Are you sure you want to believe in a teaching about God, the Trinity, which requires that you affirm the following propositions?

“The Trinity is indivisible in its divisions.” “The Son was eternally begotten and thus he has a beginningless beginning.” “Jesus is 100% man and 100% God.” “Jesus is man but not a man.” “The Trinity rejects the Jewish concept of God” (so Jesus was rejected by the church fathers!).

The Trinity affirms that **God is one Being (ousia)** but **three Persons (hypostases)**. These are Greek philosophical terms. God is never called a “Being” (ousia) in the Bible. The title for Jesus, God the Son, is found nowhere in the Bible. The Greek word for “preexist” is never used of Jesus.

Even in the late 300’s AD there was no agreement about the Holy Spirit. Do you want to believe that the Holy Spirit can be worshiped and prayed to, when no Scripture allows for this? And the Holy Spirit never sends any greetings.

The Jew agreeing with Jesus is a powerful testimony: “The Torah-teacher said to him, ‘Well said, Rabbi; you speak the truth when you say that He is one, and that there is no other besides Him’” (Mark 12:32, CJB).

If we claim to be following Jesus, why do we not believe this monotheism? Why don’t we define God as Jesus did, using his very words? Could anyone possibly argue that Scripture is other than a unitarian document in all of its 66 books?

In addition to these verses above, there are countless thousands of **singular personal pronouns** to define God as I, Me, My, Myself, Mine, Thou, Thee, Thy, Thyself, Thine, He, Him, His, Himself. Singular personal pronouns designate, as we all know, one person. How very confusing to say then that God is three persons! Bible dictionaries and commentaries constantly describe God as a Person. The evidence is massive and overwhelming. The Jews as custodians of the Hebrew Bible (Rom. 3:2) always defined God as a single divine Individual. Isaiah 44:24 says that He was completely alone and unaccompanied at the creation: “I created all things by Myself: Who was with Me?” The implied answer is of course, “No one.”

Who Is God, the One God?

1. Deuteronomy 4:35, 39 “To you it was shown that you might know that the LORD, He is God; there is no other besides Him...Know therefore today, and take it to your heart, that the LORD, He is God in heaven above and on the earth below: there is no other.”

2. Deuteronomy 6:4 “Hear, O Israel! The LORD our God is one LORD.” (Note in Mark 12:28-34 how Jesus and a Jewish scribe he encountered affirmed this text as the greatest commandment.)

3. Deuteronomy 32:39 “See now that I, even I, am He, and there is no god besides me; I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal; and there is no one who can deliver out of My hand.”

4. 2 Samuel 7:22 “You are great, O LORD God; for there is none like You, and there is no God besides You, according to all that we have heard with our ears.”

5. 1 Kings 8:60 “That all the peoples of the earth may know that the LORD is God, and that there is no one else.”

6. 2 Kings 5:15 “When he returned to the man of God with all his company, and came and stood before him, he said, ‘Behold, now I know that there is no God in all the earth, but in Israel; so please take a present from your servant now.’”

7. 2 Kings 19:15 “Hezekiah prayed before the LORD and said, ‘O LORD, the God of Israel, who are enthroned above the cherubim, You are the God, You alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth. You have made heaven and earth.’”

8. 1 Chronicles 17:20 “O LORD, there is none like You, nor is there any God besides You, according to all that we have heard with our ears.”

9. Nehemiah 9:6 “You alone are the LORD. You have made the heavens, the heaven of heavens with all their host, the earth and all that is on it, the seas and all that is in them. You give life to all of them and the heavenly host bows down before You.”

10. Psalm 18:31 “For who is God besides the LORD? And who is a rock except our God?”

11. Psalm 86:10 “For You are great and do wondrous things: You alone are God.”

12. Isaiah 37:16, 20 “O LORD of hosts, the God of Israel, who is enthroned above the cherubim, You are the God, You alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth: You have made heaven and earth...Now, O LORD our God, deliver us from his hand that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that You alone, LORD, are God.”

13. Isaiah 43:10-11 “‘You are my witnesses,’ declares the LORD, ‘and My servant whom I have chosen, so that you may know and believe Me and...”
understand that I am he. Before Me there was no God formed, and there will be none after Me. I, even I, am the LORD, and there is no savior besides Me.”

