

# ***WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER***

Monthly Letter #139; November, 2009 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser  
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)435-2836

Fax (419)435-7571; E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

## **TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS**

### **A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION**

This is a non-copyrighted teaching letter.  
Please feel free to make as many copies as you wish, but not to edit.

### **A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER**

This is my one hundred thirty-ninth monthly teaching letter and continues my twelfth year of publication. In the last two lessons, #'s 137 & 138, I started a series entitled *The Greatest Love Story Ever Told* by which I was in the process of giving the reader a general overview before going into detail on the subject. This will take some time to complete as it will cover seven stages: (1) the courtship, (2) the marriage, (3) the honeymoon, (4) the estrangement, (5) the divorce, (6) the reconciliation, and (7) the remarriage. But something has happened since putting those lessons on the Internet and distributing the remainder of them to my U.S. Postal subscribers. I got a letter from a man whom I will not name at this point, stating in very large letters: "Jesus was not a Jew" ... "Oneness is Jewish". On this first letter from him, there was no return address on the envelope nor anything inside the letter to indicate who he was. Well, about a week later, I received a second letter from him with his name and return address. Upon this, I typed out a letter back to him explaining some of the same things I presented to you in lessons #'s 137 & 138. Then, about a week later, I received a large envelope with a letter and a 15 page article on the "trinity" which he said he had written some years previous to this. Whereupon, I wrote him a second letter stating my position, citing several passages of Scripture in return to him. With that letter, in a large envelope, I returned to him much of my data, plus some of my past writings, which weighed about 4 ounces.

Therefore, I realized that I needed to address this matter of the doctrine of the "trinity" before we go any farther, as it is incompatible with the doctrine of the marriage of Yahweh to the twelve tribes of Israel! As I stated in the last two lessons, I'm following the outline of Dan Gayman in his nine-audiocassette series, and though he did well, there are areas where evidence proves some of his premises to be incorrect. For instance, in that series Gayman spoke favorably of a trinity. As I stated in lesson #138, if Yahshua Christ (the Lamb) and Yahweh are two different persons, then according to Scripture, Yahshua is going to marry His Father's wife! Therefore, in essence, Gayman was destroying his own thesis.

What I am about to present in this lesson ranks high among the principal tenets found in the Bible, and without its comprehension, one is lost to a major portion of the enlightenment found in its pages. In short, one can't have it both ways – one cannot have both the marriage and the trinity! It is true that there is a Father-Son relationship spoken of in Scripture, but it is not “God in three persons” but one God in three manifestations! Yes, there is a Father, and yes, there is a Son, but Christ Himself cleared up the matter in two very important passages found at John 12:45 & 14:6-9:

At John 12:45 Yahshua stated: **“And he that seeth me seeth him that sent me.”** Here Christ is both the sent and the sender!

At John 14:6-9 Yahshua stated: **“<sup>6</sup> Yahshua saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me. <sup>7</sup> If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him. <sup>8</sup> Philip saith unto him, Master, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. <sup>9</sup> Yahshua saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou *then*, Shew us the Father?”** Here Christ is seen as both Son and Father!

But we have another witness in the Old Testament, at Isaiah 9:6: **“For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.”** Here it is prophesied that Christ would be called the Father, and at John 12:45 and 14:6-9 He called Himself the Father, as predicted. If we can't trust Christ's own Word, who can we trust? This is evidence that Christ would make the matter clear; that He being the Son was also the Father, and in the above two passages found in John, He confirmed the words of Isaiah 9:6. Nothing could be more insulting to Christ than to speak or sing of Him as part of a trinity, for it repugnantly implies that He is going to marry His Father's wife at Rev 19:9! Stop and think, it amounts to accusing Him of committing incest! Didn't Christ suffer enough on the cross without having His reputation dragged through a hog's sty? Have we no shame? Yet many people are doing just this by singing “holy, holy, holy, blessed trinity”! There is nothing more UNHOLY than singing such a song! I would ask such people, “what would you do if someone were to commit incest in your family?” Or, “What would you think if your son got your wife pregnant?” Why, then, should we accuse the Almighty of doing such a thing by claiming He is a trinity of persons?

