

The Twofoldness of Divine Truth

For many years we have presented and upheld, as foundational to the theological enterprise, the twofoldness of divine truth—the essential biblical principle that the great truths in the Scriptures are respectively of two aspects. These aspects, or sides, although they might appear to be inconsistent, are by no means contradictory; rather, they are complementary. Recently, strident critics of our work, among them a religionist and philosophical apologist highly regarded in certain fundamentalist circles, have raised objections and posed questions concerning our testimony of the twofoldness of the divine truth in the Word of God. Not all the objections and questions are reasonable, for some spring from a serious lack of understanding, and others, from speculative predilections that are contrary to the emphasis of the New Testament revelation. Nevertheless, it is fitting, and perhaps timely, for the benefit of interested, objective readers and even of those influenced by biased critics, to restate and reaffirm our understanding of and commitment to the principle of the twofoldness of divine truth.

Set Forth by Robert Govett

Contrary to the suppositions of some, the principle of the twofoldness of divine truth did not originate with either Watchman Nee or Witness Lee, and thus this principle cannot accurately be called “Lee’s mysterious doctrine of the ‘Twofoldness of Truth.’” For our understanding of the twofoldness of divine truth, we are indebted to Robert Govett, a meticulous and perceptive student of the Word of God, and to his essay that bears this title, and several extracts and examples will be given both to recognize Govett’s contribution and to explain the meaning and significance of this precious principle in the Word of God.

“The oneness and harmony of Divine Truth as contained in the Scripture,” Govett observes, “is a pleasing and profitable subject of contemplation” (3). He then goes on to say, “Yet it must not be forgotten or denied, that there are continually exhibited within its pages, in bold relief, truths seemingly opposed to each other” (3). Here with the words *truths seemingly opposed to each other* Govett introduces the twofoldness of truth, and then he identifies his purpose: “To trace out some of these, and set them before the reader, with the ground on which they are to be received, is the main object of the present

tract” (3). *Some of these* include the role of God and human beings in the change of a person from enmity against God to love for Him, the extent of the redemption procured by the death of the Lord Jesus, perseverance and justification, the nature of God as uniquely one yet triune, the justice and mercy of God, the divine and human natures of Christ, the God-ordained way of worship, how the church is to be built up, the various dispensations of God, and salvation by grace alone and reward according to works.¹ Regarding such instances of the twofoldness of truth and pointing out that in nature God “is continually acting with two seemingly-opposed principles,” Govett says,

The twofoldness of truth as offered to our view in Holy Writ, is one strong argument of its not being the work of man. It is the glory of man’s intellect to produce *oneness*. His aim is to trace different results to one principle, to clear it of ambiguities, to show how, through varied appearances, one law holds. Anything that stands in the way of the completeness of this, he eludes or denies. (3)²

Understanding this tendency of the unrenewed human mind, Govett argues against the attitude that we are free to choose between seemingly opposing truths and that, if we are unable to reconcile these truths in the doctrinal system of our preference, we have the liberty to embrace the one and discard the other. “This is sheer unbelief,” he declares. “The same God who spake the one, spake also the other. Do you ask then—‘Which you are to believe?’ *Which? Both!*” (6). Next, addressing the impulse of fallen persons to harmonize conflicting truths, Govett asserts, “It is not necessary to reconcile them, before we are bound to receive and act upon the two. It is enough, that the Word of God distinctly affirms them both” (6). Insisting that twofold truths are not contradictory, he goes on to say, “Nay, that cannot be; for they are both parts of the Word of God; and contradictions cannot both be true. Both, then, are to be received” (8). In this way God tries His people. “Will they trust Him, when He affirms that view of truth which runs counter to their temperaments and intellectual bias? or will they trample on one of His sayings, in the zeal for the other?” (11).³

Govett specifically applies the principle of the twofoldness of divine truth to the nature of God:

The same twofoldness of truth appears in the Scripture statements concerning the NATURE OF GOD. It affirms His unity...But the Scripture as plainly affirms the distinction of persons in the Godhead. 'Unity in plurality and plurality in unity' is the great assertion here. This master-truth, which takes its rise in the nature of the Godhead, flows out into all His works. (12)

We should note with care Govett's statement that this "master-truth...takes its rise in the nature of the Godhead." In other words, God's revelation of Himself in the Scriptures, being twofold, is an expression of the nature of God.⁴ The two aspects of God's intrinsic, eternal, immutable being—that He is three being one and one being three—are testified by the twofoldness of the truth of His revelation in the Scriptures. "Thus the Scripture is twofold in character, like the God who gave it" (20). The challenges to the human intellect and fleshly wisdom implied in the twofoldness of divine truth are intentional.

