

DOWNLOAD "In Addition" MP3
(or Right-Click links to "Save As")



the beauty of YHVH

the "What Trinity?" series

In Addition

by haRold Smith

a citizen of the Commonwealth (Ephesians 2:19)

*"The revelation of Yeshua haMashiach, which **YHVH** gave Him (Yeshua) to show to His servants the things that must soon take place. He made it known by sending His angel to His servant John, who bore witness to the Word of YHVH AND TO (IN ADDITION) the testimony of Yeshua haMashiach, even to all that he saw. Blessed is the one who reads aloud the words of this prophecy, and blessed are those who hear, and who keep what is written in it, **FOR THE TIME IS NEAR.***

*"John, to the seven churches that are in Asia: Grace to you and peace from Him (YHVH) Who is and Who was and Who is to come, and from the seven spirits who are before His (YHVH's) throne, **AND FROM (IN ADDITION)** Yeshua haMashiach the faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead, the ruler of kings on earth.*

*"To Him (Yeshua) who loves us and has freed us from our sins by His Blood and made us a Kingdom, priests **TO HIS** (YESHUA'S) GOD AND FATHER, to Him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen." Revelation 1:1-6*

When we look at scripture from a Western, non-Hebraic mindset, we often fail to see the real meaning contained in the words written. Words mean things. Consequently, since we have already made up our mind as to what they mean based on observing them from a platform other than from which they were written - we come away with a distorted view of this Hebrew world they speak of. We must constantly keep in mind that all the words of the entire Book were written by Hebrews from a Hebrew mindset that was influenced out of a Hebrew culture that was presented primarily to a Hebrew audience who understood the nuances of the Hebrew language. To properly understand what these words mean necessitates viewing them from the Hebrew perspective they were written in - not our current English culture. This is precisely the attitude the previous article, [Agreement](#), addressed (**click on highlighted words to view content**). After a while, because we have so incessantly invested ourselves into a particular premise of doctrine, our search begins to take on the nature of finding scripture that will support what we have already come to believe instead of questioning the source of everything every day. So, the real question becomes - how have so many gotten it so wrong for so long? The answer lies in not questioning the source of the tradition handed down to us - the only thing Yeshua ever pointed to that would make the word of YHVH null and void, of none effect (**Mark 7:1-13**, see what it means to have [Salvation and Eternal Life](#)).

For instance, are you aware that the English translated phrase **"I AM that I AM"** (traditionally lauded as the Name of the Hebrew God, **YaHoVeH**) does not appear anywhere in the Hebrew text. This is an English equivalent of a Greek phrase appearing in the Greek translation of the Original Books (called the Septuagint) that was carried over into the Greek translations of the Messianic Writings (renamed the New Testament) to support a Greek concept of a **triune godhead** every time the Hebrew Messiah utters the words "I am" - but, that concept does not have its origin in Hebrew thought. The Greeks served many gods, so it is natural to see that ideology reflected in their translations of these Hebrew words that speak of only One God of Truth. The Greek language is linear in conceptualization, meaning the thought process travels a straight line logic; whereas Hebrew is more "fluid", if you will. This is why it benefits us to view scripture from the Hebrew mindset these authors wrote from which is very different from the Greek approach our English language is based upon (see [My Big Fat Greek Mindset, Part 1](#) and [Part 2](#)). The literal Hebrew of **Exodus 3:14** appearing in the [Hebrew Interlinear Literal Translation](#) reads **"I shall become who I am becoming"** and is found throughout the *Tanakh* (renamed the Old Testament) to describe the continuity of YHVH's existence in the passage of firstborn status through one generation of Hebrew to the next. Thus, Yeshua was validating His claim in **John 8:58** of being the fulfillment of the promised seed of the firstborn **Kinsman Redeemer** to the house of Israel -

the Son of YHVH, the prophesied Messiah. Since every Hebrew had a visible experience of firstborn status living within their immediate family and what came with that status, every Hebrew understood the significance of the firstborn status of the coming Messiah of YHVH to the family of Israel as well. This is what incensed the religious leaders of Yeshua's day and those who embraced their doctrines. As Hebrews, they understood the significance of Yeshua's claim to be the fulfillment of the **"One Becoming"** - not that He was YHVH. Christianity has taught that the reason Yeshua was put to death was because He claimed to BE YHVH. However, **scripture** clearly indicates the charge brought against Him was that He claimed to be the SON of YHVH - the fulfillment of the **"One Becoming"** (see [Who's Your Daddy?](#)). Consider another example of distortion:

***"For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one."* 1John 5:7 KJV**

You might have wanted a nice and simple, uplifting little refresher course today - but this lesson is important because it affects our understanding of what happens with biblical translations and, consequently, how we perceive Truth. This sentence in 1John 5:7 is found in the King James Version of the Bible, the standard for the religion "Christianity" for nearly 400 years and one of the key phrases in support of "the trinity" doctrine. Unfortunately, however, these words are not what John wrote. If you will notice, in most translations, these words are either in *italics* or they do not appear at all - **which means they can not be found in the earliest manuscripts** (click [here for an example](#)). This sentence first appeared in the text sometime during the middle of the 3rd century because it was added to John's words by Priscillian, a Spanish monk charged with the translation. By the 5th century, it was incorporated into a marginal note in the Old Latin (pre-Vulgate) translation and was eventually incorporated into the actual Latin Vulgate about 800 CE. There it stayed. Erasmus refused to incorporate it into his Greek translation in 1516 because he claimed (and rightly so) that it was not in the oldest manuscripts, but by 1522 he succumbed to ecclesiastical pressure and incorporated this sentence into his new edition of the Greek New Testament. This added text then became part of Luther's translation into German and then part of Tyndale's translation into English. Subsequently, it appeared in the English King James Authorized Version and made its way into theological history. Now that you know how this verse got into scripture, its theological authority (at the very least) becomes suspect. With this little history lesson in mind, you might want to ask yourself how this verse came to be used to support a "trinitarian" doctrine. Could it be because some men wanted to be assured of the promotion of a certain agenda? It should also make you wonder about the usual rebuttal that "God superintended" the words in our Bible - doesn't it? (see [Who Is The Word?](#)).



the Hebrew, apostle Yochanan (John)

verse got into scripture, its theological authority (at the very least) becomes suspect. With this little history lesson in mind, you might want to ask yourself how this verse came to be used to support a "trinitarian" doctrine. Could it be because some men wanted to be assured of the promotion of a certain agenda? It should also make you wonder about the usual rebuttal that "God superintended" the words in our Bible - doesn't it? (see [Who Is The Word?](#)).

In spite of how well conceived men can cobble scripture together to package theological assumptions like **the rapture** and **pre-destination** - these concepts, including that of "the trinity", are just not found in the whole of scripture. **Isaiah 43:11**, **Isaiah 45:21** and **Hosea 13:4** all speak to this issue of there being a multiple godhead as plainly as can be said. Even *Sha'ul* (the Hebrew apostle Paul) agrees in **1Corinthians 8:6** and **1Corinthians 15:27**. Briefly put, YHVH is the Source and Object of all; Yeshua is the channel or instrumentation of all that YHVH is - thus it is always found in scripture. It is never said we come out of Yeshua, but only out of YHVH. Indeed, Yeshua asserts that He Himself came out of YHVH in **John 8:42**. *Sha'ul* proclaims all is out of YHVH in **Romans 11:30-36**. Constantly, we are told to worship YHVH and keep the testimony of Yeshua (i.e., **Revelation 19:10b** and the first verses opening this article above). Every single letter of the "New" Testament starting with the Book of Acts begins with some sort of salutation that makes a clear distinction between "YHVH, the Father, AND His Son, Yeshua." These are but a few out of many, many instances of scripture that speak contrarily to the concept of "the trinity".

Why does it make a difference? To approach scripture with a mind already made up as to how it reads causes everything read after to be colored by that same filter of preconception ([Ezekiel 14:1-5](#), see [Pure or Perverse](#)). But, that is not why these words were given. Scriptures were given so that we might validate YHVH, the Source of Life, in the Truth of Who He says He Is - not who we want Him to be. Consequently, it is important we look at all of what the Father has given us to validate Who He says He Is. The ringing insistence of the scriptures that there is only one God has been subtly undermined by the prevailing teaching concerning a "triune deity". This is a Greek concept superimposed onto Hebrew scripture. In the famous passage from [Isaiah 9:6](#), the prophet says YHVH will have a son - not another god and YHVH is not described as birthing Himself (see [Who's Word Is It?](#)).

The religion Christianity has elevated a Greek/Latin "[Jesus](#)" to a place and position equal to or, most often, [replacing](#) the One True *Elohiem* (God) of Israel and uses the words of the apostle *Sha'ul* as vindication for doing such. Yet, the words of this apostle plainly speak otherwise throughout his writings if we simply look at what he is saying without this filter of preconception. But, what is most telling about what this Hebrew apostle believes is in the words of his oratories given before Gentiles in [Acts 24:14](#), and, most notably, in [Acts 17:22-34](#). The definition of a Gentile is someone who "worships idols" - worshipping someone or something other than the Hebrew YHVH. From the perspective of this Hebrew Book (what most call "the bible") in which every word written therein was penned by Hebrews, there are only two classifications of people - Hebrews or "others". There were no "Christians" around when these letters were written. These "others" are called [Gentiles](#).



the Hebrew, apostle Sha'ul (Paul)

In reading the entire chapter of [Acts 17](#), one cannot help but notice that the only place *Sha'ul* speaks about Yeshua haMashiach (the promised Messiah of Israel - not the Greek "Christ") is in the synagogues to Hebrew audiences - those faithful to keep YHVH's Words who understood the role of this prophesied [Kinsman Redeemer](#) to the nation of Israel, the family of YHVH. Who does *Sha'ul* speak about when addressing Gentile members of the [Areopagus of Athens](#) - Yeshua? No - he speaks of the One True Holy Elohiem of Israel Who "created the world and everything in it." NOT ONCE does he mention Yeshua to these Gentiles. NOT ONCE does he proclaim or insinuate Yeshua to be that God - and, yet, at the end of the chapter we are told that "...some men joined him and believed..." Who did they believe in? It could not have been Yeshua because He was not even mentioned. "Christianity" would tell us that *Sha'ul* was speaking of Yeshua because of the doctrine of a "triune godhead" which tells us, that since Yeshua IS the Father, the words "God" and "Jesus" now become interchangeable. But that would be an assumption - a rationale overlaid upon these words from a perspective we have already concluded in our minds to be appropriate. But, if we simply read these words at face value, just for what they say - they plainly speak otherwise.

