

***Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas***  
***Fredericksburg Bible Church***  
*107 East Austin*  
*Fredericksburg, Texas 78624*  
*830-997-8834    [jthomas@fbgbible.org](mailto:jthomas@fbgbible.org)*

**B1030 – July 25, 2010 – The Trinity: The One & The Many**

We finished with the Birth of the King and the doctrinal consequence of the hypostatic union and we said there were some practical results that followed from this doctrine of the hypostatic union and this truth. Turn to Col 2:8, the fourth thing, a very basic thing that follows, once the full deity of Christ is appreciated. That is that Christ, as the God-man, is the definer of the basic categories of human thought. Everyone thinks in categories, but from whence have these categories come? This question and this verse have been woefully neglected over the centuries of church history. Very rarely do we think about how we're thinking. Yet this was fundamental in Paul's theology and he pointed it out to the Colossians centuries ago. It's a verse that everybody reads and goes on and doesn't give much thought, but it's a very important one.

Paul says: "See to it that no one takes you captive through philosophy and empty deception, according to the tradition of men, according to the elementary principles of the world, rather than according to Christ." In that sentence he sets two things over against each other. He says we have a choice, we can begin and we can follow philosophy that is according to, *kata*, a Greek preposition meaning according to a standard, we can set up our thinking, our basic categories of thought, he says "according to the tradition of men, according to the elementary principles of the world." The *stoicheia*, the world used centuries before by the Greek philosophers and they had something very special in mind by this *stoicheia*. What they had in mind were the basic categories of thought itself; the fundamental building blocks of the universe.

Does anyone remember what the Greeks thought the universe came from? Earth, fire, water, air. Those are four very common elements that the Greeks thought about. We ought to be careful before we laugh at that, because if you

think of what these four elements are, fire, air, water, and earth, what does that look like? It corresponds to what in our modern scientific terms? It's the three phases, the three states of matter; liquid, gas and solid, and the fire is energy. So it really wasn't too off base. Today we are taught in our schools the same thing. When you were trained in school, what did they say everything came from? Atoms, energy; those are the basic categories, and then we use those basic categories and build everything else from them.

Paul says in verse 8; don't be taken captive by that kind of thinking, "according to the principles of the world, rather than according to Christ." What is striking about this verse is that he is contrasting the *stoicheia* with Jesus Christ. We have to stop here and observe text carefully and ask why does he do this? How can you contrast earth, fire, water and air to Jesus Christ? Why is this contrast there? And he's making it a point of orthodoxy. He's saying let no man be deceived. He says you have two paths; you have two fundamentally different world views. You can build one on this basis or you can build the other one on that basis. The last four or five weeks we've talked about the hypostatic union of the Lord Jesus Christ where the Creator and the creature meet in one person. So what he is arguing for is that the basic category that we have to begin with is the Creator-creature distinction, because it's the Creator-creature distinction that's fundamental to understanding who Jesus Christ is.

You cannot understand who the person of Christ is without understanding the OT Creator-creature distinction; it's fundamental. The Lord Jesus Christ has a human body made of matter. Moreover, Jesus Christ's human body that's made of matter, it's not a pile of atomic particles that arranged themselves by chance, random processes. What do we understand if we read Gen 1 about man? We understand that he's made in God's image. Remember we made a big point that the image of God, in which we are made, is not just the immaterial part of man, but that our bodies, fingers, head, ears, these correspond to what God would look like were He to appear in a finite form. So the human body is not the random result of chance evolution. The human body's shape is a finite derivative of the very character and being of God Himself. The animals don't have that, the angels don't have that, no other creation has that, only man has that. That's not a difficulty in the Christian worldview. In the pagan worldview spirit and matter always contradict. You have the Gnostics, you have eastern thinking, pagan thought always gets

these in contradiction. Yet, in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ the spirit and the matter fit together in one without contradiction.

This is a difficult area that we're going into, the doctrine of the Trinity. The whole doctrine itself is difficult but in these lessons we're going to get into a lot of Bible passages about the Trinity. I'm tired of hearing this stuff about oh, the Trinity is not taught in the Bible. All that shows is that whoever says it never reads the Bible.

Today we want to set things up so that when we come to the text and we look at the Biblical verses that have to do with the Trinity you're asking the right questions, the big questions. Scripture is like a wonderfully rich gold mine, and you get out of it as much as you put into it. We can come into the cave and pick a few nuggets but if we really want the good stuff you have to dig deep, and the way to dig deep into the Scripture is to bring the heavy questions to the text and let the text answer the heavy questions, which means first we have to deal with what are the heavy questions.

