79]](#footnote-79)

“For now, having extended the hand, I will strike you. I will kill your people. You will be destroyed from the earth.” — Exodus 9:15[[80]](#footnote-80)

“Every firstborn in Egypt land will die, from the first born of Pharaoh who sits on his throne, to the firstborn of the slave girl who is beside the mill, and to the firstborn of every domestic animal.” — Exodus 11:5[[81]](#footnote-81)

“It came to pass, when Moses lifted up his hands, Israel prevailed; but, when he let down his hands, Amalek prevailed.” — Exodus 17:11[[82]](#footnote-82)

“You yourselves have seen how much I have done to the Egyptians. I lifted you up as if upon eagles’ wings. I brought you to Myself.” — Exodus 19:4[[83]](#footnote-83)

“Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people. He said, ‘See the blood of the covenant, which the Lord established with you around all these words.’ ” — Exodus 24:8[[84]](#footnote-84)

“And of the chosen of Israel, not even one was absent. They were seen in God’s presence[[85]](#footnote-85). They ate. They drank. — Exodus 24:11[[86]](#footnote-86)

“The Glory of the God descended on mount Sinai. The cloud covered it six days. The Lord called Moses on the seventh day from the midst of the cloud; the sight of the Glory of the Lord was as if burning fire on the mountain peak in the sight of the children of Israel.” — Exodus 24:16-17[[87]](#footnote-87)

“Moses went into the midst of the cloud. He ascended the mountain. Moses was there on the mountain forty days and forty nights.” — Exodus 24:18[[88]](#footnote-88)

“Make me a consecrated room. I will be seen among them.” — Exodus 25:8[[89]](#footnote-89)

“I will be known to you there. I will speak to you from above the mercy rising midway of the two cherubim existing over the Ark of witness. According to everything, that whenever I would command you about the children of Israel. — Exodus 25:22[[90]](#footnote-90)

“You will set the bread of presence on the table before me forever.” — Exodus 25:30[[91]](#footnote-91)

“You will make its seven lamps. You will set the lamps on [it]. They will shine from one face.” — Exodus 25:37[[92]](#footnote-92)

Thus, in Exodus 25 we have combined tropes representing the presence and the work of the Father, above the Mercy [Seat]; of the Son, in the bread of His presence which feeds us all; and of the Spirit, who enlightens the inner beings of God’s servants, so that they can give light to the world. In combination, each and all of these make up the Shəkinah, the presence of God among His people. This is a strong witness of the Trinity. However, there is only One God: so the Son and Spirit are present above the Mercy; the Father and Spirit are also with the Bread; the Father and Son share in giving light. Clearly, these are mysteries which we do not understand.

Exodus 26 deals with the construction of the Tabernacle, which is a trope of God’s heavenly palace: the Oracle, the synaxis of holy angels, and more are all depicted there with the Trinity.

In Exodus 27, the brazen altar couldn’t be a picture of the lake of fire, could it? As sins are confessed on the heads of sacrificial animals; the animals actually, with the sins symbolically, are consumed in the fire. The purified sinner, with the ashes of the sweet savor[[93]](#footnote-93) sacrifice, freely enters the presence of God. The trope pictures the work of the Father, Son, and Spirit in confession and absolution.[[94]](#footnote-94)

“The Lord passed by before his face, and proclaimed, ‘The Lord God, showing pity and mercy, patience and great love and truth. Preserving righteousness and mercy to thousands, forgiving lawlessness and unrighteousness and sin. He will not cleanse the liable: bringing the lawlessness of the fathers on the children, and on the children’s children, to the third and fourth generation.’ ” — Exodus 34:6-7[[95]](#footnote-95)

“He has filled him with God’s Spirit of wisdom, understanding, and knowledge of all things…” — Exodus 35:31[[96]](#footnote-96)

Leviticus

Leviticus 23 discusses the great annual feasts: Pesach is specifically a trope of the death of the Son; Shavuot is a trope of the coming of the Spirit producing first fruits in the Son, Who, is the embodiment of Torah; Sukkot is a trope of entrance into the heavenly rest of the Father. Pesach is a week-long feast held on the fourteenth day of the first month. Shavuot is fifty days after Pesach, and in close association with First Fruits. Sukkot is a week-long feast held on the fifteenth day of the seventh month; however, it is preceded by Trumpets on the first day[[97]](#footnote-97), and Atonement on the tenth day[[98]](#footnote-98). It is difficult to see, how these three feasts, in aggregate, fail to present a strong argument for Trinity.

Deuteronomy

“Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord:” — Deuteronomy 6:4; Mark 12:29[[99]](#footnote-99)

“Moses, the priests, and Levites spoke to all Israel, saying, ‘Be still, and listen, O Israel, this day you have become the people of the Lord your God.” — Deuteronomy 27:9[[100]](#footnote-100)

Psalms

“The Lord said to my Lord, ‘Sit at my right hand, until I make your enemies your footstool.’ ” — Psalm 110:1; Matthew 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42-43; Acts 2:34-35; Hebrews 1:13; 10:13[[101]](#footnote-101)

Zechariah

“The Angel of YHWH answered and said, ‘O YHWH of hosts, how long will You have no mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah, against which You have had indignation these seventy years?’ ” — Zechariah 1:12[[102]](#footnote-102)

“YHWH said to Satan, ‘YHWH rebukes you, O Satan. YHWH Who has chosen Jerusalem rebukes you. Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?’ ” — Zechariah 3:2[[103]](#footnote-103)

“He said, ‘These are the two anointed ones, that stand by the Lord of the whole earth.’ ” — Zechariah 4:14[[104]](#footnote-104)

O T Summary

The evidences of plurality and unity are unmistakably evident throughout the Old Testament. Yet, without a detailed proof of Old Testament Patrology (the theology of the Father); Christology (the theology of the Son); and Pneumatology (the theology of the Spirit), we would be hard put to paint a clear picture of the Trinity in the Old Testament: the picture is there, it’s just not clearly defined without much more study.

Baptism

“Jesus, being baptized, ascended straight from the water. Look, the heavens were opened. He saw the Spirit of God descending as if a dove, coming upon him. Look, a voice from heaven, saying, ‘This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well glorified.’ ” — Matthew 3:16-17[[105]](#footnote-105)

“[John] ascending straight out of the water, saw the heavens rent. The Spirit descending into Him as a dove. A voice came out of the heavens, ‘You are My beloved Son, in You I am well glorified.’ ” — Mark 1:10-11[[106]](#footnote-106)

“The Holy Ghost descended on Him, bodily visible, as a dove. A voice to come out of heaven, ‘You are My beloved Son; in You I am well glorified.’ ” — Luke 3:22[[107]](#footnote-107)

“John testified, saying, ‘I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven. He remained upon Him.’ ” — John 1:32[[108]](#footnote-108)

Lord’s Prayer

“Therefore, pray in this manner: ‘Our Father in heaven, Your Name was consecrated;’ ” — Matthew 6:9[[109]](#footnote-109)

“He said to them, ‘When you pray, say, Father, Your Name was consecrated; Your kingdom came.’ ” — Luke 11:2[[110]](#footnote-110)

Transfiguration

“While [Peter] was speaking…. Look, a bright cloud overshadowed them. Look, a voice out of the cloud, saying, ‘This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well glorified. Hear Him.’ ” — Matthew 17:5

“A cloud came, overshadowing them. A voice came out of the cloud, ‘This is my beloved Son. Hear Him.’ ” — Mark 9:7