14. Isaiah 44:6, 8 “Thus says the LORD, the King of Israel and his Redeemer, the LORD of hosts: ‘I am the first and I am the last; and there is no God besides Me...Do not tremble and do not be afraid; have I not told you from of old and declared it? And you are My witnesses. Is there any God besides Me? Or is there any other rock? I know of none.”

15. Isaiah 45:21 “Declare and set forth your case; indeed, let them consult together. Who has announced this from of old? Who has long since declared it? Is it not I, the LORD? And there is no other God besides Me, a righteous God and a Savior; there is none except Me.”

16. Isaiah 46:9 “For I am God, and there is no other; I am God, and there is no one like Me.”

17. Hosea 13:4 “I have been the LORD your God since the land of Egypt; and you were not to know any god except Me, for there is no savior besides Me.”

18. Joel 2:27 “Thus you will know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I am the LORD your God, and there is no other; and My people will never be put to shame.”

19. Zechariah 14:9 “And the LORD will be king over all the earth; in that day the LORD will be the only one, and His name the only one.”

20. Mark 12:29-34 “Jesus answered, ‘The foremost of all the commandments is, “Hear, O Israel! The Lord our God is one Lord. Love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength.” The second is this: “Love your neighbor as yourself.” There is no other commandment greater than these.’ The scribe said to him, ‘Right, teacher; you have spoken the truth, for there is one God and there is no one else besides Him, and to love him with all the heart and with all the understanding and with all the strength, and to love one’s neighbor as himself, is much more than all burnt offerings and sacrifices.’ When Jesus saw that he had answered intelligently, he said to him, ‘You are not far from the kingdom of God.’ After that, no one would venture to ask him any more questions.”

21. John 17:3 “This is the life of the age to come, that they may know You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom You have sent.”

These are the words of Jesus, the rabbi, who obviously defined God exactly as had the Hebrew Bible. The God of the Jews is the same as the God of the Gentiles (Rom. 3:29). A disciple is to be as his master (Luke 6:40). Salvation is of the Jews (John 4:22). The Biblical idea of God is summarized by Malachi 2:10: “Do we not all have one Father? Has not one God created us?”

Paul, quoting the Shema as Jesus had, said in 1 Corinthians 8:4, 6: “We know that there is no God except for the one God...For us there is only one God, the Father.” This is unitary monotheism exactly as Jesus expressed it in John 17:3 “You, Father, are the only one who is true God.”

“The conception of God in Judaism is strictly monotheistic. God is the absolute one, indivisible and incomparable being who is the ultimate cause of all existence. Jewish tradition teaches that the true aspect of God is incomprehensible and unknowable, and that it is only God's revealed aspect that brought the universe into existence, and interacts with mankind and the world. In Judaism, the one God of Israel is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who is the guide of the world, delivered the Israelites from slavery in Egypt, and gave them the Law of Moses at biblical Mount Sinai as described in the Torah” (Wikipedia, “God in Judaism”).

The Begetting of the Son in the Womb of Mary

The World’s Most Famous History of Identity, the Birth Certificate of Jesus

Raymond Brown’s The Birth of the Messiah, the classic commentary on Matthew 1 and Luke 1: "The action of the Holy Spirit and the power of the Most High come not upon the Davidic king but upon his mother. We are not dealing with the adoption of a Davidite by coronation as God’s son or representative; we are dealing with the begetting of God’s Son in the womb of Mary through God’s creative Spirit...The association of the christological formula [‘Today I have begotten you,’ Ps. 2:7] with the conception involves a more literal begetting. The ‘coming’ of the holy spirit in Luke 1:35b (which explains why the child is called holy in 35d), and the overshadowing by the power of the Most High in 1:35c (which explains why the child is called the Son of God in 1:35d) really beget the child as God’s Son — there is no adoption here..." "There is more of a connotation of creativity [the beginning of the New Creation and new Adam]. Mary is not barren, and in her case the child does not come into existence because God cooperates with the husband’s generative action and removes the sterility. Rather, Mary is a virgin who has not known man, and therefore the child is totally God’s work — a new creation...I have stressed in the notes on Luke 1:32, 35 that being ‘called’ Son of the Most High or Son of God is tantamount here to being God’s Son, and that Luke does not think of a preexistent Son of God..."
of course no NT work achieves the clarity of the Council of Nicea, calling him ‘true God of true God’” (pp. 312-314, 150, 158).