From this twofoldness of truth DESIGNED difficulties arise. Thus does God try mankind. Thus does He try His people. Will they receive both His statements on His simple assertion? Most will not. They are one-sided. They will force everything to unity...They ignore all evidence that tells against their views. (21)

Govett concludes with the illustration of a house that can be viewed from more than one perspective:

The Scripture is a house with more than one front. He who will always approach it by the eastern path, may assert that its colour is *black*. He who never will enter it by any but the western road, may affirm, with equal resoluteness and with equal truth, that its colour is *white*. But he who will tread both paths, and go round the house, viewing it in its every aspect, may see how the black wall and the white, the front, the back, and the gables, make up one consolidated edifice, deep rooted in the nature both of God and man. He who will receive but half the truth, is ever liable to revulsions: and these are the more vehement, the more unmingled and one-sided they are. (24)

Some of the Twofold Divine Truths in the Word of God

As illustrations of the principle of the twofoldness of divine truth enunciated by Govett, let us identify, with utmost brevity, some of the numerous twofold divine truths in the Scriptures:

Salvation is absolutely by grace through faith, but the reward of the coming kingdom is according to works. The believers' eternal salvation is absolutely by grace through faith, not by the works of the law, "because out of the works of law no flesh will be justified" (Gal. 2:16). Paul's word on this matter is emphatic: "For by grace you have been saved through faith, and this not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works that no one should boast" (Eph. 2:8-9). This is echoed in 2 Timothy 1:9 and Titus 3:5. In the former reference Paul says that God "has saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works but according to His own purpose and grace." This is reinforced by his declaration in Titus 3:5: "Not out of works in righteousness which we did but according to His mercy He saved us." This great truth is balanced by the truth that when believers appear before the Lord at the judgment seat, they will give an account

of their works and then receive a reward (either positive or negative) based upon their life in the Lord and their service to Him. "For the Son of Man is to come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and then He will repay each man according to His doings" (Matt. 16:27). The Lord Jesus emphasized this in one of His last utterances recorded in

the Scriptures: "Behold, I come quickly, and My reward is with Me to render to each one as his work is" (Rev. 22:12). This reward is specifically related to reigning with Christ in the coming millennial kingdom (2:26-27).

God's complete salvation is both objective according to the righteousness of God and subjective in the life of God. These two aspects are portrayed by the best robe and the fattened calf in Luke 15. The best robe, signifying Christ as our righteousness covering us in the presence of God for our justification, is objective; the fattened calf, signifying Christ processed to be our life supply for our nourishment and growth in the divine life, is subjective. Hence, God's complete salvation is both objective and subjective. Paul addresses both in Romans 5:10: "For if we, being enemies, were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more we will be saved in His life, having been reconciled." On the one hand, believers in Christ have been saved eternally according to God's righteousness objectively; they have been justified by faith and reconciled to God through the death of Christ. On the other hand, there is "much more," and this is the need of being saved in Christ's life. This salvation in life, as a careful study of the book of Romans discloses, includes sanctification, renewing, transformation, conformation, and glorification, all of which are predicated

The two aspects of God's intrinsic, eternal, immutable being—that He is three being one and one being three—are testified by the twofoldness of the truth of His revelation in the Scriptures.

upon subjective experiences of Christ, who is our life (Col. 3:4). In keeping with the principle of the twofoldness of the divine truth, God's complete salvation is both objective and subjective, both an accomplished fact and an ongoing process.

Christ is both at the right hand of God in the heavens and in the believers. Romans 8:34 says, "It is Christ Jesus who died and, rather, who was raised, who is also at the right hand of God, who also intercedes for us." The statement is perspicuous, and its meaning is clear: Christ is at the right hand of God. We should be conscious of this as we read Paul's word in verse 10, where he speaks of Christ in us, a remark that is also perspicuous. According to these verses, Christ is at the right hand of God, and Christ is in the believers—a twofold truth. The same twofoldness is found in Colossians. "If therefore you were raised together with Christ, seek the things which are above, where Christ is, sitting at the right hand of God" (3:1). Where is Christ? As Paul makes clear, Christ is at the right hand of God. But there is another aspect of this truth, and it requires equal attention. "To whom God willed to make known what are the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory" (1:27). Significantly, both mentions of the locations of Christ are related to glory. In 1:27 the Christ who dwells in us is the hope of glory; in 3:4 the Christ who is at the right hand of God (and who simultaneously is our life) will be manifested in glory, and we will be manifested with Him. The same twofold truth concerning Christ is presented in Ephesians. In 1:20 we see that, through the operation of the surpassing greatness of God's power, Christ has been seated "at His right hand in the heavenlies," yet in 3:17 Christ is making His home in our hearts through faith. Therefore, He is both at the right hand of God and in us who have believed into Him.