I would point out to the reader, there was a time that I strongly believed in a trinity, which term I will not capitalize as I no longer hold to that premise. There was a time when I agreed with most everything that churchianity taught on this subject. Therefore, it would help if I would explain how my position was changed. With the Israel Identity message, I found that I had to reverse myself on nearly everything I thought I knew, which includes more than the matter at hand. Approximately 20 to 25 years ago, I ordered a 14 audiocassette series on the Book of Revelation by Bertrand L. Comparet, which I then transcribed into writing. This is what Comparet said on tape #1, which I now fully believe: “... First of all, in this Book of Revelation, the Revelation that was given to John by Yahshua the Christ. And lest there be somebody who has been at

some time misled by the common “church” doctrine of the trinity, that we have three separate and different Gods (just like the pagans, you know; they have a few more than we). But no, don’t be misled by that. Some of the preachers take that view, yet the Bible makes it clear that Yahshua the Christ, son of Yahweh, is at the same time Yahweh, God, the Father Himself, and this is one of the places where He tells us so in unmistakable words. ...” I would also state that I used to strongly believe in the doctrine of futurism, but Comparet also enlightened me on the historical interpretation of Revelation.

Another passage at Isaiah 7:14 supports this also: **“Therefore Yahweh himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.”** Immanuel is #H6005 and means: “with us (is) El”. “El” is #H410, and is in the singular, and therefore cannot support a trinity!

I should also point out that a thesis on this topic concerning “one God vs. a trinity”, without a mention of Yahweh’s marriage to Israel (all 12 tribes), is a deficient work, for we read at Hosea 2:7: **“And she shall follow after her lovers, but she shall not overtake them; and she shall seek them, but shall not find *them*: then shall she say, I will go and return to my first husband; for then was *it* better with me than now.”**

So the “Lamb of God”, who is Yahweh in the flesh, or Yahshua Christ, is Israel’s first Husband! Anything else is out-of-context! The problem is, if Yahweh the Father didn’t come in the flesh as Yahshua and die for us, we, according to His own Law, are forever divorced from the Father without any hope of reconciliation. In short, if that is the case, we have no redemption! The Law demands that except upon the death of one of the two parties, can the other remarry! The reason that I hold so tenaciously to this is because I do not want to be judged as an antichrist! Therefore, I will **never, never, never** stop declaring that Yahshua is Yahweh come in the Flesh!

For important reasons, we must return to John 12:45, where Christ addressed the Pharisees, **“... he that seeth me seeth him that sent me”** and John 14:9, where He stated to Philip, **“... he that hath seen me hath seen the Father ...”** Some of the commentaries, with their trinitarian leanings, try to suggest that Philip and the rest of Christ’s followers saw only the attributes of the Father working in Christ. For instance, the *Zondervan NIV Bible Commentary* on John 12:45 states in part, “The Father and the Son are inseparable; though they are two personalities, they work as one being ...” How could it be “two personalities” when Christ went on in John 14:10 to state in part, **“... I am in the Father, and the Father in me ...”**. To suggest that the Father and the Son are two different persons is equivalent to accusing Christ of suffering from schizophrenia *i.e.*, a dual or split personality! To avoid such an assertion, one must conclude that there is but ONE GOD! To show that one and the same God is meant, we will read John 5:16-18, where a sect of Kenite-Canaanite-Edomite-jews were rebuking Christ (not indicating which sect it was):

**“<sup>16</sup> And therefore did the Jews persecute Yahshua, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day. <sup>17</sup> But Yahshua answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. <sup>18</sup> Therefore the Jews sought the**

more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that **God was his Father, making himself equal with God.**"

Here the Greek word for "equal" is Strong's #2470, and Goodrick & Kohlenberger in their *The NIV Exhaustive Concordance* describe it thusly: "**2698** ἴσος (*isos*), h (ē), on (*on*): adj.; = Str 2470; ... '**equal, same as**' (Mt 20:12; Mk 14:56, 59; Lk 6:34; Jn 5:18; Ac 11:17; Php 2:6; Rev 21:16+)." Thayer, in his *Greek-English Lexicon of the N.T.* appears to agree, stating in part on page 307: "... to claim for one's self the nature, rank, authority, which belong to God, Jn. v. 18 ..."