More from Raymond Brown:

“Mary was then ‘found to be,’ i.e. was, pregnant…The manner of begetting is implicitly creative rather than sexual…[The phrase] ‘Holy Spirit’ should not lead the Christian reader to assume that either Matthew or Luke has developed a theology of the Spirit as a person, much less the Third person of the Trinity…As for capitalization I follow recent Bible custom, without implying that a passage conveys either personality or a Trinitarian concept of divinity. Early English Protestant Bibles capitalized neither ‘holy’ nor ‘spirit’; the Rheims Catholic edition capitalized both; the Authorized (King James) Version capitalized only ‘Spirit’ until the eighteenth century (p. 124-125).

“[Without the intervention of the dream, Joseph could not have expected] that the child had been begotten through the creative action of the Holy Spirit…[Matthew 1:20] ‘literally what was begotten’…‘Begotten’ is related to genesis of 1:1, 18 and more closely to ‘begot, was the father of’ used regularly in the genealogy…[The begetting] literally is ‘of a Spirit which is Holy’…‘To call someone’s name X’ is a Semitism for ‘to call someone X’… (p. 127, 130).

“In my judgment the question of Mary's remaining a virgin for the rest of her life belongs to post-biblical theology.” [That is, it is non-biblical tradition!]

“'What do you think of the Messiah — whose son is he?...'The Jesus of Matthew, while not denying Davidic sonship, points to an exalted status for the Messiah, a status that cannot be explained by mere descent from David, since the Messiah has a lordship even over David [Ps. 110:1] (p. 134).

“It is true that the title ‘son of God’ does not appear in Matthew 1:18-25; yet the theme of divine sonship is present there because ‘begotten through the Holy Spirit’ is offered as a counter-explanation to human parentage in 1:20...When Davidic messiahship and divine sonship are moved back to the conception of Jesus, the imagery of begetting is now in a context where it is capable of a more realistic sense...When Matthew tells us that Jesus, who through Joseph’s acknowledgment is the descendant of the royal Davidic line, has been begotten in the womb of a virgin through God's holy spirit, he sees a very tight connection between Davidic and divine sonship. For Matthew it is a literal fulfillment of the promise of God to David through Nathan [2 Sam. 7:12, 14]: ‘I shall raise up your son after you...I shall be his father, and he will be my son’ [cp. Acts 13:33 which likewise tells of Jesus’ beginning, and v. 34, not v. 33, refers to the resurrection: raise from the dead] (p. 135, 137).

“The fact that Matthew can speak of Jesus as begotten (passive of gennao) in 1:16, 20, 28 suggests that for him the conception through the agency of the Holy Spirit is the becoming of God’s son.

“Conception christology and pre-existence christology were two different answers to adoptionism. In the former, God’s creative action in the conception of Jesus (attested negatively by the absence of human fatherhood) begets Jesus as God’s son. Clearly here divine sonship is not adoptive sonship, but there is no suggestion of an incarnation by which a figure who was previously with God takes on flesh. Incarnational thought is indicative of pre-existence christology...For pre-existence christology the conception of Jesus is the beginning of an earthly career, but not the begetting of God’s son...I stress this difference between conception christology and pre-existence christology, because Christian theology soon harmonized the two ideas, so that the pre-existent Word of God was soon described as taking flesh in the womb of the virgin Mary. The virginal conception was no longer seen as the begetting of God’s son [i.e. Scripture was refused and contradicted!] but as the incarnation of God’s Son, and that became orthodox Christian doctrine...

Matthew sees “a sonship not through sexual relations with Joseph...The two parents have a harmonious role in making Jesus who he is. Although they do not join physically in the begetting...Mary is the one through whom he is begotten as Son of God” (p. 141-142, Matt. 1:20, cp Thayer’s Lexicon, “begotten in her”).

Finally, note the prediction of the supernatural begetting, coming into existence, of the Son from the LXX and some Hebrew manuscripts, often quoted in the New Testament Greek.

Psalm 110:3: “With thee is dominion in the day of thy power, in the splendors of thy saints: I have begotten thee from the womb before the morning.”