“[Peter] saying these [things] of himself, a cloud came and overshadowed them; they were afraid as they entered into the cloud. A voice came out of the cloud, saying, ‘This is my elect Son. Hear Him.’ ” — Luke 9:34-35[[111]](#footnote-111)

I Am[[112]](#footnote-112)

“Jesus said to her, ‘***I Am*** the One speaking to you.’ ” — John 4:26[[113]](#footnote-113)

“Jesus said to them, ‘***I Am*** the bread of life. Anyone coming to Me would never hunger. Anyone believing in Me will never thirst.’ ” — John 6:35

“Then Jesus shouted out in the temple, teaching and saying, ‘You know Me. You know from where I am. I did not come from Myself: but, He sending Me is True, Whom you do not know.’ ” — John 7:28[[114]](#footnote-114)

“Then Jesus said, ‘I am with you only a short time. I depart to My Sender.’ ” — John 7:33[[115]](#footnote-115)

“Then Jesus spoke to them again, saying, ‘***I Am*** the light of the world. Anyone accompanying Me could never every walk around in the darkness: but, will have the light of life.’ ” — John 8:12

“Then Jesus said, ‘Whenever, you would have lifted up the Son of Man; then, you will know that ***I am***. I do nothing from Myself; but, exactly as the Father taught Me, these I speak.’ ” — John 8:28[[116]](#footnote-116)

“Jesus said to them, ‘Amen, amen, I say to you, before Abraham was, ***I Am***.’ ” — John 8:58[[117]](#footnote-117)

“Jesus said, ‘I came into this world to judge[[118]](#footnote-118), that those not seeing could see; while those seeing would become blind.’ ” — John 9:39[[119]](#footnote-119)

“Then Jesus said to them again, ‘Amen, amen, I say to you,
***I Am*** the door of the sheep.’ ” — John 10:7

“Jesus said to [Martha], ‘***I Am*** the Resurrection, and the Life. Anyone believing in Me, even if he would die, he will live.’ ” — John 11:25

“Jesus said to him, ‘***I Am*** the Way, the Truth, and the Life: no one comes to the Father, except through Me.” — John 14:6

“They [who were searching for Him] replied to Him, ‘Jesus the Nazōréan’. Jesus said to them, ‘***I Am***’. Judas, the betrayer, had also stood with them. Then, as He said to them, ‘***I Am***’, they drew back and fell on the ground.” — John 18:5-6[[120]](#footnote-120)

“Jesus replied, ‘I said to you that ***I Am***. So, if you seek Me, let these go their way:’ ” — John 18:8

“Then Pilate said to Him, ‘Then You are not a king [are You]?’ Jesus replied, ‘You say that I am a king. I have been begotten[[121]](#footnote-121) for this. I have come into the world, in order that I would testify the truth. Everyone who is of the truth hears My voice.’ ” — John 18:37[[122]](#footnote-122)

“Jesus said to her, ‘Do not cling to Me: for, I have not yet ascended to the Father; go to My brothers and sisters. Say to them, “I ascend to My Father, and your Father; to My God, and your God.” ’ ” — John 20:17[[123]](#footnote-123)

John

“I have come in My Father’s Name, and you do not receive Me. If another should have come in his own name, you will receive.” — John 5:43[[124]](#footnote-124)

“Jesus answered them, ‘I told you, and you did not believed: the works that I do in My Father’s Name, these bear witness of Me.’ ” — John 10:25[[125]](#footnote-125)

“Father, glorify Your Name. Then a voice came out of the heaven. ‘I have glorified it. I will glorify it again.’ ” — John 12:28[[126]](#footnote-126)

“Whatever you ask in My Name, I will do this, that the Father would be glorified in the Son…. The Father will send the Holy Ghost, [Who is] called beside [you], in My Name, He will teach you everything, and remind you [of] everything, that I said to you.” — John 14:13, 26[[127]](#footnote-127)

“You have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you. I placed you, that you should depart[[128]](#footnote-128) and could bear fruit. Your fruit would remain: that whatever you would ask the Father in My Name, He would give you.” — John 15:16[[129]](#footnote-129)

“In that day, you will ask nothing from me. Amen, amen, I say to you, ‘Whatever you ask the Father, He will give you in My Name…. In that day, you will ask in My Name. I do not say to you, that I would ask the Father for you.’ ” — John 16:23, 26[[130]](#footnote-130)

“Now I am no longer in the world. These are in the world. I come to You. Holy Father, keep them in Your Name, those whom You have given Me, that they would be One, as We.” — John 17:11[[131]](#footnote-131)

Great Commission

“Therefore, scurrying about[[132]](#footnote-132), make disciples of all the nations: baptizing them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. Look, I am with you all the days until the end of the age.” — Matthew 28:19-20[[133]](#footnote-133)

Epistles

“Because you are sons, God sent out the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, shouting, Abba, Father. — Galatians 4:6[[134]](#footnote-134)

“Giving thanks always for all things in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ to Father God….” — Ephesians 5:20[[135]](#footnote-135)

Mapping

Mapping is a mathematics discipline. It refers to the appropriateness of applying a particular math model to a specific instance. The idea is that the map of Ohio is inappropriately applied to Oklahoma or Oregon: improper mapping reduces to absurdity, it can only get people lost.

The usual mapping absurdly applied to the Trinity is that:
therefore, there cannot possibly be three persons in the Godhead: for, this would obviously require three gods. Such gainsayers only display their ignorance of the elements of mathematics. There is no good reason to map the ordinary arithmetic process of addition onto the Godhead; nor is there any necessary reason to map each of the persons of the Trinity as an ordinary arithmetic one. That which is indivisible and inseparable cannot simply be added. As far as one is concerned, one what? Yet, even at this level of thinking we can easily produce a better map:

for, in mathematics, zero is a far more basic element than one; after all, God created the universe ex-nihilo. Or, perhaps more understandable:

or, to be even more absurd:

If we abandon the idea of ordinary addition as a properly mapped operator, we might come up with:

all of which are better than that with which we began.

The fundamental problem with attempting to map a mathematical model of God is that what is finite, the map; cannot be applied to the infinite, God. The very idea of mapping considers something that is measurable: there is nothing measurable about God. All such attempts at mapping God, result in a cold dead impersonal Ein Sof: none of them bring us to the loving Father, Almighty, Maker, to Whom we owe life itself.

God Himself is the Fountain of Truth. He is the Sole Source of all Light, Life, and Love. Everything we are and have stems from His relationship with us.

Heresies

The discussion of the Trinity abounds with heresies even to this day. We will avoid references to save the guilty of embarrassment. The list includes Adoption-ism, Arianism, Docetism, Ebionite-ism, Macedonian-ism, Modalism, Partial-ism, Tri-theism.[[136]](#footnote-136)

We have presented all the evidence we could find to the best of our ability. It remains for you, dear reader, to weigh this evidence carefully, and add your own discoveries to its mass. You decide if the point is sufficiently proved or not.

Nicaea

“† Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν: Πατέρα, Παντοκράτορα, Ποιητὴν; οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς; ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων.

“[Πιστεύομεν] καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον: Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν Μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα – οὐ ποιηθέντα – ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί, δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὸν δι’ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν, κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα. Σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρα, κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρός, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς; οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.

“[Πιστεύομεν] καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα: τὸ Ἅγιον, τὸ Κύριον, τὸ Ζῳοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.

“[Πιστεύομεν] καὶ εἰς μίαν, ἁγίαν, καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Προσδοκοῦμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Ἀμήν.”

“We believe in One God: Father, Almighty, Maker; of heaven and earth; and of all things visible and invisible.