In support of this is 1 Timothy 3:16: "**Who has been manifest in flesh, justified in Spirit, has appeared to messengers, has been proclaimed among nations, is believed in the cosmos, taken up in splendor.**" (Translation, W.R. Finck.)

Another passage which supports the fact that the Father and Son are one and the same is found at John 10:25-39

**"<sup>24</sup> Then came the [Kenite-Edomite]-jews round about him, and said unto him, How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. <sup>25</sup> Yahshua answered them, I told you, and ye believed not: the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me. <sup>26</sup> But ye believe not, because ye are not of my [Israel] sheep, as I said unto you. <sup>27</sup> My [Israel] sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: <sup>28</sup> And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. <sup>29</sup> My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. <sup>30</sup> I and my Father are one. <sup>31</sup> Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him. <sup>32</sup> Yahshua answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? <sup>33</sup> The [Kenite-Edomite]-jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God."**

What is there that is so difficult to understand that the Father and the Son are one and the same person? The only aspect that separates the Son from the Father is the fact that before the incarnation of Yahweh in the flesh, Yahweh was an invisible being, Col. 1:15. Also, it is very clear from this last quoted passage that the Kenite-Edomite-jews understood that Christ was claiming to be Yahweh God Himself, and they would bring this very same charge to their kangaroo-court trial to gain support for His crucifixion! Repeating their charge, "**... because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.**" It is very obvious here that the Kenite-Canaanite-Edomite-jews understood Christ's words as a claim to being God Himself! Therefore, they had a better comprehension of Christ's words here than the later roman catholic and protestant trinitarians [*4 words lowercase mine*]. A few verses later, at John 10:38, Christ stated in part: "**... the Father is in me, and I in him.**" This substantiates John 12:45, where Christ addressed the Pharisees, "**... he that seeth me seeth him that sent me**", and John 14:9, where He stated to Philip, "**... he that hath seen me hath seen the Father ...**" How could it be otherwise?

Once we comprehend these facts, we can then understand the context of Philippians 2:6-9: "**<sup>6</sup> Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be**

**equal with God: <sup>7</sup> But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: <sup>8</sup> And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. <sup>9</sup> Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.”**

Not only is it important to understand that Christ was Yahweh come incarnate in the flesh (with a secondary meaning “a.- flesh-colored; pink, b.- red; rosy”), but also the bloodline of that flesh. There is no such thing as an incarnate negroid or mongolian! Hence, there should be no question as to Christ’s race!

At John 7:42 we read: **“Hath not the scripture said, That Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?”**

Romans 1:3: **“... who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh.”**

ASV

2 Timothy 2:8: **“Remember that Yahshua Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel ...”**

Thus, we see that Yahshua Christ (the Son) was Yahweh (the Father) incarnate into David’s fleshly line. Yes, there is a father-son relationship, while at the same time being the same person. If Christ is to be considered a second person, then He couldn’t have come into existence until His conception and birth, which is contrary to Scripture! On the other hand, if Christ preexisted as a second person or Son of Yahweh, His birth at Bethlehem couldn’t have been His incarnation, but rather (and this is absurd) His reincarnation! As one can plainly see, the theory of a trinity falls apart at the seams! As I have stated before, it’s not God as three persons, but ONE GOD as three manifestations! Not only this, but if the Father and Son are two different persons, then according to Scripture, the Son is going to marry His Father’s wife, which lowers the morals of the Almighty equivalent to that of the average alley cat! Such an assertion is vile beyond description!

As shown above, Yahshua Christ was of the line of David, and that can only be through His mother Mary, as Joseph was not his physical father. It is well known today that the mother contributes as many chromosomes to the child’s genetics as does the father, so Christ was legitimately of the house of David, of the tribe of Judah through Nathan. So in effect, Christ was both son of David and son of Yahweh (in respect to His incarnation into David’s flesh). Hence, neither the expressions “Son of God” nor “son of man” are out of place. And since Christ explained at John 12:45 **“... he that seeth me seeth him that sent me”**, He is both the sent and the sender, or both the Father and the Son! Therefore, every place it speaks of the Father and the Son in Scripture, it must be taken in this context that the Father and Son are one and the same!

