

Chapter 9 – Bible Translations that Present the Messiah as God

In the previous chapter we saw that the Scriptures unanimously testify that the Messiah existed from eternity within the Father, however not as a conscious being but as the master plan that the Father had inside of him and through whom and for whom all things were created. The eternal Word was first a thought, then a spoken word, thereafter a written text, and finally it became man, the second man. Because of his obedience unto death, the man without sin, Yeshua, was raised from the dead, made divine and exalted to take the place that was intended for him from eternity as Lord of creation.

Furthermore, there are four clear passages in the Scriptures that testify that the Eternal cannot be a man. When Yeshua used the expression that is translated as “I am”, he was referring to the fact that he is the Messiah. It is not a reference to the Name of the Eternal.

A person’s eternal salvation does not lie in a confession of Yeshua being the Eternal, but rather in faith in the Eternal’s testimony concerning Yeshua as the promised Messiah, the Son of Elohim, who according to the Scriptures would suffer, die as an atoning sacrifice for the sins of all mankind, and be raised again on the third day.

In this chapter we are going to address a number of passages in the English translations that present the Messiah as God.

Isaiah 9:5-7

*For all the armor of the armed man in the tumult, and the garments rolled in blood, shall be for burning, for fuel of fire. For to us **a child is born, to us a son is given**; and the government shall be on his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty **God, Everlasting Father**, Prince of Shalom. Of the increase of his government and of shalom there shall be no end, on the throne of David, and on his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with justice and with righteousness from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the LORD of Hosts will perform this. (HNV)*

This text speaks of the future eternal kingdom of peace in Israel that will encompass the whole earth. The main person in this kingdom of peace is the promised Son, the Messiah.

First it says that a child is born unto us, “us” being Israel. This was fulfilled when Yeshua was born of a woman within the Jewish people. Next it is written that a son was given to us. After Yeshua was appointed and proclaimed by the Father as his Son¹ through the resurrection², he was taken away from us for a season in order to later be placed as a prince of peace for all eternity. Remember that sonship is a function rather than a state of being.³

This child that was born and this son that was given to us will have an eight-fold name. He will be called “*pele yoetz el gibor avi-ad sar-shalom*” – wonderful counselor powerful (“El”) hero eternal-father prince of peace”. Names entail function, which means that the Messiah will hold an eight-fold

¹ Luke 1:35; Matt 3:17; 17:5; 2 Pet 1:17

² Rom 1:4

³ Compare with 1 Cor 4:17 where Paul calls Timothy “my beloved and faithful son”. The same word is used in the Aramaic Peshitta text in 1 Cor 4:17 as is used in the gospels when the Eternal says of Yeshua that he is his beloved Son, “beri chabiba”. It does not mean that Timothy was Paul’s physical descendant, but rather that he was his son in regard to succession and representation.

function corresponding with this eight-fold name that the Eternal has given him. One of the names is the Hebrew word “El” which we discussed in chapter two. We mentioned that the Hebrew word “El” is most commonly used in the Scriptures to describe a “divinity” and in some cases “power”.

In Genesis 31:29a, it is literally written,

*There is **power** (“El”) in my hand to do you harm.*

In Proverbs 3:27, it is written,

Don’t withhold good from those to whom it is due,

*When it is in the **power** (“El”) of your hand to do it. (HNV)*

In Micah 2:1b, it is written,

When the morning is light, they practice it,

*Because it is in the **power** (“El”) of their hand.(HNV)*

These texts are three witnesses to the fact that the word “El” is not only used in reference to the Eternal or to a divine being but could also have the meaning “power” or “might”.

As we have mentioned in a previous chapter, the plural of “El” is “Elim” and this word never refers to the Almighty but rather to other mighty beings, people, angels, or idols.

In Job 41:25 (v 17 in Hebrew) it is written,

*When he raises himself up, the **mighty** (“Elim”) are afraid.*

They retreat before his thrashing. (HNV)

Note that the word “Elim” has been translated as “mighty”. The context proves that this is not a matter of angelic beings but of humans.

In Psalm 29:1, it is written,

*Give to the Lord, you **sons of the gods** (“Benei Elim”), give to the Lord glory and strength. (BBE)*

In Psalm 89:6, it is written,

*For who is there in the heavens in comparison with the Lord? who is like the Lord among **the sons of the gods** (“Benei Elim”)? (BBE)*

Here we see the words “Benei Elim”, which could be translated as “mighty beings” and which describe the angels that surround the Eternal’s throne.

These passages show that the word “El”, whether singular or plural in form, can be something other than the Eternal himself. That would mean that when the word “El” is used as one of the names of the Messiah in Isaiah 9:6, it is not proof that he is the Eternal. The word can very well be understood as a mighty hero and not the Eternal.

Furthermore, the passage speaks of the Messiah being born. This means that it would be impossible for the word "El" to be a reference to Messiah being "God" in its absolute sense, since the Eternal can neither be born nor die.