Isaiah 9:6: “Unto us a child has been begotten” — the aorist tense of the same Greek word as found in Matthew 1:20, “begotten in her” and then 1 John 5:18 (not KJV): “the one who was begotten” (Jesus) preserves the Christians. The Father is “the one who begat” in 1 John 5:1. All this is clear and simple. Mary had a baby supernaturally.

Has the monarchy of Israel ended?
Not according to Isaiah 9:6-7
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A Plea for a Return to Biblical Repentance

Is Forgiveness Unconditional?

by Barbara Buzzard

This is a surprisingly controversial subject. It appears that society has changed the ground rules and the requirements from what they used to be, when an offense occurs. No longer is the biblical model an absolute for rebuilding a fractured relationship. Our standards for forgiveness have so broadened that even in some “Christian” counseling repentance is no longer required. That seems to defy the biblical model as seen in 2 Chronicles 7:14: “If my people…will humble themselves and pray…and seek…and turn…then I will hear…and forgive.” And Jeremiah 9:5b: “They commit iniquity and are too weary to repent” (NRSV). Isaiah 1:27: “Zion will be redeemed by justice and those in her who repent by righteousness.” God requires a contrite heart. It is the only way He can work with us. There is no substitution. Beware substitutions for a broken heart. Biblically, repentance seems to be required and that is what is at the heart of this great divide, as society and even counselors advise, “Just move on.”

Cheap Forgiveness?

“God has an open door policy, but the door we go through is marked ‘Repentance.’”1 Repentance is the price of entry. As in Matthew 3:8 we are to bring forth fruit in keeping with or worthy of repentance. However, many authors and counselors disagree. They maintain that one must forgive no matter what, and they argue that this is the Christian way. Those on the other side regard this as cheap forgiveness and stress that it bypasses the injury, as well as hampering a possibility of developing a healthy relationship. They feel that the absence of moral disgust which should precede repentance is dangerous. They see forgiveness as being accomplished when the victim no longer has to hold the wrongdoer responsible for the injustice; the wrongdoer holds himself responsible. There is much at stake here — the future relationship.

Forgiveness does not equal reconciliation. Nor does it necessarily restore a relationship. Without remorse, we don’t even have the assurance of a temporary cease-fire. For example, if the offense is not repented of, how can the victim know that it will not be repeated again and again? (Obviously, there are no guarantees and we all fail, but what is in question here is whether the heart of the violator is changed. Is it safe to reinstate a good relationship if the offender has not changed radically?) Trust must be rebuilt and it is a spirit of remorse that can do that. When the offender demonstrates that he understands and is disturbed by the harm he has caused; when he works to make repairs, it is then that one might find it safe to invite him back into one’s life.

More popular is a “not too much required” approach, with “move on” advice, a kind of quick “one size fits all” forgive and forget for all-comers. The other side says this “forgive and forget, get on with your life” philosophy is an insult, revealing a moral shakiness that is not what Scripture teaches.

No Substitutions Allowed

There is a constant theme of repentance in the Scriptures. Repentance is mentioned ninety times in the Jerusalem Bible. God invites, even begs His people to repent. He specifically gives us time to repent: “Do you not realize that God’s kindness is meant to lead you to repentance? But by your hard and intemperent heart you are storing up wrath” (Rom. 2:4-5). And Jeremiah 3:13a employs the same theme: “Only acknowledge your guilt.” God gives us opportunity to humble ourselves. It is honesty of character that He is after. The true test of an individual is admitting and fixing his mistakes. Psalm 7:12 warns that if we do not repent, God will sharpen His sword, and Proverbs 28:13 compares those who cover their sins with those who confess them. The latter will be the ones who receive mercy.

Revelation 3:19 exhorts us to be diligent and repent. Repentance will be redeeming (Isa. 1:27). “Sorrow without repentance is the kind that results in death” (2 Cor. 7:10b). “People who cover over their sins will not prosper. But if they confess and forsake them, they will receive mercy” (Prov. 28:13). Is it possible that society has substituted defiance for accountability and justification for penitence?