The concept of Father and Son are alluded to at Matt. 3:17, where it is stated: **“And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.”** Some would claim that this demonstrates two different persons, but it must be kept in a proper context as the Father and Son being One. Some may respond, “But here the Father is in heaven and the Son is on the earth!” We must remember, though, that Yahweh is omnipresent, meaning “present in all places at all times”, so it matters not from whence came the voice, as long as it was heard! Because of Yahweh’s

omnipresence, it means (at the same time He was stating this above), He could be present several trillion light-years out in space near some distant galaxy. This verse doesn't support any trinitarian interpretation!

Another verse cited by the trinitarians to somehow support the premise that the Father and Son are two persons is Matt. 7:21, which reads: **“Not every one that saith unto me, Master, Master, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.”** Here again, the trinitarians will assume that heaven is somewhere other than on this earth, and that Christ is addressing this in His earthly ministry, postulating that somehow this proves these are two different persons. But where is this “kingdom of heaven” sometimes referred to as the “kingdom of God”? When it speaks of the “kingdom” in this manner, it is referring to the kingdom people of the twelve tribes of Israel right here on this earth! Where else would one expect the Father to be except in the midst of His people? In other words, Israel is the heavenly race of people, or the born from above people, John 3:3! How the trinitarians get two persons out of Matt. 7:21 I'll never understand, for Christ's own words at John 12:45 were, **“... he that seeth me seeth him that sent me.”** The “him” here is the Father!

Again, the trinitarians will cite Matt. 11:25-27 to somehow support their theory of the Father and Son being two separate persons: <sup>25</sup> **“At that time Yahshua answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Sovereign of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. <sup>26</sup> Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight. <sup>27</sup> All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.”** Actually, this passage supports the oneness of the Father and Son rather than a trinity, where it says, **“... and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son ...”** Again, read Matt. 11:25-27 in the context of John 12:45, where Christ said, **“... he that seeth me seeth him that sent me.”**

Trinitarians point out Matt. 12:50 as surefire proof that the Father and Son are separate persons, where it reads: **“For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.”** One trinitarian stating, “... leaving no doubt as to His connection to the God in heaven.” I will assert again that the “God in heaven” spoken of here is the God of the heavenly race of Adamic Israelites as pointed out previously above. Not only is the Father in this heaven, but also “my brother”, “sister” and “mother”, for they are all of this heavenly race! No wonder in Matthew chapter 13 that the multitudes were astonished, saying, (vv. 55-56): <sup>55</sup> **“Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? <sup>56</sup> And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath this man all these things?”** These passages can only be understood in the context of John 12:45, where Christ said, **“... he that seeth me seeth him that sent me.”**

Also, Matt. 14:33 where it reads, “... **Of a truth thou art the Son of God**”, where Christ calmed the sea must be taken in the context of John 12:45, “... **he that seeth me seeth him that sent me.**”

The trinitarians are also quick to point out Matt. 16:15-16, where Peter confessed: “<sup>15</sup> **He [Christ] saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? <sup>16</sup> And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.**” Again, this passage can only be understood in the context of John 12:45, where Christ said, “... **he that seeth me seeth him that sent me.**”

Yet another passage the trinitarians use to support their flawed premise is found at Matt. 17:5, which states: “**While he [Yahshua] yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.**” Here the trinitarians use man’s logic to support their faulty hypothesis, but the context at John 12:45 still stands, where Christ addressed the Pharisees, “... **he that seeth me seeth him that sent me**” and John 14:9, where He stated to Philip, “... **he that hath seen me hath seen the Father ...**” Inasmuch as the Father is omnipresent, the trinitarians overlook the fact that the Father can be in the Son and the cloud simultaneously! This shows that they serve a very small and insignificant god.

Never quitting in their endeavor to prop up their flawed premise, the trinitarians will cite Matt. 18:10, which reads in part: “... **That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.**” After citing this, one trinitarian wrote, “Jesus again refers to God as ‘my Father,’ reaffirming that he was the Son of God.” This is in blatant disregard of John 12:45, where Christ addressed the Pharisees, “... **he that seeth me seeth him that sent me**”, and John 14:9, where He stated to Philip, “... **he that hath seen me hath seen the Father ...**”. Matt. 18:10 is just another verse which the trinitarians take out-of-context! It appears the trinitarian’s god is so small that they will need a powerful magnifying glass to find him!