What we want to do is turn the tables on what usually happens with this doctrine of the Trinity. Nine times out of ten when the doctrine of the Trinity is taught, someone will say but that doesn't make logical sense; you Christians are irrational, you have a logical contradiction in the very heart of your faith; how can God be three and how can God be one? What happens is that the non-Christian starts with his logic machine and then he wants to subject God to the logic machine. What we're going to do is show you that it's actually the reverse - the logic machine can't exist without the Trinity. It's exactly the opposite. It's only because we have the Trinity that we have the ability to think logically and use language.

I want to review how the pagan mind works because this is heavy stuff, and if you don't get it first time, don't worry about it, we'll just go a little at a time. This will not affect the benefit of the Scripture verses we'll have next week. But for those of you who have banged your head on the wall in this area, try to stay with me as I work through this, because what I am trying to show you is actually a truth about the Trinity that wasn't well perceived prior to the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In the progress of the Church the Holy Spirit teaches men; then the next generation that comes along builds on the shoulders of the previous generation. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century because so many battles were fought in the

1700's and 1800's over the faith, fundamentalist Christian thinkers at the turn of the century realized that something needed to be reformed in how we deal with issues of our faith, on how we deal with the big questions because it wasn't being dealt with very skillfully in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Out of this came an approach called the presuppositional apologetic, largely developed in Westminster Seminary by Cornelius Van Til, largely produced within the Reformed Calvinist circles, a very powerful insight into Scripture. Cornelius Van Til is not well known. He never really wrote a popular book in his life. The books that he did write were classroom syllabi that people insisted on reforming and finally going out and publishing. He wrote articles, forty or fifty of them, in some of the Reform Christian magazines for the Reformed faith. Cornelius Van Til earned his PhD at Princeton, and he was one of those men who was involved in the day when Princeton was going and the big fundamentalist/modern controversy was around. He regularly hung out with J. Gresham Machen who wrote NT Greek for Beginners. He was around Robert Dick Wilson who knew twenty-five Semitic languages; this is the kind of scholar this guy worked with. He was a brilliant guy; he actually wanted to be a farmer in Michigan, his family had emigrated from Holland, they were Dutch farmers, he was a very home-spun type guy, but he was also brilliant. God had gifted him in a very interesting way. At Princeton his teachers encouraged him to go on, and he eventually wrote his PhD dissertation on Immanuel Kant. His PhD dissertation on Immanuel Kant was used by the professor of philosophy at Princeton to write the standard text on Immanuel Kant that is still used today. So this guy is not some obscurantist.

What Van Til pointed out to Christians is that the fundamental question behind all philosophy throughout the centuries has been the question of the One and the Many. This is very practical in its results: the One versus the Many. The ancient world had a problem with this; the modern world has a problem with this. Politicians have a problem with this. Accountants have a problem with this. Spouses have a problem with this. Children have a problem with this. It permeates all of life.

Let me try to develop it. The problem of the One and the Many is this: which is more important, is it the unity of a group or the individual. For example, politically is it better to have a unified society where we sacrifice individual

rights to the state so that the state is ultimate and the state determines what is right and what is wrong? What's the end result of that? Totalitarianism.

Or, on the other side, is it better to have individual rights and risk breaking society up into little clubs, gangs, groups, races, etc, where everybody has their rights but you don't have any unity. What's the end result of this kind of political thinking? Anarchy. Every man does what is right in his own eyes. So politically speaking, we can swing to an overemphasis on the State and the importance of a unified society or we can swing the other direction to an overemphasis on the Individual and the importance of an individual's right. So you have these extremes and people have fought this battle for ages. Communism came out on the totalitarianism side of the spectrum. We have these two extremes. We've always had them in politics.

Let's take it in another area to see the One and the Many; let's take marriage. Marriage is a divine institution. You can emphasize the marriage or the individuals in the marriage. If you emphasize the individuals you emphasize the Many, the individual is primary. In this case you say the husband and the wife are individuals and that individuality needs to be protected at all cost. The husband has a right and the wife has a right. But if this is made to be the final story we go to divorce and the dissolution of marriage because the marriage is less important than the individuals in the marriage. On the other hand you can emphasize the "marriage," honoring marriage, this emphasize the One, the unity of the marriage to the point where one or the other or both spouses lose all individual expression, their gifts and their use, etc.