Genuine Forgiveness Requires a Transfer of Vigilance

“After a traumatic injury, you, the hurt party, are likely to become hyper-vigilant, patrolling the border between you and the offender, making sure you’ll never be violated or fooled again. You may live and breathe the injury, obsessed with its grubby details. The offender in contrast may want to repress, deny, or minimize his wrongful behavior. With Genuine Forgiveness, a profound shift in preoccupation takes place. You, the offender, demonstrate that you’re fully conscious of your transgression and intend never to repeat it. You, the hurt party, become less preoccupied with the injury and begin to let it go.”2 Please note the interaction which takes place here. The offender acknowledges the full force of the violation. Genuine forgiveness requires the offender’s involvement and participation. (Obviously, there are exceptions, e.g. after the death of the offender.) However, this is exactly the opposite of what is often being advised; there seems to be an ethic in place to make both “sides” equal, i.e. there is no victim and no offender. This is, in
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my opinion, psychology gone mad, choosing not to do the honest work involved — naming wrongdoing for what it actually is.

There is an ancient Chinese proverb which says, “The beginning of wisdom is to call things by their right names.” We do have the violator and the violated. Tragically, people in our society do creepy and vicious things. Part of the work of a counselor would be to urge repentance, not to avoid the sin or to equate the two parties. Resorting to group hugs at the end of the day, failing true and honest counsel, in my opinion, is a fraud.

“To forgive sin under all circumstances, unconditionally, and to reconcile with the unrepentant offender communicates a false gospel. It is not biblical. This is not what God does, nor is it what He commands us to do. However, to be unforgiving of sins against us by others also communicates a false gospel. So what is a believer to do?”

### Face the Past for the Sake of the Future

“Genuine Forgiveness is not a pardon granted unilaterally by the hurt party. It’s a shared venture, an exchange between two people bound together by an interpersonal violation.” The author also makes the point that “Genuine Forgiveness must be earned. It comes with a price that the offender must be willing to pay. In exchange, the hurt party must allow him to settle his debt.” This simple and biblical formula is what is needed to restore trust. The “move on” approach is in stark contrast to this. It can be used as an excuse never to face the issue. We face the past for the sake of the future.

“And if you have taken a wrong turning, then to go forward does not get you any nearer. If you are on the wrong road, progress means doing an about-turn and walking back to the right road; and in that case the man who turns back soonest is the most progressive man…Going back is the quickest way on.” This is against our nature, but is both biblical and smart.

God seems always to work through process, e.g. learning, growing, maturing. He doesn’t just hand us a finished product. This process must be completed. As with medical prescriptions which emphasize “take exactly as directed,” so too, God’s process or recipe must be followed precisely; a step cannot be removed or eliminated. The Scriptures give us clear, delineated steps as to what action to take with regard to the offense of a brother. (It is interesting to note that Dr. Laura and Dr. Phil include this step of repentance as a necessity for rebuilding relationships.) They seem even to maintain a stricter code of behavior than some Christian counselors.

Is there not a possibility that we have so massaged and gentled what we don’t want to face that we have done damage to those seeking help and advice? And the process becomes ineffective, that vital ingredient of repentance being undervalued and passed over. “It seems that many today want to propose sin without consequences, morality without absolutes, forgiveness without repentance.”

“Reconciliation should not occur until there is repentance.”

“If forgiveness, fulfilled in reconciliation, is to occur, evil must repent with clarity and conviction. Does this mean that if repentance does not occur, then forgiveness cannot be offered? If forgiveness is defined as a continuing process of hungering for restoration, revoking revenge, and offering good gifts, then we are to forgive until there is reconciliation. But reconciliation should not occur until there is repentance.”

This view makes sense to me. There is a time and a place to move on, but not without this critical ingredient. Unless people speak the truth about what they have done and change their minds and their behavior, a relationship of trust is just not possible. Which is to say that forgiveness does not always restore trust. Nor will forgiveness necessarily bring reconciliation. Repentance is the key here. It can bring a regenerative power to the relationship. It is what God wants most from us. The negative side is this: “If one does not repent, God will sharpen His sword” (Ps. 7:12).

Consider this scenario: two young boys are fighting. One purposely lashes out and kicks the other. You interrupt the fight. The offender is still angry, the other boy hurt and crying. What would you require before you let them play together again? If you insisted on forgiveness without remorse, why would the boy who has been kicked want to invite the other boy back into his life? Perhaps too few people ask themselves this question: why would X (who I have grievously offended) want to have me back in his life?