Christ is the only begotten Son in the Godhead and the firstborn Son among His many brothers. In the unique, eternal, unchanging Godhead, Christ is the only begotten Son, and several portions of the New Testament testify concerning this. John 1:14 speaks of Him as "the only Begotten from the Father." Verse 18 goes on to say, "No one has ever seen God; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He has declared Him." Motivated by vast, immeasurable love, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that everyone who believes into Him would not perish, but would have eternal life" (3:16). If we would have eternal life—the indestructible life of God—we must not only believe the only begotten Son but also believe into Him. "To believe Him is to believe that He is true and real, but to believe into Him is to receive Him and be united with Him as one. The former is to acknowledge a fact objectively; the latter is to receive a life subjectively" (Recovery Version, v. 16, note 2). One who believes into Him is not

condemned. However, "he who does not believe has been condemned already, because he has not believed into the name of the only begotten Son of God" (v. 18). Although "God sent His only begotten Son into the world that we might have life and live through Him" (1 John 4:9), and although we, by God's grace, have believed into the only begotten Son and thereby have received the life of God, we need to see and realize that, in His resurrection, Christ, the only begotten Son of God in the Godhead, is now the Son of God in another sense. He is the firstborn Son of God, implying, as the Scripture elsewhere states explicitly, that He has many brothers and that God the Father has many sons (John 20:17; Heb. 2:10-12). We believe into the only begotten Son, but we are being conformed to the image of the firstborn Son. "Because those whom He foreknew, He also predestinated to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the Firstborn among many brothers" (Rom. 8:29). As the only begotten Son in the Godhead, Christ the Son of God is unique in His deity, and as such He cannot have brothers. But as the firstborn Son in resurrection, Christ, possessing both divinity and humanity for eternity, has many brothers, whom God the Father predestinated to be conformed to the image of the Firstborn for the corporate expression of God in Christ the Son with the believers as the many sons. Furthermore, when God sent His Son through incarnation, the Son was the only begotten Son, but when Christ returns with His bridal army, He will be the firstborn Son (Heb. 1:6).

The resurrected Christ has a glorified body of flesh and bones, yet He is the Lord Spirit, the life-giving Spirit. According to the Gospel of Luke, when the resurrected Christ manifested Himself to the disciples, "they were terrified and became frightened and thought they beheld a spirit" (24:37). Assuring them that He was not a ghost or a specter, the Lord Jesus said, "See My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself. Touch Me and see, for a spirit does not have flesh and bones as you behold Me having" (v. 39). This fact was further verified when "they handed Him a piece of broiled fish; and He took it and ate before them" (vv. 42-43). According to John 20:20, the resurrected Christ, in manifesting Himself to the disciples, "showed them His hands and His side" (v. 20). Eight days later He said to unbelieving Thomas, "Bring your finger here and see My hands, and bring your hand and put it into My side" (v. 27). The resurrected Christ surely has a body of flesh and bones, albeit a spiritual body—a body saturated by the spirit—and a body of glory—a body saturated with God's glory (1 Cor. 15:44; Phil. 3:21). Nevertheless, the New Testament testifies that this resurrected Christ with a spiritual body is a life-giving Spirit (1 Cor. 15:45) ready and able to be received by us, to enter into us, to dwell in us, and to live in us. As such, He is the Lord Spirit, a compound title which testifies that, as Paul asserts boldly, "The Lord is the Spirit" (2 Cor. 3:17-18).

Because the resurrected Christ has a glorified spiritual body of flesh and bones, He can be seated on the throne in the heavens, and because the resurrected Christ is the Lord Spirit, the life-giving Spirit, He can dwell in us and even be one spirit with us (1 Cor. 6:17).