You can have the same thing in the family. You can have a family that's very splintered, everyone does their own thing, everyone stays out of everyone else's business, that's an emphasis on the Many; or you can have a family that's run by a total dictatorship so that all individual personalities are lost, that's emphasizing the One, the unity of the family. So I think you can see that in the social realm you have a tendency to the One or the Many. And it goes on and on and on. But it's not just in the social realm where this occurs, it occurs in other areas.

Let's take the simple case of a secretary or at home your filing cabinet. You've got all this stuff, materials scattered here and there and you say I want some

order to this stuff. So you sit down and start sorting it out into categories; you put this in this file, this in that file, etc. What sometimes happens is that, say this is July, you go through and you spend a week organizing all your stuff in this great filing system. Then you don't pay any attention to it until October and then you wonder where did I put this, because the system of organizing the material doesn't somehow fit any more, there was a bad emphasis on the structure of the filing system. In this illustration what is the One and what is the Many? The Many is the stuff that's going into the file, the individual things, and you're trying to organize it. By the way, why do you want a filing system? Think about it, why is there a need for a One in the middle of the Many? A filing system is a wonderful illustration of this. Why do we bother to file anything? Because we want to manage it. You can't manage individual marbles rolling all over the place, it's just chaos. So the only way you can manage things is to have it organized, and if you're going to organize it, what do you have to have by way of organizing principles? You have to have something that makes sense, some categories that people understand. It has to really mean something, it can't just be a thing you make up, and so you have to think through how do you do a filing system.

There's got to be something that emphasizes the One, and you'll see that the people who emphasize the One want meaning, they want the big picture. On the other hand, that can become very rigorous and oppressive. So the other tendency is to fly in the opposite direction and emphasize the Many, and these are the people who want freedom, they want things loose. The point is that there's this tendency wherever you look, whatever century you're reading, men have struggled to find the balance between the One and the Many.

I want to show that it's even more serious than politics, marriage and filing systems. This problem is at the core of our entire way of thinking and knowing. The One and the Many has to be solved in order to deal with language and thinking. Those are linked because you can't think without language. All you can do is feel. I don't mean illiterate in the sense of reading (the people in Bible times were illiterate in that sense) but they were very literate people: they governed themselves, they thought in terms of absolutes, they had laws, they had rules of evidence, they could discuss large issues, so they were literate in that way. That's the general sense of what I mean; they

could think. They just didn't go oomph and feel. So thinking requires language.

Also involved in this is logic because logic is involved in thinking. In order for us, at the most basic part of our souls to function we need language and we need logic. Here's the issue. What I'm doing here is I'm building something because the critics like to say the Trinity is a logical contradiction. What I'm going to show you is that if the Trinity doesn't exist then there is no language or logic.

Language and logic both struggle with the One and the Many. Let's take a simple sentence; My dog is a German Shepherd. In that sentence there's One and the Many. What is the individual item? My dog. I'm classifying my dog as one member of a class called German Shepherds. In that sentence I haven't talked about what a German Shepherd is, I've said it's a class into which my dog fits, one German Shepherd, it's what eats the food that falls off my table, it's my German Shepherd.

The point we're making is that here is an ordinary sentence that everybody uses every single day and we have to deal with the One and the Many. The Many is any item, any individual item that we're thinking about, and when we think about any individual item, whether it's a business transaction, whether it's an object in our house, a person or anything else, we have to link that with some sort of classification. If we don't, we really don't know it. Think of anything you know, I just picked an animal. When you go to describe your dog to the friend down the street, how do you describe him? You describe him by saying he's a German shepherd, he's brown with black, medium hair, etc. what are you doing? You're describing him in terms of characteristics. So you have to have a set of characteristics out there in order to describe and know him, or it's just I have an uuuu in my house, oh, it's an uuuuu, come over and see it. Now until you come over and see an uuuu, you don't know anything about what uuuu is. If I'm going to tell you what uuuu is, I have to have a list of characteristics that you know about.

The point is that the language we use every day, believer and unbeliever alike, is solving the problems and yet nobody can explain how it works. The philosophers have struggled with this question, but in practice, the secretary deals with it, the husband deals with it, the politicians deal with it. We're



forced in our roles in life to think in these terms. We just do it without thinking about it.