The message of repentance was both the first message after Jesus’ baptism (Mark 1:15) and the last message to the church (Rev. 3:19), both messages of extreme importance. Repentance was the urgent message of all the prophets. Paul recognizes its significance: “Now I rejoice, not because you were grieved, but because your grief led to repentance” (2 Cor. 7:9). Repentance pleases God, but it heals us. It is restorative and nutritious to our very souls. We don’t do God or the world much good without a broken heart, one of the after-effects of true
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sorrow. It is a gift we can offer to God and He readily accepts it as a hugely valuable token. “I reprove and discipline those whom I love. Be earnest, therefore, and repent” (Rev. 3:19). We deceive ourselves if we think there is any other way.

No Papering over the Offense

As seen in People of the Lie, a healthy sense of self-loathing is a good thing after an action which has caused hurt and pain. It can move a person to action, to a place of contrite humility. A very stern warning is given in Acts. 28:27 with regard to the hardening of one’s heart which prevents one from repenting and being healed. In today’s world this hardening of the heart happens when we justify and rationalize our actions. We deceive ourselves into thinking we behaved properly when, in fact, we have violated the human condition. The essence of repentance is just to say and be sorry — authentic, genuine words of sorrow may have a hugely healing effect. As everyone will have to bow the knee, so too everyone will have to say sorry, to acknowledge guilt. No papering over the offense, no excuses and no minimizing of damage. In speaking of the Old Testament concept of restitution which accompanied some offenses: “Restitution can also instill true moral guilt in a person, which can lead to genuine repentance and a decision by the perpetrator to make different choices leading to a better life.”

Life Lessons

“In truth, the mechanics of good apologies aren’t difficult to understand. A bad apology is cagey and ungenerous, an attempt to avoid taking full responsibility. Good apologies are about stepping up. The 12th-century sage Maimonides said that true repentance requires humility, remorse, forbearance, and reparation. Not much has changed since then. Basically, you must take ownership of the offense, even if it makes you uncomfortable. Name what you did, even if it makes you squirm... Acknowledge the impact of what you did. ...make reparations... If you said something bone-headed, educate yourself about why your remark was offensive. And for heaven’s sake, never present yourself as the aggrieved party. You are not the hero of this story. That’s why you have to say, ’I’m sorry that I did something hurtful,’ not ’Sorry if you were hurt.’ A good apology means laying yourself bare. It means putting yourself in the other person’s position, giving [him] her what [he] she wants and needs. In short, it’s not about you.”

repenting of them turns us into victims rather than offenders and that is delusional thinking.

How are we to obey the command in Luke 3:8 and Acts 26:20 to show/bring forth fruits worthy of repentance without first recognizing the need for this first and most basic requirement? These scriptures seem to say that true repentance is evident and visible, as the person displays a changed heart and an obvious desire to make things right. We must not lose sight of this in our rapidly changing world. We have been given guidelines: there will be fruit — fruit that is consistent with repentance.

“Therefore produce fruit that proves your repentance” (NET Bible).

“One of two things precedes forgiveness: the transgressor’s expression of remorse or the victim’s embrace of life after damage.”

Hax and others maintain that there are two paths after a serious transgression occurs; either the transgressor is seriously remorseful (moral disgust at his own actions), or absence of remorse and justification or playing the victim. Note that in the first scenario, the one damaged is invited to interact by virtue of the repentance of the other. Lives can be rebuilt and trust regained. In the second case the victim has no choice except to embrace life after damage. It is imperative that growth happens or this injury will steal joy, rule the spirit, and possibly devastate the future. God wastes nothing, not even pain, and His brilliant principle of bringing good out of evil will defeat an ugly situation.

Shabby Chic?

There is something beautiful about making amends. One cannot do it alone, and one does not desire justice in order to place blame on others but so that one can make amends. As stated earlier, it is an exchange between two people bound together by a violation. Without repentance, one holds up the reconciliation process; no resolution, no peace. Shabby chic is very popular in decorating, but in relationships and before God, I think not.