“And [we believe] in One Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all ages, Light of Light, True God of True God, begotten, not made, being of one essence with the Father; through Whom all things were made. Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was made man. He was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried, and the third day He raised again, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father; and He shall come again, with glory, to judge the living and the dead; Whose kingdom shall have no end.

“And [we believe] in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Giver of Life, Who proceeds from the Father, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified, Who spake by the prophets.

“[We believe] In One Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church; we acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins; we look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the age to come. Amen.”

The error of Nicaea seems to consist, not in the accuracy of its doctrine; but rather in tempting us to believe that we can be saved by accuracy of doctrine: rather than by the Blood of Christ. This error will unfortunately lead to the increasing politicization of the Church on earth, with many concomitant errors of doctrine resulting.

“If we would walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus, His Son cleanses[[137]](#footnote-137) us from all sin.” — 1 John 1:7[[138]](#footnote-138)

Onward and Forward

Doubtless, we have just scratched the surface of the subject. Our purpose was to convince others that this is a subject worth pursuing. It lacks and needs an extensive investigation of Patristics to see what our Church Ancestors have had to say about the Trinity. Numerous other Bible passages require investigation. Please become a contributor to the knowledge base, study, and understanding of the Trinity… that great mystery.

Appendix One

In no small part, this study has led me to finally believe that the YHWH legend is a fabrication of Judaism taken from Oral Torah or other Jewish mystical writings: the reader will see hints of this development along the way.

As everyone knows, the pointing of יְהוָה֙ [[139]](#footnote-139) is fabricated: for, it belongs to the word, אֲדֹנִ֔י. The common explanation is that the word in the text, יְהוָה֙, is too sacred to be said aloud for fear of violating the commandment about taking God’s name in vain: so אֲדֹנִ֔י is read aloud to avoid sinning. I believe that this common explanation reverses the actual facts of the matter; that אֲדֹנִ֔י was always in the text, but the Masoretes falsified the record by inserting the characters, יְהוָה֙; concocting the YHWH mythos as a cover story or smoke screen. Had the original text contained the word, יְהוָה֙, LXX would more likely have a transliteration, such as ΥΧΥΧ, or some other. LXX, when encountering any sort of name, nearly always transliterates in preference to translation; in fact, translation is a dead giveaway that the word was not understood to be a name at all: such as is the case here with YHYW. Had YHWH appeared in the 200 BC manuscripts, we would have something such as ΥΧΥΧ, rather than Κύριος. The fact that we have Κύριος exclusively, argues for the original manuscript wording to be אֲדֹנִ֔י in all instances.

If the hyper-sacred name, YHWH, actually exists, it is strange that neither Jesus nor His Apostles have anything to say: for the New Testament is rarely, if ever, silent about such critical issues.

Once we eliminate the word, YHWH, as a fabrication, all that remains is Exodus 3:14-15, אֶֽהְיֶ֖ה אֲשֶׁ֣ר אֶֽהְיֶ֑ה, and, אֶֽהְיֶ֖ה. A minor difficulty in our argument is that LXX does not transliterate either of these: instead, the translation, Ἐγώ εἰμι,[[140]](#footnote-140) is observed. “***I Am***!” This difficulty might bother us if Jesus had not made an issue of this Name in John: whereas, He never makes an issue of YHWH anywhere. We conclude that, “***I Am***!”, is the new Name of God given to Moses, which is exactly what the text says.

Now, all the difficulties associated with Abraham not knowing the Name, evaporate: for there is no indication in Scripture that Abraham ever heard that name, “***I Am***!”.[[141]](#footnote-141)

The Documentary Hypothesis now crumbles into ruins: for there is no J writer, not before 300 AD. We have discovered the great probability that Judaism loves to invent things to explain away whatever it is that it does not like, Shaddai, YHWH; or as with the name of Moses in Judges 18:30 being changed to Manasseh to avoid the shame to Moses and his family. If J does not exist at all in 200 BC, then the Documentary Hypothesis does not exist either.

While my personal conviction, in no way constitutes a proof, it does touch all the bases, and answer all the associated problems. Again, you decide.

Appendix Two

My private agenda is obvious. I have been harping on Luther’s, *The Bondage of the Will*, as well as many similar issues concerning Calvinism and the Reformation. It has taken me decades to resolve these issues to my own satisfaction; it has cost me at least one ordination, and no small loss of credibility in the organized Church. Am I able to prove the freedom of human will?

Does God have freedom of the will? Is man created in the image of God? Therefore, man necessarily has free will. QED[[142]](#footnote-142)

Luther creates the problem when he confuses and mixes the two distinct philosophical categories of will and power. Man, has will every bit as free as God’s will; man can, and frequently does, go his own way. However, whereas God is omnipotent, Pantocrator, or Almighty; mankind is among the lesser weaklings of the universe… there is scarcely a lesser creature weaker than mankind.

Many of the hypotheses of Calvinism, therefore, continue to cause us intellectual difficulties. Some of the claims of Calvinism are so clearly stated in Scripture that they are obviously true. Other claims of Calvinism seem just as obviously contradictory: so, we continue to have both Calvinist and Methodist churches.[[143]](#footnote-143)

Much of the difficulty, if not all of it, is removed by the words of Christ Himself in the phrase, “Your will be done”.[[144]](#footnote-144) Jesus, as incarnate, obviously has free human will. As fully God, the Son has no need to submit His Divine will to the Father, since these wills are always in perfect agreement: so, Jesus human will is considered here. Jesus freely submits His human will to the Divine wills of Father, Son, and Spirit, which are always in agreement. Here is the restoration of perfect humanity: in submitting the human will to God’s will. Salvation, in no small part, consists of the confession (ὁμολογῶμεν[[145]](#footnote-145)) that God’s will and way is the right will and way; while the human will and way can only be wrong. I believe that this satisfactorily resolves all issues, except for human obstinacy, between Calvinism and Methodism.

The perfectly free human will is bent on waging war with God. Even a Calvinist might admit, “I fought against God as hard as I could; God did the rest”. This is both why people are condemned, guilty, and punished for theirs sins… for which they are fully responsible; as well as, how people must make a decision for Christ… admitting our helpless and hopeless condition is an act of the free human will. God does not force people to love Him: but, the doors of His heavenly Temple are always open; while the Angels continually cry, “Welcome sinners.”

[[146]](#footnote-146)

1. The name, Jezreel (יִזְרְעֶ֑אל) means God spreads or scatters; in its positive connotation, it paints a picture of God sowing seed on the earth. In its more negative meaning, it suggests that God is dispersing a gainsaying, wicked people. Perhaps, these are not necessarily two different and distinct things. Matthew 13; Mark 4; Luke 8; Ecclesiastes 11:1 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The meaning of εὐσεβείας (εὐ-σεβείας) is good or right respect, reverence, or worship; nothing is said about godliness. This εὐσεβείας is a person: “***Who***”, clearly Jesus is intended. Jesus, the Christ of God is the Only One, “***Who***”, by His εὐσεβείας brings us this entire litany of victorious joy. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. DLNT and LEB seem to be the only translations that take the reflexive pronoun and infinitives very seriously; unfortunately, this does not produce the smoothest English translation. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The word is καθαρίζει, it cleanses, not it justifies: too much is said of justification; too little is said of cleansing and other effects; we are both cleansed and justified. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. We set these few verses before our eyes as frontlets in our earnest quest for sound doctrine. Sound doctrine, if we should happily find it, will not do for us, what “the blood of Jesus” does for us. Yet, we persist at dividing the table of “the blood of Jesus” into thousands of fragments over our differences of doctrine; or, worse yet, over our differences of dogma. At the end of the day, let us leave our differences of doctrine open for earnest and frank discussion; striving to someday share the One table of “the blood of Jesus”: for it is His blood alone that washes us, not our perfection of precious doctrine. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. We are sorry to say that we didn’t coin the word Trine; Trine refers, among other things, to: one third of a circle, aspects of planets, the name of a university, the name of an LLP, the name of a fantasy action game. We, of course, meant it as a reference to three; a kind of shorthand for Trinity: Trinity-ology just seems unnecessarily cumbersome. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. We accept this division as legitimate, even helpful; yet, not absolutely necessary. A few western theologians follow the distinction; most eastern theologians prefer it, as do we also. Nevertheless, we will not break fellowship or divide company from other Christians over this issue. If this is your preference: be well. If you do not find it helpful: be well. Let us not be more divided than we already are. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. reductio ad absurdum