The trinitarians, being quite stubborn in their persuasion, will cite Matt. 24:35-36, where it says, “<sup>35</sup> **Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.** <sup>36</sup> **But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.**” The trinitarians will assume from this, in their flawed resolve, that the Father and Son are two different persons, that one knew something that the other didn’t. But is this really what Christ implied? In other words, did Christ know the day and the hour? We must remember that Christ, having a two-fold nature (*very* God and *very* man), it would exclude Him from verse 36. Therefore, Christ being both the Father and the Son did know the day and the hour! To understand that He did know we must review John 12:45, where Christ addressed the Pharisees, “... **he that seeth me seeth him that sent me**”, and John 14:9, where He stated to Philip, “... **he that hath seen me hath seen the Father ...**” Therefore, being both the Father and Son, He did know the day and the hour, and nothing at Matt. 24:36 says that He didn’t! So the trinitarians strikeout again!

Not giving up on their pet theory of promoting a trinity, the trinitarians will cite Matt. 27:43, where it states: “**He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God.**” At this point, we must ask the question,

How did these Kenite-Edomite-jews know that Christ claimed to be “the Son of God”? It was at John 10:30 where Christ stated, “... **I and my Father are one.**” And this proclamation was based on John 12:45 where Christ addressed the Pharisees, “... **he that seeth me seeth him that sent me**”, and John 14:9, where He stated to Philip, “... **he that hath seen me hath seen the Father ...**” Such are the words that were used as an excuse to crucify Him!

Then one trinitarian cites Matt. 27:54 and suggests it is the ultimate proof of a trinity, which reads: “**Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Yahshua, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God.**” No doubt this was a very startling event, for at that moment the veil in the Temple was rent and many saints who had formerly died arose from their graves. But just because the centurion is recorded as saying, “**Truly this was the Son of God**” doesn’t make the Father and Son two separate persons! This is not true as it is not in context with John 12:45, where Christ addressed the Pharisees, “... **he that seeth me seeth him that sent me**”, and John 14:9, where He stated to Philip, “... **he that hath seen me hath seen the Father ...**”.

The trinitarians will then attempt to find support for a trinity at Matt. 28:18-19, where it says: “<sup>18</sup> **And Yahshua came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. <sup>19</sup> Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ...**” One trinitarian, thinking he had the ultimate answer, wrote, “This is the Trinity.” Well, it might appear as a trinity to some, but there is one major problem in applying verse 19 to a trinity. The English word “name” is properly translated from the Greek #368,6 *on'-om-ah*, and is singular in both the English and the Greek. Therefore, it is not the plural “names” but rather the singular “name”! And since it is not plural, it cannot support three separate persons no matter how much they rant and rave otherwise! As I said before, it is not God in three persons, but ONE GOD in three manifestations!

We should not be surprised that Christ is called by more than one appellation, as Isaiah 9:6 gives a few more: “**For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.**” Did you notice here that the Son would also be called the Father? It seems that the trinitarians know more about it than Isaiah! Actually, they are intimating that Isaiah is a liar!

It is paramount that we take all of these passages in context with John 12:45, where Christ addressed the Pharisees, “... **he that seeth me seeth him that sent me**”, and John 14:9, where He stated to Philip, “... **he that hath seen me hath seen the Father ...**”

Another passage that alludes to this same thought is Mark 9:36-37, where we read: “<sup>36</sup> **And he took a child, and set him in the midst of them: and when he had taken him in his arms, he said unto them, <sup>37</sup> Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.**” Thus, to receive the Son is to receive the Father! This is similar language to John 12:45, where Christ addressed the Pharisees, “... **he that**



**seeth me seeth him that sent me”,** and John 14:9, where He stated to Philip, **“... he that hath seen me hath seen the Father ...”**

Likewise, similar language is found at John 7:16: **“Yahshua answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.”** Question: Who sent Him? Answer: John 12:45, **“... he that seeth me seeth him that sent me.”** It is clear, Christ knowing that the Father and Son were ONE, He was sent by the Father. John 8:16 might seem to contradict this, where Christ states: **“And yet if I judge, my judgment is true: for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me.”** Here, Christ, knowing the Father and Son are ONE, is declaring that the Father and Son serve as two witnesses when it comes to the law (the Father being Spirit and the Son being flesh). Yet in Christ, the Spirit and the flesh are fused into one being, never to be severed. How else could the Father and Son be ONE?