Let's look at logic which is closely related to this. In order for there to be any logical coherencies to thinking you've got to have, again, categories. Let's say that we have this sentence: All dogs have four legs. If we're sloppy in our logic here's what happens. X has four legs, this is a bad syllogism, therefore X is a dog. Something's wrong here, it's not true. That's false syllogism. But one of the problems with these syllogisms and why they break down is that words switch meanings in the process of talking about these things. To avoid a logical fallacy, not only do the premises have to be true, but the vocabulary usage has to remain the same. If I start talking about dogs and I have in mind four-footed creatures, and you use the word d-o-g and you're referring as a metaphor to something else, we're going to be totally confused in our communication, because when I use the word dog I'm talking about those four-legged things with a tail. When you use the word dog you might be sarcastically referring to a sorry individual person. If we try to think across those boundaries we utilized the word d-o-g different. What saves us?

Aristotle pointed this out centuries and centuries ago. He made a very perceptive statement, as a pagan thinker; here's Aristotle thinking through, Plato had started to work with this, Aristotle and Plato developed logic, etc. Here's what their conclusion was, and nobody's refuted them. What they basically argued was that you cannot have genuine logic unless you have 100% perfect categories. The moment the category boundaries smear out, your logic starts to leak, as well as your language. That was great, but the problem that Aristotle and Plato found as pagans was: what do we have to have in order to have a 100% perfect category? Think about it. If you think in terms of dog, German shepherd, that's a category. Breeders can spend their lives working with German shepherds and still be out there in the fuzzy edge, not knowing exactly what a German shepherd is. What kind of knowledge do you have to know to have the perfect knowledge of exactly what a German shepherd is and what he isn't? Omniscience.

Follow us, we're coming to thick stuff here, but here's where the payoff is. Think of what we just said. In order to have language and logic function you need 100% perfect categories, but what finite creature can get hold of 100% universal categories. None of us, because to have 100% universal categories



you've got to have omniscience, you've got to know everything in order to classify it in terms of universal categories, because if you make the category of German Shepherds on the basis of four dogs and along comes a fifth one, you have to say oops, I have to adjust the category for that one. You look at the stock market, some computer guru has this model that works great for three years, and then the fourth year the market...oh, we've got to adjust our model. The problem is a finite person is always subject to the  $n + 1^{th}$  piece of data. If that's all there is then all knowledge would be contingent.

So the problem and the dilemma of the One and the Many is simply this, let's try to phrase this... because this is going to make us appreciate... this doctrine of the Trinity that came out of 400 years of church history, that everybody says oh that was imported from the Greeks, you're about to see how stupid that statement is. The Greeks said One and Many, and they were smart enough then to realize that in order to get unity in classification you've got to be God, G-o-d. You've got to have God-like knowledge to anchor logic and language. You've got to, because you've got to have universal categories that aren't going to go away on Tuesday afternoon, they're going to be valid Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, the year 2000, 2010, 3000, 4000 if the Lord tarries. You can't have these things changing or you don't have knowledge. So the One has got to be the same, it's got to be God.

Now let's look at the other side. The other problem is that you've got to also have an infinite set of observations of the individual things. You've got to have some idea of ... here's an object, here comes something else, like reading the morning newspaper, you open up the newspaper, well now what kind of a mess do we have today? You have these things coming to you, and what the Greeks realized was all you have back here as the source of these individual things is pure chance, or they liked to call it fate. So the problem of the Many is that you've got all these things coming out of nowhere, and you can't really know where these things are coming from, they just happen. They just happen, they pop into your life, go away, pop into your life, they go away, new things come popping into your life every day. The problem here is that if everything is really chance, what does that do to the One? If you really don't know where this stuff is coming from, how do you know you can ever get a One, how do you know you could ever get a category going at all? You don't.

The One and the Many are in perpetual antagonism to each other, on a pagan basis. Finite man is torn between trying to establish all the details of life in a pattern, on one hand getting the details under control and on the other hand once he gets it, it freezes on him and now he has no freedom; now he has no rights, no individual room to move, he's moved to determinism. So here's the picture of the unbeliever, going back and forth, back and forth, back and forth. That's human history. In a personal private way you can see this in religious circles, including our Christian circles by a tendency of those people who in the flesh, when we're not following the Holy Spirit, not filled with the Spirit, not obeying Scripture, not walking by faith, we drift in one of these two directions in our spiritual life. The direction toward the One is characterized by legalism. We're going to establish a principle, whether God leads us to that or not, we've got to have a principle, got to follow the principle, come hell or high water we're going to follow the principle; don't adapt it to the situation, we've got to follow the principle!