Romans 1:20 specifically states that God’s essence or Godhead is known; especially by wicked God hating pagans, who are left without excuse, so powerful is the testimony within them. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. More than clear, this means blazing brightly, emitting light. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. without-apology [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. 1 Corinthians 13:12 [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Such punishment is specifically described as God’s wrath in the preceding two verses. Romans 1:17-18 [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Apologetics is the art of gracious pleading before a judge, king, or other magistrate. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Because of Romans 1:19-20, where we have a strong positive declaration. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. That God cannot lie tells us more than an energy; it tells us something about God’s internal character or essence, don’t you think? Titus 1:2 [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. John 3:16 [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. We leave the debate over the differences between empathy and sympathy to the reader. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Since nature, properly, has to do with living plants and animals (mother nature); we have a physical nature; we cannot say, accurately, that we have a spiritual nature. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. The translation common in many western versions of The Creed. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. The translation common to most eastern versions of The Creed. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. NB that in this verse πνεῦμα is used in two distinct ways: one, it describes something about the essence of God; two, it gives a name for the only domain whereby or wherein worship communication can possibly take place. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Neither of them being that these things are not true; they are true: it is the context that forces us to reject these meanings in this location. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. If God Himself is a creature, there is little point to this emphasis on creation: in which case, there is no God. We can’t have it both ways: if God creates, He is Uncreated; if He is created, He cannot be God. Genesis 1:1; 1 Kings 8:27; Nehemiah 9:6; Isaiah 45:7; 66:2; John 1:3; Romans 8:38-39; Ephesians 3:9; Colossians 1:16; Revelation 4:11 [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Psalm 104:4; Hebrews 1:7 [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Luke 11:13; Romans 5:16 (If with our breath, would be an absurdity. If with our attitudes, we wouldn’t know the difference between God’s Spirit and an endorphin secretion: how can that be true? Our relationship with the Spirit is conversational.)

Modern psychology, a soft “science”, would teach us that conversation with invisible persons is a form of insanity. Whence comes such a marvelous “fact”? From the mind of Freud? So, modern psychology has an initial premise that God does not exist: the authority for this is Freud, or some other atheist. Thus, mere “enlightened” man is placed in the position of knowing absolutely, that God does not exist: else, we could, should, and would talk with Him. What enlightened people ridicule, the Bible proclaims as necessity for life: the real experience of such conversations makes Christianity incontrovertible for those who participate in it.

Plantinga, Alvin, *Pluralism: A Defense of Religious Exclusivism*, has an interesting and meticulous philosophical examination of the warrant for Christian exclusivism. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Acts 17:29 has θεῖον; Romans 1:20 has θειότης; Colossians 2:9 has θεότητος; 2 Peter 1:4 has θείας. Since this was discussed in, *Introduction*, we won’t develop the point here.

<https://www.swrktec.org/theology> *Introduction, Theology Proper* [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Οὐσίον derives from εἰμὶ, the Greek, to be, verb: thus it relates directly to the name of God (Exodus 3:14). The Creed speaks of the ὁμοούσιον, the same I Am of the Father; while the Lord’s Prayer specifies the ἐπιούσιον, the upon I Am, an adjective modifying bread: the bread of God, the I Am bread, the eternal manna… which is Christ Himself. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. aorist active subjunctive, first person plural [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. present active imperative, third person plural [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. How many humans existed when this sentence was first conceived? [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Elohim is the Hebrew plural, as the whole world already knows. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Cairo Museum, seven meters tall

<http://www.crystalinks.com/Amenhotep_III.html>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Colossal_statue_of_Amenhotep_III_and_Tiye>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amenhotep_III> [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Pharaoh Menhaure triad statue of greywacke, with Hathor and goddess of the seventeenth nome of Upper Egypt, Anput. Cairo Mus. Ent. 40679.

[https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Pharaoh\_Menhaure\_triad\_statue,\_Caire-Mus%C3%A9e.jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File%3APharaoh_Menhaure_triad_statue%2C_Caire-Mus%C3%A9e.jpg)

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Menkaure> [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. <https://www.akg-images.com/archive/-2UMDHUKALO_H.html>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seti_I> [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. British Museum:

<https://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details/collection_image_gallery.aspx?assetId=31303001&objectId=6484&partId=1> [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Egyptians of the day, worshipped everything from bulls to beetles. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crowns_of_Egypt>

<http://www.ancientegypt.co.uk/pharaoh/explore/bluec_b1.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. British Museum:

<http://www.ancientreplicas.com/eagle-head-deity-nisroch.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Royal_Cemetery_at_Ur>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Standard_of_Ur>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mesopotamia>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ur> [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. NB the use of YHWH already at Genesis 2:4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22. Our gainsayers will immediately resort to the Documentary Hypothesis, claiming that primitive man only knew E, not J. Yet each of these verses invariably says YHWH Elohim: a practice that continues in Genesis 3. How exactly did the ancients weave the E creation story and the J creation story, so perfectly that every reference to YHWH in Genesis 2 is also a reference to Elohim? The answer of the Documentary Hypothesis is that the Jews cooked the books around 550 BC; according to this lie, none of the events prior to 1010 BC happened: they were all fabricated stories constructed in stages (known as J, E, D, and P) around 900, 800, 650, and 550 BC, respectively.

The Septuagint proves that MT editors added YHWH at Genesis 2: 5, 7, 8, 9, 19, 21, and 22: for the term, Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς, does not appear in full form… ὁ Θεὸς stands alone. The Masoretes did cook the books after 500 AD.

Kidner, Derek, *Genesis, An Introduction and Commentary* (IVP, Downers Grove: 1967, 1973 reprint) 224 pages, has a withering, yet subtle, refutation of the Documentary Hypothesis and other such foolishness. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. First person singular: Genesis 1:29 (I have given).

Third person singular: Genesis 1:1 (He made), 2 (it was), 2 (He carried), 3 (He said), 4 (He saw), 4 (He divided), 4 (let it be), 4 (it became), 5 (He called), 5 (He called), 5 (it became), 5 (it became), etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Same plural word in Hebrew in both places; singular, then plural in Greek: however, we can’t have it both ways. The usual translations make no sense; even Septuagint blunders: for, gods generally do not know good and evil. Only the Living God knows good and evil: gods are either angels, knowing only good; demons, knowing only evil; dumb idols, knowing nothing; or leading men and women, just as ignorant as Adam and Zoe (Eve | Life). Since Adam and Zoe are alone, we must reject the last case as an impossibility at the time of creation and temptation. Only the Living God knows both good and evil in the complete sense that Ὄφις (נָּחָשׁ | Serpent) suggests. The plurality is in the word…. YHWH is clearly meant (Genesis 3:1, 8, 9, 13, 14, 21, 23 [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. We believe that Adam and Zoe, even in the perfection of their created state, were still not sufficient for enduring fellowship with God: only as new creatures in Christ would that sufficiency be supplied. The fall was necessary to show mankind the enormity of their need: God did not cause the Fall; yet, He allowed it. God let His children play freely, stumble, and get hurt, even die: it was a necessary lesson for creatures with free will. It was fully necessary for God to become man; so, that man could become god.