Another passage which declares that the Father and Son are ONE is found at John 10:37-38 thusly: **“<sup>37</sup> If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. <sup>38</sup> But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him.”**

An additional passage that describes this very same concept is found at Romans 1:3-4, where Paul states: **“3 Concerning His Son who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh; 4 And declared to be the Son of Yahweh with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead ...”**. Most translations do not include the phrase, “Jesus Christ our Lord” as does the KJV. The proper context here is found at John 14:9, where Christ stated to Philip, **“... he that hath seen me hath seen the Father ...”** *i.e.*, Yahweh took up His abode in the fleshly body of Christ.

Going back to the man who wrote that 15-page article attempting to prove a trinity, he made a very serious blunder on page 10 where he stated in reference to Mark 16:19; Luke 22:69; Acts 7:55-56; Rom. 8:34; Col. 3:1; Heb. 10:12; 12:2; & 1 Pet. 3:22, **“If He is sitting on the right hand of God He must be a separate person (and HIS Son) and where we should seek what is above, or from God.”** All of these passages are subject to John 12:45, where Christ addressed the Pharisees, **“... he that seeth me seeth him that sent me”,** and John 14:9, where He stated to Philip, **“... he that hath seen me hath seen the Father ...”** Yes, as a metaphor, there is a father-son relationship, and yes, as a metaphor, a son is his father’s right arm or hand! (*i.e.* strength or example.)

Like I said at the beginning of this lesson, if the premise of a trinity is true, there can be no remarriage of Israel back to “the Lamb of God” who is one with the Father, (John 1:29, 36; Rev. 7:9-10-11, 14; 12:11; 14:4; 15:3; 19:9; 21:3; & 22:1, 3). To claim such a thing is tantamount to the Son marrying His Father’s wife! If the premise of a trinity is true, the remarriage is untrue, it’s that simple! I sincerely hope the man who wrote his 15-page paper on his supposed trinity will wake up to the seriousness of this implication.

The following are some of the other passages that this man used attempting to justify a trinity: Mark 1:11; 3:11; 5:7; 9:7, 37; 13:26, 32; 14:62; 15:39; Luke 1:35, 37; 3:22, 38; 4:34, 41; 8:27-28; 9:26, 35; 10:22; 18:19; 22:70-71; 23:46; John 1:29, 34, 40,

51; 3:17-18, 35; 5:18, 19-47; 6:27, 39-39, 65, 67; 7:16; 8:16-19, 28-29, 38, 42, 54; 10:18, 36; 11:27; 17:7-10; 20:31; Acts 8:37; 9:20; 13:33; Romans 1:3-4; 1 Cor. 1:9; 2 Cor. 1:3; Gal. 1:1, 15-16; 4:4; Phip. 2:5-8; Col. 1:3; 3:1-2; 1 Tim. 2:5; Heb. 1:1-2, 5; 2:6, 7; 3:6; 4:14; 5:8; 10:12; 1 Pet. 1:3; 1 John 2:22-23; 3:23; 4:10, 14-15; 5:5-6, 10-15; 2 John 3, 7, 9.

I would advise each reader of this lesson to check every one of these references out for themselves, applying John 12:45, where Christ addressed the Pharisees, “... **he that seeth me seeth him that sent me**”, and John 14:9, where He stated to Philip, “... **he that hath seen me hath seen the Father ...**” for a proper context.

It is my prayer that the reader can now comprehend why it was necessary for me to address this issue of the trinity so I can proceed with the subject *The Greatest Love Story Ever Told*. Surely the doctrine of the trinity represented an obstacle blocking its presentation. I will leave you with this thought: With a trinity, Whom do we really worship? Secondly, Was the first trinity Satan, Eve and Cain?