The problem is often times the principles are just part of our own personalities, we happen to be more comfortable with this life style, so all the Christians have to fit our lifestyle whether it's in the Scripture or not. That's legalism; we have no right to impose some standard outside of the Scripture on other Christians. We're going to meet people that just grate our souls, but we have to have grace. God has grace. It doesn't mean we abandon His standards; we're sensitive to these things. Paul deals with this. If you want some good Scripture try Rom 14 and 1 Cor 8-10. Those are central passages, Rom 14, 1 Cor 8-10 are practical texts where Paul had to deal with this legalism situation; people were worried about what food to eat.

I watch this week in week out. One thing going right now is that we have to eat all organic food and if some mother doesn't provide organic food for her family well, she's just unspiritual, she's not concerned for their best interest. Where in the heck does the Bible say that every woman has to buy organic food on every aisle whether she has the money to do it or not? That's not in the Scripture. But boy we're going to judge them if they don't. We can get into it in our own congregation, we can say boy, everybody should home school their kids. The Bible doesn't say Thou shalt home school. The Bible gives you educational principles; it says parents are responsible. It doesn't specify exactly how they have to do it. I think home schooling is great but I wouldn't say that every parent must do it. And if you make it for every parent its

legalism. It's when we come up with our pet principle and we've got to push it on everybody else. That's overemphasizing the One. Everyone must conform to my principle or else no matter what Scripture says.

On the other hand we have the licentious crowd and they emphasize the Many. Well, I don't think we should judge anybody, you know, we don't want to evaluate anything, everybody has their own rights so we're free to do anything, it's grace all the way baby. So we can go out and raise all kinds of hell and Jesus will forgive it. We have that group, and that's an overemphasis on the Individual. Here we go, back and forth, back and forth, back and forth, we're doing it in our Christian circles and it's just evidence that we haven't solved the problem of the One and the Many. I want you to see that this thing is all permeating.

Here is where the Trinity comes in. The Bible-believing Christian sees the One and the Many in creation as derivative of the One and Many in the Creator. What did we say is fundamental to the Christian worldview over against the pagan? What is the difference between the Christian and the non-Christian? The Christian thinks in terms of two levels of being, the Creator and the creature. The pagan doesn't have that, he thinks of being, everything just exists, God exists, man exists, nature exists, the rocks exist, one level of being. The Christian can't do that, we have to come over and say there's two levels of being. So when we ask the question of the One and the Many, instead of doing it like Aristotle and Plato, we say wait a minute, we've got to ask our One/Many question in terms of the Creator and the creature, there's a One and Many there and here. This is where the Trinity starts to show up.

This is fundamental; this is what separates Biblical Christianity from all other religions. Do you remember when we were going through different heresies? Go back to when the Church was arguing about who the person of Jesus Christ was and they ran into all these heresies. Many times the heresies were majority viewpoints. It wasn't until the Holy Spirit led the Church through a series of fierce debates that the cause of these heresies was finally swept out the door. On the right column of that table I gave you I have underlined certain words. The words I have underlined in the right column refers to the presuppositions about God that were wrong; behind the heresy there stood a false, deceptive, wrong, erroneous view of the being of God. It was because of that wrong view of God that these men could not handle the

person of Christ. They just could not deal with Jesus Christ correctly, because in their presuppositional level of their most basic level of thinking they were screwed up and that led them to wrong views of the person of Jesus. That's why the Church went through and rejected them.

Notice what we've underlined: solitary monotheism. In terms of what we've been talking about the last forty-five minutes what's the error here, is this drifting toward the One or to the Many? It's drifting to the One. Islam does this. Allah is God and God alone, he doesn't talk, there's no communication. Who does Allah talk to besides himself? This is why the Trinity is central to our faith. If we abandon the Trinity we go into something like Islam or Judaism. It's as simple as that and once we do that we compromise the attributes of God.