The Amish practice forgiveness by welcoming back a straying member, but always after confession. And the Jewish Day of Atonement is central to confession and repentance. Forgiveness implies the other party has already confessed to a sin. Or this is what used to be the case. It is being altered and redefined. But is there any refuge or escape from confession? Would the story of the prodigal son be a part of Scripture had he not repented? (Note that the father did not even allow the son to finish his repentance before he forgave him, so eager he was to forgive. And so should we be eager to forgive and praying constantly toward that end.) The very compassion and mercy which have been extended to us — we must extend to others.
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We hear much about closure and how important it is. It is repentance which can bring closure. The word repentance actually means change and it is knowledge of that change of heart which allows friendship to be rekindled. A wife would be considered foolish if she were to forgive her husband of adultery while he was still engaging in it. It is only after the changing of his ways and the seeking of forgiveness that it can even be considered. Until there is repentance, the offense is ongoing.

We are all aware of heroic cases of forgiveness, when, for example, a little child has been murdered and the parent says that he forgives the murderer. It is not my intent to take anything away from these astonishing acts when, for example, a little child has been murdered and the parent says that he forgives the murderer. It is not my intent to take anything away from these astonishing acts in any way. However, that is not the focus of this inquiry. There are amazing resources available to help one with forgiveness: research councils, organizations devoted to help, a myriad of books and counseling materials. Forgiveness is a blessed action, an awesome and beautiful thing. We are allowed no revenge, no grudges, no bitterness. We shouldn’t even keep a record of the wrongs we suffered. We are not to hold on to hurts and wrongs. In fact, to be governed by the offenses done to one can be the very bait of Satan. I can think of no example, however, when a parent would sit down with the one who murdered their child if the murderer still harbored that intention in his heart.

There are two exceptions in Scripture where repentance is not specifically mentioned. Luke 23:34: “Father, forgive them for they do not know what they are doing.” And in Acts 7:60 Stephen asks that those stoning him be forgiven. Neither Jesus nor Stephen were overriding God’s directive to repent and the ones in these passages will have to repent as well. To say that those in question need not repent is unthinkable according to the scriptural prerequisites.

**Repentance is Clean-up**

We are given the brilliant formula for achieving forgiveness in Matthew 6:12: “Forgive us our sins, just as we have forgiven those who have sinned against us.” And we also know that there is no end to our forgiving when our brother repents with the illustration of the seventy times seven model (Luke 17:4; Matt. 18:21). We know that it was wicked of the servant in Matthew 18:28-33 not to forgive when he was asked. *But Biblically forgiveness always implies repentance.* “If another believer sins, rebuke him; then if he repents, forgive him” (Luke 17:3-4). To think that one is being generous or loving by ignoring repentance would be like building on top of the devastation after a tornado, without clean-up. Repentance is clean-up.

As in nature, soil must be broken before it can produce a crop; grapes must be crushed before they can produce wine; clouds must burst before rain can come — so there are conditions which must be met when harm has been done. We must allow the LORD to define those terms.

One of the most effective prayers we can pray is to ask our Father to show us our sins, in order that we might repent of them. As with beautiful music, our ears require it to end on the right note; so too with conflict and peace. So too, our God has a requirement: “If I had not confessed the sin in my heart, my LORD would not have listened” (Ps. 66:18).

When we follow the Biblical model and petition the throne room of heaven, we are assured of forgiveness. How totally remarkable that God forgives, and even forgets our sins, that what He remembers is the blood of His Son which enabled us to be forgiven. May our walk honor the One who made this possible and the Son who sacrificed his life so that we could be forgiven.

### Trip to University of Southern Indiana

It was a delight to visit again a university where my colleague and fellow believer Dr. Brian Atra has worked for many years as professor of world religions and ethics. A university enjoys the privilege of allowing for free dialogue, questions and discussion of any and every aspect of faith. Some hundred students from various countries and religious backgrounds engaged my thoughts on non-violence and then on the nature of Christian faith. I was able to hand out some copies of my translation of the NT, *The One God, the Father, One Man Messiah Translation,* with commentary, available at Amazon.com and also Atlanta Bible College, 800-347-4261.

### Comments

“I have greatly benefited from the wealth of information available on your site. Over the course of the last several months, I have come to see the truth of monotheism as it is taught in the Scriptures and believed by the Church of God (Abrahamic Faith), Christadelphians, and some others. In addition, I have also come to see the centrality of the Kingdom of God in the Gospel. Having been brought up Primitive Baptist, I formerly believed in the Trinity and associated the Kingdom of God almost exclusively with the Church.” — North Carolina
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