So, the question has to be asked - if *Sha'ul* was such an adherent to establishing this new religion (as "Christianity" says he is); then, why did he not mention Yeshua to these folks of the Areopagus? It was because this Hebrew, this Rabbi of the Torah, understood that to come to faith first meant to conform their behavior to the Words of YaHoVeH, the Only One True God of Israel

which would allow them to become a member of the family of YHVH - Israel. Once within the confines of the family, the discussion then turns to the prominent role of Yeshua as the firstborn Kinsman Redeemer - which the faithful to YHVH in the synagogues where *Sha'ul* presented Yeshua as that Messiah understood what he was saying. Anyone can come into the family and partake of the freedom from darkness that comes from abiding in the Presence of Light, YHVH, Who is the Source of Life - as long as they adhere to the standards of the family set by the Father and upheld by the words and actions of the firstborn Son. The sacrifice of the Kinsman Redeemer is what [restored the Kingdom](#) of YHVH to the rightful heirs - the family of Abraham, Isaac

and Jacob (who was renamed *Israel* in [Genesis 32:28](#)). These words and actions of *Sha'ul* did not in any way diminish or tarnish what the firstborn Son accomplished by His sacrifice and the Prominence due Him for that sacrifice - it just puts it into its proper Hebrew contextual perspective ([1Corinthians 15:3-4](#), see [the Fulfillment](#)).

When we inquire into the relation of the three members of the "trinity" to one another, we are met by meaningless and incomprehensible (as well as unscriptural) *phrases* - just as most people, while acknowledging the actual word "trinity" is not found anywhere in scripture, will say the "concept" is still there. Well, just looking at ALL the words contained in ALL these Hebrew Books just for what they say and promote, balanced against one another - even the *concept* is not found in scripture. Hear this - in order to embrace the concept of the trinity, one has to *negate* all the scriptures quoted above - plus many, many more. They are negated either by taking them out of context, re-defining them, explaining them away as dispensational or just flat out ignoring them. The scriptures are written that we should know, first the Father AND THEN, in addition, His Son and it is of utmost importance IF we are to know them IN TRUTH that we give to each the place assigned to them in scripture. We can believe whatever we want to believe, but if what we believe does not align with scripture - then, it becomes disingenuous to say we believe in the words of the bible.

You are a smart person. Ask yourself, if the Father's intent is for us to *really* come to know Him in Truth, and the scriptures were given to help us accomplish that - then *why* does this word "Trinity" not appear in any manuscript of scripture and why is the concept itself not to be found historically any further back than 300 years after the Resurrection (even then only emerging within the nefariousness that was the origin of the Constantinian Roman Catholic Church)? Why is it that we can be so quick to invalidate a religion like Islam because its roots are bred in ignorance of the One True God of *Israel*, but cannot recognize that same breeding took place with the religion "Christianity" parked on our own doorstep? Why is the name Holy Spirit only capitalized beginning with the Latin Vulgate, the Catholic bible? The Hebrew is *ruach hakodesh*, found throughout the Original Books to mean "the holiness of spirit". This Hebrew phrase *ruach ha kodesh* (reading right to left in Hebrew) has been used inadvertently as a substitute for the English "Holy Spirit" appearing in their bibles. This is incorrect as there is no capitalization in Hebrew; thus, there is no personification, no third person "**Holy Spirit**". What is the holiness of spirit? Holiness is the Nature abiding in Spirit, Who is YHVH. The holiness of spirit is something that is *cultivated* within an individual by that individual. The term "Holy Spirit" is a convoluted translation of the Hebrew perspective of there being only **One Spirit** spoken of throughout scripture. Yeshua said there is but one holy, **YaHoVeH** - not some other "person". If you do not believe the religion Christianity has all of its roots and tentacles embedded in these doctrines of Catholicism - do the research. It is a fascinating history lesson.

There is the Father and then there is the Son. Yeshua did not raise Himself from the grave - that was His Father's doing.

*"But **YaHoVeH** has raised Him up and freed Him from the suffering of death; it was impossible that death could keep its hold on Him."*
Acts 2:24

the What Trinity? Series

Part One, the Godhead

Part Two, Agreement

Part Three, In Addition

Part Four, One Spirit...

Part Five, ...One Name



???Questions???

Please feel free to email me at harold@hethathasanear.com. While not claiming to have all the answers, it would be an honor to partake with you of what Spirit is uncovering.

[CLICK HERE TO RETURN TO HOME PAGE](#)

[Download the Scriptural Salvation ebook.pdf](#)