What we have done is show..., and let's let this flow out a little more, with the Creator-creature we have God as Trinity because God is One, and God is Three, there's multiplicity in God. We want to look at this oneness and this threeness. We want to be careful about something. The Church came in the Chalcedon Creed to say that Jesus Christ is undiminished deity and true humanity united in one person. We want to be careful when we say that in the Trinity God is one in essence. He is righteous, He is just, etc. and He is three in person. That's often the way it's said. I just want you to be careful. A Mormon can say the same thing. How are you going to distinguish how a Mormon talks about the Trinity, and how an orthodox Christian talks about the Trinity. A Mormon interprets that to mean there are three persons, all of whom are gods, plural. So you have the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, each one is God and you have three Gods. Wait a minute, that's not the Trinity, that's tritheism. So what's missing?

How do we state the Trinity? Here's the dilemma, we've got to state the Trinity so God is as much one as He is three. It's like Jesus Christ is as much God as He is man. That's where the critic, the pagan, thinks there's a contradiction; he says something can't be three and one. But the critic is down here inside the creation, he has something called number one and he has something called number three. You can't have something one and three, clearly there's a conflict there. What is he doing? He's saying there's a concept called oneness and there's a concept called threeness, and those two are universal categories that apply to the Creator and the creature in the

same way. Therefore, if that's the case, if that's really the case, then the pagan is right, there is a contradiction. But where do we get a category of oneness and threeness that apply to the Creator and creature in the same way? Only if we violate the Creator-creature distinction and think of oneness and threeness in terms of the Continuity of Being can we do that. And what did Paul warn against in Col. 2:8? Do not think according to the elementary categories of this world, do not think according to the basic concepts of paganism, but according to Christ. So what do you do to your basic concepts? You have to, from the hypostatic union and the maintenance of the Creator-creature distinction, realize that the concept of oneness and threeness is derived from the Triune Creator. In other words, those categories of oneness and threeness do not sit in judgment over the Trinity, they are derived from the Trinity. That's where the categories come from. What does this mean? Well it means that God can speak of Himself as I, 1<sup>st</sup> person singular, I AM. What did He say to Moses? He didn't say WE ARE, He said I AM. God can speak and refer to Himself with a 1<sup>st</sup> person singular. But how else can He refer to Himself? As in Gen 1:26? "Let us," 1<sup>st</sup> person plural. 1<sup>st</sup> person singular; 1<sup>st</sup> person plural, and God refers to Himself both ways, alternately, one, many, one, many, one, many. You say wait a minute, I can't grab this. That's right. What does the Bible say: "My ways are not your ways, neither are your thoughts My thoughts." There's an incomprehensibility to our God.

But what we can say is that in God the oneness and the threeness are of equal importance, and that's the key. Van Til said it this way, "Using the language of the One-and-Many question we contend that in God the one and many are equally ultimate. Unity in God is no more fundamental than diversity, and diversity in God is no more fundamental than unity. The persons of the Trinity are mutually exhaustive of one another." In the Trinity it's not one over the three, it's not three over the one. Mormonism elevates the three over the one; they have three individual gods running around so the three, the Many, has been emphasized to the diminishment of the One. Islam reverses it and elevates the One over the Many and they have the solitary Allah. In the Trinity God is as equally three as He is one. We do not completely understand that because our concepts are finite and they're limited in trying to grapple with His level of being. But that God is one and God is three is data that we're pulling from His revelation. That's how He speaks, that's what we're hearing; He says I am, He says let us, 1<sup>st</sup> person singular, 1<sup>st</sup> person plural, back and forth, back and forth.

But today I just wanted to show as an introduction to the Trinity, this is a strange doctrine, yes. Can we comprehend it? Not exhaustively. Is it logically contradictory? No, not if you think in terms of the Creator-creature distinction. We think it's strange but really we face the problem every day of our lives. What does the filing cabinet do, what does the wife do, what do we do in our normal sentences when we talk every day, and when we think? Aren't we balancing the One and the Many and tending either to the One or the Many in every single decision of our lives. We try to keep them in balance all the while evidencing that we know somewhere, somehow the One and the Many are in perfect harmony. We all know that that's true. Every businessman knows that's true. Every secretary who files knows that's true. And when we think about it, every time we utter a sentence we know that's true. So we can sit here and fret all we want to about we're into hard stuff and I don't understand it, but it's equally hard to understand a normal sentence, because we don't think about how we're thinking. We don't think about our language. It's just all of a sudden when the doctrine of the Trinity appears all of a sudden we've got a problem. The problem is we had the problem all the time; we had it every time we spoke, every time we filed, every time we started an education program, the day we got married, it's just that we never thought about it in those terms. Next week we'll get into the OT text, you may be surprised to see how much there is in the OT that speak of God as one and three.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2010