Although the believers in Christ have been chosen to be holy and have been predestinated unto sonship, they nevertheless have some degree of genuine human freedom. The debate among theologians related to God's sovereignty and foreknowledge and to human responsibility and freedom is unending. There can be no doubt that God is sovereign and that His elect have been chosen to be holy and have been predestinated unto sonship (Eph. 1:4-5). As noted above, the believers have been predestinated to be conformed to the image of the firstborn Son of God; thus, no matter what the level of human responsibility and freedom may be, the God-determined outcome is certain. Nevertheless, there is biblical ground to maintain that in the Scriptures there is a harmony of divine determination and human free choice and that this harmony involves another twofold truth—the truth of God's sovereignty and of human freedom and responsibility.

Evidence of this is the record in Exodus concerning the hardening of Pharaoh's heart. The Bible clearly says that God hardened Pharaoh's heart and that Pharaoh hardened his heart himself. In Exodus 4:21 God says, "I will harden his heart"; however, 8:15 informs us that Pharaoh "hardened his heart." In 9:7 we are told that "the heart of Pharaoh was stubborn," and in verse 35, that "Pharaoh's heart hardened." On the one hand, God hardened Pharaoh's heart, an exercise of divine sovereignty and pre-determination; on the other hand, Pharaoh himself hardened his heart, an instance of human responsibility and freedom. What was exhibited in the case of Pharaoh—a harmony of predetermination and free choice in the hardening of a human heart—demonstrates the twofold truth that God is sovereign and that human beings have responsibility and at least some kind and some degree of freedom.

God in His eternal Godhead is immutable, but God in His economy has been processed and consummated. In keeping with the principle of the twofoldness of divine truth, we should believe in and testify to both the immutability of the Triune God in His eternal Godhead and the process of the Triune God in the outworking in time of the divine economy. God's immutability is related to His being eternally, and God's process is related to His becoming temporally, that is, to a series of experiences

within the limits of time which, to the human mind, involve a time sequence.⁵ For God to be immutable means that He is not capable of change or susceptible of change; He is not subject to change, for He is unchanging, invariable (James 1:17; Heb. 6:17). He is immutable in His essence (Exo. 3:14; Rev. 1:4), in His attributes (Psa. 89:14; Eph. 2:4), in His promises (Heb. 6:18), and in His purpose (Psa. 33:11; Isa. 46:9-10; Eph. 3:11). Although God is immutable, in Christ He has passed through a process, a series of progressive and interdependent steps, to become the Spirit (John 1:1, 14; 7:37-39; 20:22) so that He might dispense Himself into us. The fact that God has passed through a process for the carrying out of His economy is indicated by certain terms used in the New Testament to describe the eternal Spirit (Heb. 9:14): "the Spirit of Jesus" (Acts 16:7), "the Spirit of Christ" (Rom. 8:9), "the Spirit of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 1:19), "the Spirit of life" (Rom. 8:2), "the Spirit" (John 7:39; Gal. 3:14; Rev. 22:17), and "the seven Spirits" (1:4). Now, as the Spirit, the Triune God can reach us, enter into us, dwell in us, fill us, and overflow from within us. Nevertheless, in His eternal Godhead He remains immutable, even as He continues to flow for eternity in the New Jerusalem (22:1-2).

We should believe in and testify to both the immutability of the Triune God in His eternal Godhead and the process of the Triune God in the outworking in time of the divine economy.

Thus, in Himself God is unchanging, for His essence is immutable, His nature is unalterable, and He can never become either more or less than what He is and always will be. The complementary aspect of the twofold truth is that this eternal, immutable, unchanging Triune God has, in Christ, passed through a process in time in order to dispense Himself into His chosen and redeemed people for the accomplishment of His eternal purpose.

Avoiding Misunderstandings

To hold to the twofoldness of the divine truth in the Word of God is not to embrace contradictions. Neither is it a violation of the principle, or law, of noncontradiction to testify of the two aspects of any particular truth. According to the law of noncontradiction, two opposite statements cannot both be true at the same time and in the same sense. We would never say that it is possible for something to be true and not true at the same time and in the same way. For example, the desk in my office cannot be made of wood and not made of wood at the same time. To say that Judas hanged himself and that he did not hang himself would be a contradiction, but to assert, as the New Testament does, that Judas "went away and hanged himself" (Matt. 27:5) and that "falling headlong, he burst in the middle, and all his inward parts gushed out" (Acts 1:18) is not contradictory, for this involves two

noncontradictory ways of referring to the same death of the person. Regarding the twofoldness of divine truth, we do not say, and we would never say, that something is and that it is not in the same respect and at the same time. The Bible does not claim that the resurrected Christ has a body and that He does not have a body, or that Christ is in the believers and that He is not in the believers. However, the New Testament does reveal more than one aspect of the resurrected Christ—that He has a glorified body of flesh and bones and that He is a life-giving Spirit. In like manner, Paul declares that the resurrected Christ is both at the right hand of God and not at the right hand of God. These statements are not contradictions, and it is not a violation of the law of noncontradiction to affirm them.