The verse structure echoes that of Genesis 1:26. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. MT removed Elohim from YHWH Elohim at verse 9. Elohim is also removed by MT at Genesis 4:26. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. This iconography is shared by the entire human race. Genesis 5:3; 9:6 [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. NB now this contradicts the absurd notion that days, in the Bible, is never used metaphorically, it always indicates a twenty-four hour period: obviously, not the case here. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. YHWH [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. We, indicates an internal conversation within the plurality of Deity. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Melchisedek serves the first communion to Abram. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. Another name for God emerges, indicating the possibility of a third person. The clarity for interpreting this as a name will not be evident until we have examined all pertinent verses: Genesis 16:7, 8 (MT removes this reference with article), 9 (with article). 10 (with article, promises a multitude of progeny which is only credible with God), 11 (with article); 22:11, 25; 24:7, 40; Exodus 20:16; and more…. Ninety-four occurrences; seventy-two in the Old Testament. In Genesis 16:13, Agar calls Him God.

Angel of God appears in Genesis 21:17; 31:11; Exodus 14:19; Judges 6:20; 13:6, 9; and more…. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. To listen, hear, and respond with definitive and expedite action. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. This structure is so unique, we cannot avoid it: the trine repetition of the phrase, the Angel of the Lord, appears, at first glance, to be unique. It is most certainly some sort of trope; yet, not a definitive one... possibly an adumbration. It might be a precursor, in this trine form, to Matthew 4, Luke 4, and John 21:15-19.

Remarkably, all of these passages also discuss humiliation: Agar and Ismael are being driven away from the family, at the brink of death; Jesus is being tempted by Satan with a view to His crucifixion; Peter is being tested by Christ as a harbinger of his own crucifixion. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. The (-) sign indicates that the word, Shaddai, is missing in LXX. Genesis 17:1 (-); 28:3 (-); 35:11 (-); 43:14 (13, -); 48:3 (-); 49:25 (-); Exodus 6:3 (-); Numbers 24:4 (El is missing, Shaddai is translated as ἰσχυροῦ), 16 (-); Ruth 1:20 (ὁ ἱκανὸς), 21 (ὁ ἱκανὸς); Job 5:17 (Παντοκράτορος); 6:4 (-), 14 (-); 8:3 (-), 5 (παντοκράτορα); 11:7 (Παντοκράτωρ); 13:3 (-); 15:25 (παντοκράτορος); 21:15 (ἱκανός), 20 (-); 22:3 (-), 17 (Παντοκράτωρ), 23 (-), 25 (Παντοκράτωρ), 26 (-); 23:16 (Παντοκράτωρ); 24:1 (-); 27:2 (Παντοκράτωρ), 10 (-), 11 (Παντοκράτορι), 13 (Παντοκράτορος); 29:5 (-); 31:2 (ἱκανοῦ), 35 (-); 32:8 (Παντοκράτορός); 33:4 (Παντοκράτορος); 34:10 (Παντοκράτορος), 12 (Παντοκράτωρ); 35:13 (Παντοκράτωρ); 37:23 (22, Παντοκράτορος, ἰσχύϊ); 40:2 (ἱκανοῦ); Psalm 68:14 (67:15, ἐπουράνιον); 91:1 (-); Isaiah 13:6 (-); Ezekiel 1:24 (-); 10:5 (Σαδδαΐ); Joel 1:15 (-).

This mass of 48 instances, where only one of them is a legitimate translation of Shaddai (Ezekiel 10:5); seems to indicate that, except for this one verse, the word, Shaddai, does not occur in the Hebrew text of 200 BC: forty-seven of these appear to be the additions of an overzealous scribe, obsessed with the wrath of God; a scribe who read his own theology into the text. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. Since only Ezekiel 10:5 is supported by LXX. Why did no El-Shaddai legend arise, as with J and E? [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. The quote was taken from a sermon on Jonah by James Montgomery Boice (1938-2000)

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James\_Montgomery\_Boice [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. God appeared to Abraham as three men, or three persons: whom he worships by prostration. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. They in MT, indicating a very ironic Trinitarian plural. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. If MT is believed, these verses say, “They said … I will….” Promising what only God can give, a miraculous pregnancy to a very old woman. This, if credible, would prove One God in three persons. Unfortunately, MT is not very reliable, so we should search for Septuagint manuscript variations. Lord appears for YHWH in both LXX and KJV 13, 17, 19, 19, 20, 22, 26, 33. Verse 14 has YHWH in MT; God in LXX. Clearly, the Israelites believed that Abraham was talking to YHWH Elohim. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. The later context indicates that these messengers may be Cherubim or Seraphim, high ranking spirit beings we call angels. However, there is a somewhat remote possibility that MT has suppressed the name, YHWH, in favor of Adonai; we cannot tell from LXX. Lord translates YHWH in both LXX and KJV at 13, 13, 14, 16, 24, 24, 27. Elohim 29, 29. While it seems obvious that this is at most a trope for the Trinity, it is still very possibly a trope. The outcome takes place at the action and direction of YHWH Elohim. It is a capital punishment said in some places to be executed directly by God; elsewhere, by the angels. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. It is difficult to understand how YHWH and Moses can specify name, with YHWH, if Abraham and others are ignorant of that very name: Exodus 3:14; 6:3, therefore, must convey some other meaning, which we do not completely understand. Perhaps, understanding, or the lack thereof, is key. Is it possible that Abraham had and used the name YHWH without understanding its meaning as God specified that meaning in Exodus 3:14? Genesis 4:26; 12:8; 13:4; 16:13; 26:25 [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. NB: the same exact phraseology is used of Elohim in Genesis 22:1. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. These Angel of the Lord passages are all surprising and unusual. We find it strange that a hypothesis of an AL legend, never developed to attend the false J-E legends. J and E occur so frequently that they are unremarkable; here, AL, which is truly amazing, deserves no comment from the J-E gainsayers.

This passage is distinctly Christological; here the trope is very clear, extending to a heartrending experience which predicts the future reality.

Again, if the Christology is proved; so, also, is the Trineology proved. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. This new term for God seems almost too trivial to mention; especially, with no evident connection to Trineology. Abraham first used the expression in Genesis 20:11: it is a rare idea in Scripture. Genesis 31:42, 53; 1 Samuel 11:7; 2 Samuel 23:3 [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. This section parallels Exodus 3:13-16; 6:2-3. Jacob never gets an answer to his question. Exodus 6:2-3 may very well be citing that fact. There are other indications that Abraham knew the name; but, Jacob evidently did not know it. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. If an untranslated name, the change from hireq yod (ִי) to shureq (וּ) is almost certainly an error in the Hebrew MT; there was no pointing in the original manuscripts: only a slip of pen, smudge of dirt, or accidental erasure is required to turn yod (י) into vav (ו). Septuagint translates both locations as Appearance of God (with and without specific articles): Εἶδος Θεοῦ, and τὸ εἶδος τοῦ Θεοῦ; rather than face (פָּנִ֣ים | πρόσωπον). The Septuagint places emphasis on the visibility of God: for which the face to face encounter is the outcome. Brenton’s translation is unfortunate, failing to deal with the difference between εἶδος and πρόσωπον. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. Jacob has been praying with God throughout this strange chapter. While Jacob is enduring an extended encampment, he sees the encampment of God paralleling his encampment. The word camp or encampment is repeated four times, indicating an extreme emphasis in Hebrew idiom (verses 1-2). Jacob is greatly terrified and perplexed at the aspect of confrontation with his brother; this, in spite of the fact that God has assured him of His direction (verse 7). Unnerved, Jacob prays for deliverance from his brother to the God of his fathers, Abraham and Isaac, “O YHWH” (verses 9-12). In spite of numerous prayers and precautions, he awakes in the middle of the night and moves his family across the raging Jabbok (verses 22-23).

