

A Different Take ON: God Hides His Face From Us Because Of Sin

The standard teaching around the belief that ‘God’¹ hides his face from sinful people is this: God cannot look on sin.

The key verse for that teaching is this:

Habakkuk 1:13 (NKJV) – *You are of purer eyes than to behold evil, and cannot look on wickedness.*

That seems indisputable proof that he separates himself from us. However, what’s missing from the teaching that’s drawn from that text is the context of the verse that they’ve ‘cherry-picked’. The next verse actually says, “Why do you?”

Habakkuk 1:14 (NKJV) – **Why do You** look on those who deal treacherously...

Obviously God can look on sin or on sinful people. It’s, therefore, quite illogical for anyone to take verse 13 and make a doctrine out of it – especially a very impacting one – while ignoring the context of the next verse. Truly, religion teaches so much that is counter to the character and heart of the Trinity.

So, if that’s the reality (i.e. he can look on sin), why are Christians so adamant that he can’t? Is there anything else that supports that paradigm so that it’s absolutely ingrained in their belief system and defended with vigour?

The supporting text for their belief is this:

Isaiah 59:2 (NKJV) – *But your iniquities have separated you from your God; and your sins have hidden His face from you, so that He will not hear.*

That seems to ‘nail it’ for the belief that we’re separated from him through our sinful nature and because of the sins we commit. It also seems to support his not being able to look on sin.

However, even though their stance on the matter seems conclusive with that additional verse, the Isaiah verse above is only one way of translating it. That may be the way most translations render the text, however, multiple occurrence of that version is most likely due to the translators’ preconceived Christian worldview and theology, rather than accuracy. Christian worldview and theology always interfere with translators understanding of what ancient writers wanted to convey to the people of their time. We even have difficulty, because we read their writings through Christian ‘lenses’.

How should we see Isaiah 59:2 so that it reflects the reality of the Trinity’s relationship with humanity and not a Christianised imitation?

Take a look at this literal translation and you’ll see how it could be interpreted a different way:

Isaiah 59:2 (YLT²) – *But your iniquities have been separating between you and your God, and your sins have hidden The Presence from you – from hearing.*

This rendition is literal, not infused with Christian theology. It indicates that it’s our fault that we’re separated from Father and it’s our fault that we can’t hear him communicate with us.

Now that’s very different.

It also supports Habakkuk 1:13-14, in that there’s nothing separating us from Father.

1 – ‘God’: I use this term in inverted commas because ‘God’ is the generic term people use, while I don’t any more. I have an intimate relationship with the members of the Trinity, so I refer to them by name out of relationship. From my oneness with them, I also refer to them as The Trinity.

2 – Young’s Literal Translation www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Isaiah59:2&version=YLT

IMPORTANT: When we understand that sin is actually not coming up to God's standard,³ it's easy to see that not even the most perfect person is sinless. If he can't look on sin, that means he can't have a relationship or intimacy with any of us, let alone oneness with us. See how religion keeps us ignorant of reality and living in fear?

That means religion has put us in the position of thinking we're separated from Father when we're not.

On top of that, it doesn't teach us that the work of the cross has eliminated any separation that we might think exists.

So, where did the idea of separation due to sin, come from?

The idea comes from Greek philosophy (Neoplatonism⁴), which influenced the early Roman Catholic clerics.

(See diagrams on the next page)

What about Adam being clothed because of his sin? Doesn't that indicate that God can't look on sin?

Not really.

As François du Toit comments in his MIRROR Bible translation:

“God did not clothe Adam with the skin of an animal because of a divine need to be appeased, but because of their unconditional love for Adam; they spoke the language of Adam’s own judgment: Adam, not God, was embarrassed about his nakedness. The clothing was not to make God look at Adam differently, but to make Adam feel better about himself. And ultimately it was to prophetically prepare Adam for the unveiling of the mystery of mankind’s redemption in the incarnation. Here Deity would clothe themselves in human skin, in a Son; and the Lion of Judah, would become the Lamb of God, in order to free our minds to re-discover his image and likeness in our skin. [See 1 Peter 1:2.]”⁵

CONCLUSION: No human being is separated from the Trinity because of their sin. That's a furphy⁶

Therefore, the purpose of Jesus coming was to reverse the effects of The Fall and bring us back into Father's family as sons and rightful heirs. (See the parable of 'The Prodigal Son'.)

Believe It or Not! The choice is yours

Whatever you choose to believe won't negatively impact Father's relationship with you

Laurence
26-4-2023

www.CanberraForerunners.org

COPYRIGHT

This document is **free** to copy, republish and distribute, but only 'as is'. It is free to quote from at length.

All Canberra Forerunners' documents are licensed under

[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/)

Quotes are the copyright of their authors.

(Readers will need to look up for themselves any scriptures alluded to in this document)

3 – “Really Understanding What Sin is from a Spiritual Perspective”

canberraforerunners.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Really-Understanding-What-Sin-is-from-a-Spiritual-Perspective.pdf

4 – en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neoplatonism

5 – MIRROR p:831 [Heb 9:5 comment]

6 – Australia (slang): A rumour, or an erroneous or improbable story. www.wordnik.com/words/furphy