Nevertheless, some critics see contradictions where such do not exist, a perception that is often due to distortion caused by adherence to a particular theological system. For instance, God's sovereignty and predestination do not rule out human responsibility and freedom of choice. This means that there is no contradiction between divine predestination and human freedom of will, no matter how strongly this might be disputed by some. Since the fallen human mind displays the dreadful noetic effects of indwelling sin, we would be well advised not to be hasty in condemning other believers of violating the law of noncontradiction, for in so doing we, seeing contradictions where none exist, may wrongly accuse these believers, misrepresent them, and bear false witness against them.

We should also be cautioned not to demand of those who set forth the twofoldness of the divine truths that they systematically reconcile these truths to our satisfaction before we desist from accusing them of teaching contradictions. The Bible does not demand that we reconcile God's predetermination with human free will before we accept both aspects of the truth. God does not require that, to satisfy the insistence of the natural human mind, we mentally reconcile the truths regarding objective and subjective salvation, the kingdom of God being both present and future, and Christ coming both from the heavens and from within the glorified believers. Who are we, then, to require of fellow believers what God Himself does not require? Earnest, educated believers may reasonably maintain two aspects of a specific truth, believing that these aspects are not contradictory but complementary. Instead of dismissing their testimony as contradictory and thereby demeaning them as foolish believers who speak contrary to philosophical principles and of naively believing contradictions, we should carefully, prayerfully, and with an open, unbiased mind search the Scriptures in order to prove all things according to the Word of God and thus ascertain the biblical basis for the teachings in question. Otherwise, we may criticize someone's doctrinal position without truly understanding it, a

practice that, sadly, is rampant among religious persons today, including theologians and apologists.

Witnessing of the twofoldness of divine truth is not a way of speaking about a so-called union, or reconciliation, of opposites—a union which some believe to be achieved philosophically and which others insist is arrived at mystically by entering into a supposed ultimate reality where there are no distinctions of any kind and where opposites become one. To maintain the twofoldness of divine truth is altogether different from and incompatible with the philosophical notion, propounded by Heraclitus and Cusanus, of the unity of opposites or the union, reconciliation, or coincidence of opposites. This is the proposition that, ultimately, all pairs of opposites are reconciled or harmonized according to some kind of universal unifying principle. Apparently, it is claimed, certain things stand in opposition to each other; actually, they are parts of a whole that can be perceived intuitively by those with special insight. For Heraclitus, Sweet says, by “understanding the essential interdependence and harmony of things in opposition, we may come to recognize the hidden harmony and underlying unity of these things” (59). Correlative to this assertion is that a beautiful harmony comes from things seemingly at variance with one another.

This is a hidden harmony, superior to any perceivable concordance...It is discernible only by the person with wisdom...that is, one who understands the lawful order and systematic connectedness that underlies the apparent diversity and disjointedness of appearances. (60)

We are informed by Bond that the view of Cusanus is similar: “Coincidence of opposites, as coined by Cusanus, is a state or condition in which opposites no longer oppose each other but fall together into a harmony, union, or conjunction” (458). Bond goes on to explain that in “Cusanus’ theology, God is not the coincidence of opposites, but rather, in some sense, opposites coincide in God but not with God” (459). Such a way of thinking is altogether alien to the divine revelation in the Scriptures, which set forth not a harmony of opposites but two aspects, or sides, of the truth.