The ensuing wrestling match is said to be with a man (אִישׁ֙ | ἄνθρωπος), Who, later turns out to be God (אֱלֹהִ֛ים | Θεοῦ). The Theophany is both visible and tangible; it leaves Jacob indelibly and unquestionably marked; it results in a name change from Jacob to Israel, which name giving is primarily God’s prerogative throughout the Bible. It is difficult to weigh all these factors without having some idea of plurality within the Oneness of God.

The use of the term, man, seems prophetically Messianic to us.

Jacob’s request to learn the name of God, prefiguring Moses’ similar request, is denied. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. NB that the verse numbers are out of sync: for example, verse 24 in English and Greek is verse 25 in Hebrew. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. Is the Spirit of God (ר֥וּחַ אֱלֹהִ֖ים | πνεῦμα Θεοῦ) spoken of as a distinct person here? Ironically, Pharaoh acknowledges all these things; but, in the ensuing hierarchy of leadership he manages to forget God, and leave Him out of the picture.

As an Old Testament Christology proves the Trinity; so also, does an Old Testament Pneumatology thoroughly establish the Trinity. Spirit of God is found in Genesis 1:2; 41:38; Exodus 31:3; 35:31; Numbers 24:2; 1 Samuel 10:10; 11:6; 19:20, 23; 2 Chronicles 15:1; 24:20; Job 27:3; 33:4; Ezekiel 11:24. Holy Spirit is named at Psalm 51:11; Isaiah 63:10, 11. Job 33:4 has, πνεῦμα θεῖον. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. The Christology of the triumphal entry on Good Friday is unmistakable. [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. This significant Theophany will introduce or reintroduce YHWH (verses 4, 7, 15, 16, 18 (2x), and more) to the Israelite people; who have either forgotten YHWH since the days of Isaac; or, if the name was known, even to Abraham, its significance is unknown; or the name was never known, it was inserted as an explanation by editors. In any case, neither Israel nor the Israelites had as close a relationship with God, as did Abraham and Isaac before them… as Genesis draws to a close, the references to God seem to decrease.

He is God: verses 4 (LXX has Lord 2x), 6 (5x), 11, 12, 13 (2x), 14, 15 (5x), 16 (2x), 18 (2x). The repetitions vary between LXX and MT. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. God reveals His special name, which we usually suppose, to be YHWH. What is the source of this name, YHWH? Its origin is certainly not from Scripture; more likely YHWH is sourced in Oral Torah or other Jewish mystical sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. Exodus 33:19 has the very similar:
אָחֹ֔ן וְחַנֹּתִי֙ אֶת־אֲשֶׁ֣ר, I am merciful to that I am merciful and,
אֲרַחֵֽם אֶת־אֲשֶׁ֣ר וְרִחַמְתִּ֖י, I show pity to that I show pity. God is giving us a glimpse of His inner essence: I Am is compassionate, loving, merciful, showing pity, and tender hearted in essence. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
73. Note that Westminster Leningrad Codex (WLC) is frequently defective in that the holam over the vav is missing. The whole Niqqud system is the invention of the Masoretes.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holam>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Niqqud>

<https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Exodus%204&version=WLC> [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
74. As in John, where we repeatedly see “***I Am***” (John 4:26; 6:35; 7:28, 28, 33; 8:12, 28, 58; 9:39; 10:7; 11:25; 14:6; 18:5, 8, 37; 20:17). [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
75. This may very well be the only surviving Hebrew manuscript evidence for Exodus 6:3; Exodus 6:3 is not listed in the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus. See discussion under Genesis 17:1. El-Shaddai is a fiction.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dead_Sea_Scrolls> [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
76. Deuteronomy 17:6; 19:15; 1 Kings 21:10, 13; Matthew 18:16; 26:60; 2 Corinthians 13:1; 1 Timothy 5:19; Hebrews 10:28; Revelation 11:3 [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
77. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dead_Sea_Scrolls#cite_ref-501>

Fagan, Brian M., and Charlotte Beck, *The Oxford Companion to Archeology*, entry on the “Dead sea scrolls”, Oxford University Press, 1996. [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
78. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dead_Sea_Scrolls#cite_ref-502>

Archer, Gleason (1964). *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. Chicago: Moody Press. p. 65. [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. This is not the first henotheistic statement we have encountered; it is one of the clearest: but, of course, if there is plurality in unity, then it isn’t henotheism, is it? There is no other God than this God: He is intent on proving exactly that. [↑](#footnote-ref-79)
80. There is much debate over whether this Pharaoh dies in the Red Sea crossing: this appears to promise this Pharaoh that he will be punished by death at the hand of God. [↑](#footnote-ref-80)
81. The death of the firstborn is an obvious major Christ typology. [↑](#footnote-ref-81)
82. It would be a shame, in our examination of the Old Testament, searching for evidences of Trinity, if we should miss this trope: for, Moses is as God the Father, while his arms are as the Son and the Spirit. Is it for nothing that the Son and the Spirit are called the arms of God? This is a picture of God’s administration of the Universe: except, that God does not tire as Moses does. This is not yet another pseudo-Trinitarian heresy, in that Scripture clearly specifies that both Son and Spirit proceed from the Father by eternal procession (John 8:42; 15:26). The picture is confirmed by the fact that God has already told Moses that he would be as God, and Aaron would be his priest. [↑](#footnote-ref-82)
83. This is a similar trope to Exodus 17:11; here, the body of the eagle is as the Father… the wings as the Son and Spirit. These tropes are not at all definitive: but, they are intriguing for those who would see the Bible’s poetry. We recall in the statue of Isis protecting Osiris with her wings, that even the pagan Egyptians considered a similar such poetic imagery. [↑](#footnote-ref-83)
84. Here is another Christ centered trope: it is mystical looking ahead; unmistakable looking backwards. Hebrews 13:20 [↑](#footnote-ref-84)
85. Literally, place; which is to say, in His Oracle, His House… the location from which His voice is heard. [↑](#footnote-ref-85)
86. What did they eat and drink? There is no record of any preparation. No sacrifice was brought up the mountain with them; it was forbidden that any animal even touch the mountain: yet, here they are, enjoying what can only be described as a feast. And such a feast it is; this is God’s Pesach, prepared by His Own Hands; this is the Bread of Heaven; this is the Living Manna; these are the words of Communion; this is the Body and Blood of Christ in mystical form. [↑](#footnote-ref-86)
87. How do we miss the point, when we have the words, “We beheld His Glory” (John 1:14)? In Judaism, this is called the Shəkinah, the appearance or appearing of God. [↑](#footnote-ref-87)
88. We have to believe that this was a time of incredible emotional pressure and violent temptations for Moses. Not that such temptations came from God: for God tempts no one. However, the close proximity of God brings to the flesh, the pride of being lifted up: it is to Moses’ eternal credit that he was considered the humblest of men. [↑](#footnote-ref-88)
89. It is fair to ask, by what sort of miracle is this Invisible God to be seen? We don’t yet have a clear answer: it’s a mystery of incarnation. [↑](#footnote-ref-89)
90. God also speaks from this Mercy, which is styled as a royal sedan chair, showing that God is KING above all kings, PHARAOH above all pharaohs, LORD above all lords. [↑](#footnote-ref-90)
91. This bread is another trope of the incarnate manna crucified and raised. [↑](#footnote-ref-91)
92. The light of the lamp is a trope of the Spirit shining within and through His servants, who present a unanimous and united light to the world. The lamps are not necessarily mounted in a single plane; some authorities believe that six lamps form a circle around the central lamp. The text does not necessarily specify a particular architecture; it specifies a single face, a single light. [↑](#footnote-ref-92)
93. The smell of appeasement:

Genesis 8:21; Exodus 29:18, 25, 41; Leviticus 1:9, 13, 17; 2:2, 9, 12; 3:5, 16; 4:31; 6:15, 21; 8:21, 28; 17:6; 23:13, 18; 26:31; Numbers 15:3, 7, 10, 13, 14, 24; 18:17; 28:2, 6, 8, 13, 24, 27; 29:2, 6, 8, 13, 36; Ezra 6:10; Ezekiel 6:13; 16:19; 20:28, 41; 2 Corinthians 2:15; Ephesians 5:2 [↑](#footnote-ref-93)
94. We know that all of these things are tropes or metaphors because, the record claims this explicitly. God is teaching His people heavenly things by showing them physical models of the invisible reality. Exodus 25:9, 40; 26:30; 27:8; Numbers 8:4; Deuteronomy 4:36; Isaiah 48:6; Micah 6:8; Joshua 22:28; Hebrews 8:5 [↑](#footnote-ref-94)
95. God provides a glimpse of His inner essence and energies. [↑](#footnote-ref-95)
96. This verse not only references the Spirit as a person, it speaks of the filling of the Spirit: which is a rare gift prior to Pentecost, 33 AD. [↑](#footnote-ref-96)
97. Prefiguring the trumpets of Revelation, announcing the imminent end of this physical world. But also, the call to assembly, call to alarm, announcing feasts, setting out on the march, introducing new moons (months), and calling to war (Numbers 10:2-10). [↑](#footnote-ref-97)
98. Which cleanses the congregation in preparation for entering the eternal rest of God in heavenly glory. [↑](#footnote-ref-98)
99. Here we are given a strong statement of the unity of God; yet, it would be speculative to draw a henotheistic conclusion from this in the presence of the plural, Elohim. [↑](#footnote-ref-99)
100. … a somewhat milder argument for unity. [↑](#footnote-ref-100)
101. This one verse, all but clenches the discussion: its only weakness being, “נְאֻ֤ם יְהוָ֨ה׀ לַֽאדֹנִ֗י”, “YHWH said to my Adonai”. Numbers 36:2 is nearly identical. Clearly, the NT references intend the point; it is entirely possible that MT is a fabrication of the original Hebrew; which, according to LXX, makes no such distinction, “Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ Κυρίῳ μου”. [↑](#footnote-ref-101)
102. As far as we know, this is the only clear instance in Scripture of YHWH speaking to Himself. The unique idiom of this expression indicates that there are two persons named YHWH. The argument that one is the Angel of YHWH, and not YHWH Himself, bears little weight, when it is widely held, that the Angel of YHWH is YHWH… which we believe to be supported by other verses. [↑](#footnote-ref-102)
103. Similarly, it would be a most unusual idiom for YHWH to speak of Himself in the third person. It is far more probable that two distinct persons are intended. [↑](#footnote-ref-103)
104. Here it is difficult to understand how the Adonai of the whole earth could be any other than YHWH, or how His two anointed ones could be any other than the Son and the Spirit. [↑](#footnote-ref-104)
105. The voice of the Father, necessitated by the word, Son; the visible presence of the Spirit; as well as the fact that Jesus is called, “My beloved Son”: is certainly proof enough of the Trinity. The only question can be, who witnessed these events: Jesus, John, others? [↑](#footnote-ref-105)
106. Here, it seems evident that John witnessed these events: because, John is the closest antecedent to the participle. [↑](#footnote-ref-106)
107. This clarifies the point that the Holy Spirit was distinct, and visible; both from Jesus and from the heavenly voice. [↑](#footnote-ref-107)
108. Now every doubt is shattered: John beheld the Spirit. The Spirit remained in residence upon the Son. [↑](#footnote-ref-108)
109. Jesus seemingly addresses the Father as His co-equal. Since the verb, consecrated, hallowed, or sanctified – whichever you prefer – is both a simple past tense and passive voice: it is fair to ask how is the Father’s Name consecrated, when was it consecrated, and Who consecrated it? Only one answer suffices: the Son of God, with the Spirit, consecrated the Father’s name, in the timelessness of the eschaton, long before the universe was ever created. While, not exactly a standalone proof of Trinity, this is a hard verse to explain without the Trinity. [↑](#footnote-ref-109)
110. How can the Son address the Father unless there are two persons? [↑](#footnote-ref-110)
111. All of these passages which speak so gloriously of the Son, lay the foundation for Trinitarian understanding; they need the support of passages proving the Deity of Christ; as well as passages that show the Spirit as both a distinct Divine person. [↑](#footnote-ref-111)
112. Not all KJV based search results have ἐγώ εἰμι. The verses are clearly marked. Translations are our own. For comparative literal translations try DLNT or LEB:

<https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=John%204%3A26&version=KJV;SBLGNT;LEB;DLNT> [↑](#footnote-ref-112)
113. The complete idea is ***I Am*** the Messiah, the Christ of God. (verse 25) [↑](#footnote-ref-113)
114. The striking statement, Ἐγώ εἰμι, is absent from this verse. The phrase in use is, πόθεν εἰμί, which is nearly as strong: Jesus claims that it is common knowledge that He came from heaven and the Father. Jesus further claims that the Jews do not know the Father: which is to say that the Jews have no relationship with Him. This has been true since 586 BC when the Shəkinah abandoned the Temple, never to return until now, between 6/4 BC and 33 AD. [↑](#footnote-ref-114)
115. Ἐγώ εἰμι, is also missing from this verse. Jesus claims to return to His Father in the Heavenly Kingdom. [↑](#footnote-ref-115)
116. Jesus compares Himself to the Brazen Serpent of Moses. As looking at the Brazen Serpent healed the Israelites of venomous snakebite; even so, looking to Jesus heals anyone of the evil, Satanic, moral snakebites of this world. Jesus also shows us why He is Named the Word of God; He has exclusive authority and knowledge for perfect Bible teaching: because, He is the Bible personified in human flesh. Do not mistake our meaning here; the Person of the Word is far more important than the book: it is the Person of the Word Who produces the book… not the other way around. [↑](#footnote-ref-116)
117. Abraham did not know this name of God: it was first given to Moses. Jesus lays claim to His eternal Sonship; that He Himself is also God. If any of His antagonistic hearers had missed His use of Ἐγώ εἰμι thus far, they surely got the point now: they immediately seek to murder (לֹ֥֖א תִּֿרְצָֽ֖ח | You shall not murder) Him by stoning (verse 59). [↑](#footnote-ref-117)
118. Not an infinitive; rather, εἰς κρίμα, into judgment is a purpose clause; that is, “in order to pass judgement, I, into this world, came”. [↑](#footnote-ref-118)
119. Ἐγώ εἰμι, is not found in this verse; the KJV, I am, is an oddity of an older English idiom. That being said, ἐγώ, is still emphatic: this is an act of Divine judgment. [↑](#footnote-ref-119)
120. Jesus’ words carried such force, either physical or psychological, that the immediate reflex action of the police search party was to escape in terror. [↑](#footnote-ref-120)
121. The emphasis appears to be on the Father and conception; not on the mother or on the birthing process: the point being raised quite subtly is that Jesus is God incarnate. The Son is eternally begotten of the Father: He is King in this light. The Son added to Himself a compete, perfect, unmixed, and subsequently inseparable human nature: this timeless Son of the Father without a mother; becomes, in time, a son of a mother without a father. [↑](#footnote-ref-121)
122. Jesus does not use the expression ἐγώ εἰμι in this verse; nevertheless, He claims to be of supernatural, Divine origin: the point is not wasted on Pilate. [↑](#footnote-ref-122)
123. Ἐγώ εἰμι, is not used in this verse either; of greater interest here is what Jesus has to say about His Father and His God: He can hardly make these claims, unless He Himself is also God, co-equal with the Father (and the Spirit). The Apostles have God as their Father, only because Jesus will ascend: the Spirit is given from the Father after Jesus’ ascension and enthronement (Acts 2:30, 34-35; Psalm 110:1; Matthew 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:43; Hebrews 1:13; Revelation 5:5, 7, 13). [↑](#footnote-ref-123)
124. Jesus claim is not merely that He came as the Son of His Father; He claims that He came in His Father’s Name, which Name is I Am: in other words, He claims that He came in His Father’s essence or nature. His scathing criticism of the Jews is that they would receive anybody as God: which, in fact, is historically accurate, as with the Zevi fiasco, circa 1666. Sabbatai Zevi:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sabbatai_Zevi> [↑](#footnote-ref-124)
125. Here, not only the Divine Name, I Am; but also, Divine miracles testify of the plurality of the Divine nature. Moses did like miracles; but, he never claimed the Name for himself, or that the miracles were about him: Jesus distinctly claims that the Name and miracles “bear witness of Me”. [↑](#footnote-ref-125)
126. This is all about the glorification of Jesus (verse 23) in crucifixion and resurrection: He is the grain of wheat that dies (verse 24); He is the One Who hates His life to save the world (verse 25); He is the Son Who follows the Father as we should follow Him (verse 26); He dreaded the crucifixion, yet embraced it (verse 27). Since Jesus is glorified in the Father; as the Father is glorified in the Son: this is proof of plurality in Divinity. [↑](#footnote-ref-126)
127. Here, it is the glorification of the Father by the Son, which convinces us of the Deity of the Son and the Spirit. Who else, but God Himself, can glorify in this manner? Only the Father and Spirit can glorify the Son; only the Son and Spirit can glorify the Father; only the Father and Son can glorify the Spirit. Jesus claims the Name as His own: He repeats the I Am theme eleven times throughout John. [↑](#footnote-ref-127)
128. This usually refers to death: the implication being that even after they “shuffle off this mortal coil” the Apostles will continue to bear fruit until the end of time. [↑](#footnote-ref-128)
129. Jesus again asserts the authority of I Am as His own. He promises the Apostles that they will be instrumental is supernatural fruit bearing; which is to say, the planting and growth of believing souls… followers of the Apostles, of Jesus, and of the Father: all of which is impossible without plurality of Deity. [↑](#footnote-ref-129)
130. Jesus grants direct unquestioned access to the Father in His Oracle, at any time, based only on the authority of His Name. If we consider the full weight of the Law; this means that all the requirements of the Atonement are met in Jesus, without being repeated year after year. Even then, historically, only a handful of people were permitted in the Oracle: the High Priest, Moses, Samuel, other Prophets, Mary, possibly Kings, lesser priests in covering the Ark, Levites in bearing the Ark and in their regular duty of laying up the Autographs as well as making the Autographs accessible in certified genuine copies. The only reasonable conclusion is that both the Father and the Son are equally God. [↑](#footnote-ref-130)
131. This High Priestly prayer asks that the Unity of the Trinity, would prevail in the Apostolic Unity of the Church. Since, we have so obviously rent the will of God with our impetuous behavior; we hope for the day when God will miraculously undo all the damage we have caused. [↑](#footnote-ref-131)
132. Going about the business of ordinary daily life. In a more specific context, going wherever you are going after you leave the church assembly, where you heard this message. [↑](#footnote-ref-132)
133. The Trinity is taught as clearly as possible; the Name – I Am is implied – is applied equally to all three Persons: which is identical to saying that the essence of God is applied equally to all three Persons. The Name of God in Scripture is I Am, which is the identical root idea of ousion or essence: One essence or ousion; three persons or hypostases. [↑](#footnote-ref-133)
134. The Holy Spirit is clearly intended. The Greek genitive does not necessarily convey ownership or subordination in any way. Here the genitive indicates a co-equality of loving relationship: for example, my wife, my children, my brother, my sister, my parents. Evidently, the Spirit’s shouting is necessary to overcome our latent deafness. [↑](#footnote-ref-134)
135. Again, the plurality of God is specified in a single sentence, together with the Name. [↑](#footnote-ref-135)
136. I can’t improve on this thorough and informative summary:

<https://www.monergism.com/thethreshold/sdg/Trinitarian%20Heresies.html>

<https://www.monergism.com/topics/cults-heresy-heretics/trinitarian-heresies>

<https://reformedforum.org/heart-trinitarian-heresy/>

<https://churchpop.com/2015/05/28/dear-priests-top-heresies-to-avoid-trinity-sunday/> [↑](#footnote-ref-136)
137. The word is καθαρίζει, it cleanses, not it justifies: too much is said of justification; too little is said of cleansing and other effects; we are both cleansed and justified. [↑](#footnote-ref-137)
138. We set these few verses before our eyes as frontlets in our earnest quest for sound doctrine. Sound doctrine, if we should happily find it, will not do for us, what “the blood of Jesus” does for us. Yet, we persist at dividing the table of “the blood of Jesus” into thousands of fragments over our differences of doctrine; or, worse yet, over our differences of dogma. At the end of the day, let us leave our differences of doctrine open for earnest and frank discussion; striving to someday share the One table of “the blood of Jesus”: for it is His blood alone that washes us, not our perfection of precious doctrine. [↑](#footnote-ref-138)
139. Note that Westminster Leningrad Codex (WLC) is frequently defective in that the holam over the vav is missing. The whole Niqqud system is the invention of the Masoretes.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holam>

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Niqqud>

<https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Exodus%204&version=WLC> [↑](#footnote-ref-139)
140. Or more fully, “Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν”. [↑](#footnote-ref-140)
141. NB the curious expression, Ἐγὼ Κύριος, in Exodus 6:2-3 [↑](#footnote-ref-141)
142. “Quod Erat Demonstrandum”, “that which is sufficiently demonstrated or proved”. [↑](#footnote-ref-142)
143. The Synod of Dort never resolved all the supposed issues with Jacob Arminius, else the two churches would not have continued in separated existence and opposition; nor would Wesley and Whitefield persisted as disagreeing friends. [↑](#footnote-ref-143)
144. Matthew 26:39, 42; Luke 22:42; John 5:30 [↑](#footnote-ref-144)
145. 1 John 1:9 [↑](#footnote-ref-145)
146. If you have been blessed or helped by any of these meditations, please repost, share, or use any of them as you wish. No rights are reserved. They are designed and intended for your free participation. They were freely received, and are freely given. No other permission is required for their use. [↑](#footnote-ref-146)