In our attempt to speak of the twofoldness of divine truth, we are not engaged in anything that remotely resembles the union, or harmony, of opposites. We are not working with opposites; thus, there are no opposites to reconcile. At the risk of being tedious or repetitious, we wish to testify of twofold truths—biblical statements that embody not opposites but complementary aspects of divinely revealed truths. Furthermore, we are not attempting to reconcile, or harmonize, in a systematized way the twofold truths in the Word of God. On the contrary, our responsibility before God is to recognize

without bias or preference both sides of the truth and then testify the full truth without presuming to systematize what God has been pleased to reveal in an asystematic manner, revealing one aspect of a truth in a certain portion of the Word and another aspect elsewhere in the Word. The natural human mind, as Govett observes, may revel in unified systems, but God delights in the twofoldness of revealed truth. In addition, we are assured that the New Testament neither reveals nor promotes a kind of mysticism in which the devotees enter into a transcendent realm where all distinctions are dissolved, where opposites become one, and where the practitioners lose their identity in an impersonal ground of being. In contrast to all such notions, we wish, simply and faithfully, to uphold and testify to the divine truths of the Scriptures in their purposeful twofoldness without preference, without systematizing, and without seeking entry into an ultimate reality that, as some would say, is beyond all truth claims. Our desire is to know the truth, to be constituted with the truth, to minister the truth, and to be the church of the living God, the church that is the pillar and base of the truth (1 Tim. 3:15). We invite all those who love the Lord and His Word to join us, and seeking believers everywhere, in this worthy pursuit.

Our responsibility is to recognize without bias or preference both sides of the truth and then testify the full truth without presuming to systematize what God has been pleased to reveal in an asystematic manner.

by Ron Kangas

Notes

¹Regarding the divine and human natures of Christ, Govett says, “But, against this twofold truth, human unbelief has ever wrecked itself. One set of heretics denied the manhood of Jesus: one denied the divinity” (13).

²This prevails today, especially among philosophically oriented systematic theologians who cannot receive a biblical truth that does not harmonize with their fabricated system. For example, the New Testament explicitly states in Luke 24 that the resurrected Christ has a body of flesh and bones objectively; nevertheless, Paul emphasizes the fact that Jesus Christ is in us subjectively, even being formed in us and making His home in our hearts. Sadly, some believe the objective matter—that Christ in resurrection has a body of flesh and bones—but avoid, if not deny outright, the subjective matter—that the resurrected Christ is actually within the believers. Being uncomfortable with the subjective aspect of the truth regarding the resurrected Christ, and not truly believing that Christ Himself as a person dwells in the believers, they may resort to explanations such as “Christ in the Holy Spirit is in us,” or “the resurrected Christ is in us through the Spirit,” or “Christ is in us in the sense that the

indwelling Holy Spirit represents Christ.” In fact, denying the perspicuity of Scriptures as it pertains to the believers’ experience and enjoyment of the indwelling Christ, they reject, or at least sidestep, the clear and evident testimony of the Word of God related to Christ Himself as a living and wonderful person being in the believers.

³This is the sad, even tragic, situation among countless religious leaders and theologians today. In their zeal for a truth that matches their disposition, that harmonizes with their system (often regarded as “orthodox”), and that can be reconciled with their philosophical outlook, they actually trample on certain divine truths. This is the case in particular with truths concerning the indwelling of the Spirit, the genuine divine birth by which believers receive the divine life, and being one spirit with the Lord (1 Cor. 6:17). This will no doubt continue until all the believers, having been humbled and broken under the mighty hand of God, will experientially be brought into chapter 42 of

Job and thus will repent of their folly and confess that they did not truly know the God for whose revelation they were supposedly contending so earnestly.

⁴If we would truly know the Triune God in revelation and experience, we need to recognize the twofold truth concerning God in His Divine Trinity. To say that God is triune is to testify

that He is three-one. He is uniquely one, yet He is distinctly and inseparably three. In the Godhead the Father, the Son, and the Spirit are distinct but inseparable; in God’s being one there is no separation among the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, and in God’s being three there is a distinction among the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. The three of the Trinity cannot be separated, yet there is a distinction among them. This is the twofoldness of the divine truth in the Word of God concerning the Triune God.

⁵The divine perspective of events in time is different from the human perspective; for example, although Christ was crucified at an exact time and place, Revelation 13:8 speaks of Him as “the Lamb who was slain from the foundation of the world.”

Works Cited

- Bond, H. Lawrence. “A Brief Glossary of Cusan Terms.” *Introducing Nicholas of Cusa: A Guide to a Renaissance Man*. Ed. Christopher M. Bellitto, Thomas M. Izbicki, and Gerald Christianson. New York: Paulist Press, 2004.
- Govett, Robert. *The Twofoldness of Divine Truth*. Hayesville: Schoettle Publishing Co., n.d.
- Lee, Witness. Footnotes. Recovery Version of the Bible. Anaheim: Living Stream Ministry, 2003.
- Sweet, Dennis. *Heraclitus: Translation and Analysis*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1995.