On the other hand, it is very possible for the Messiah to hold the function of "Elohim" as judge, as we have mentioned earlier. However, I have not found the word "El" in the Scriptures used for this function, only "Elohim". Therefore we cannot point to this text as proof that the Messiah was given the name "El" in order to fulfill the function of "God" as highest judge.

On the other hand, there are alternative Jewish translations that connect the word "El" with the Eternal in different ways.

D. Mandel translated Isaiah 9:6 like this,⁴

For to us a child is born, to us a son is given; and the government is upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called "Wonderful counselor of the mighty God, of the everlasting Father, of the Prince of peace."

In his commentary on the book of Romans, Joseph Shulam writes,⁵

The original text in Isaiah 9:6 speaks of the messianic figure as "Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God." Later Jewish thought found difficulty in attributing God's own name to a human being, and found a textual resolution to the problem. A description of the Messiah in 1QH 3:10⁶ reads the text in Isaiah 9:6 as "Wonderful Counselor with his Might." This text implies that the Messiah is (or shall be) God's "counselor," or that his task as a counselor will be together with God's Might. The author possibly understood the words "with God's might" in the light of Psalm 110:1, and believed that the Messiah's place as God's Counselor would be "at the right hand of the Power." (page 308-309)

According to Qumran literature, the word "El" should be understood as power.

The Swedish translator Helge Åkesson translated Isaiah 9:6 like this,⁷

For a child is born unto us, a son is given to us, whose kingdom is on his shoulder; and his name called the wonderful in counsel, strong God, Father of eternity, "Prince of Peace".

My personal belief is that the word "El" should be understood as a powerful person since the Messiah was given all power in heaven and on earth with his position as the ruler of the world (see Matthew 28:18).

Another question arises concerning this text. How is it that a child that is born and a son that is given can have the title "everlasting Father"? Is it not only the Eternal who is called Father in the Scriptures?

⁴ D. Mandel, Davka Corporation, www.davka.com.

⁵ Messianic Jewish leader of the Netivyah Bible instruction ministry in Jerusalem who also serves as an elder in Roeh Israel, Jerusalem. For more information see www.netivyah.org.

⁶ One of the texts found in the first Qumran cave.

⁷ Translation from the Swedish text that says, *Ty ett barn är oss fött, en son oss given, vilkens herradöme är på hans skuldra; och hans namn kallade den i råd underbare, starke Guden, Fadern av evighet: "Fridens furste."*

Actually, no. Just as sonship is a function, so is fatherhood. We find the function entitled father in the story of Joseph in Mitzrayim (Egypt). In Genesis 45:8, Joseph says that Elohim placed him to be father to Paro (Pharao). According to Rashi, the Hebrew word “av” does not only mean “father”, but also “counselor”, “friend”, and “administrator”. Just as Joseph was placed as father to Paro, without having a higher or equal position to him, so Yeshua has been given the title “av” by HaShem without have a higher or equal position. This title has been given to him for eternity.

Note also that the Hebrew text says that this Son will be **called** by this manifold name. Who has given him this name? It is the Eternal himself. This messianic function of being “El Gibor”, mighty conqueror, and “Avi Ad”, eternal father, is not something that the Son has in and of himself but it was given to him by the Eternal. It is the Eternal who has made him Messiah and Son for all future eternity with all these functions, and therefore he has given him this manifold name.

When this child who is born to us and this son who is given to us is given the title “eternal father”, it does not mean that he is a part of the godhead but that for all future eternity he is granted the delegated authority to serve as father, i.e. administrator, in his function as the Eternal’s representative. Yeshua is no more the Eternal than Joseph was Paro.

John 1:1-3, 14

*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and **the Word was God**. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him. Without him was not anything made that has been made... The Word became flesh, and lived among us. We saw his glory, such glory as of the one and only Son of the Father, full of grace and truth. (HNV)*

This translation is based on the Greek manuscript of the book of John. The Greek word that has been translated “Word” is “Logos” which means word, utterance, doctrine, teaching, calculation.

Naturally the meaning of the word “logos” in the Scriptures is not the same as the meaning it has within Greek philosophy. The word must be understood from its Hebrew concept.

The Aramaic Peshitta and the ancient Syrian text of verse 1 read like this,

*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with Eloah and **Eloah was the Word**.*⁸

The Aramaic word that has been translated as “Word” is “Melto” which means word, utterance, case, reason, subject, thing.⁹

The Hebrew parallel of the word “Melto” is “Davar” which means word, expression, goal, term, utterance, promise, order, command, incident, thing, question, body, something, nothing.

The Aramaic concept “Memra” which means “number” and which is found repeatedly in the Targum texts – the Aramaic paraphrased translations of the Tanach (OT) – and traditional rabbinical literature, is a concept used to describe how the Eternal reveals himself through his “word”.¹⁰

⁸ From J. Trimms *Hebraic Roots Version*. Compare Etheridge’s English translation at http://www.aramaicpeshitta.com/AramaicNTtools/Etheridge/etheridge_john.htm.

⁹ See *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon* <http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/index.htm> and *Peshitta New Testament* <http://dukhrana.com>.

According to David Stern¹¹ the word “Logos” is equivalent to the Aramaic word “Memra” which is a technical theological term used by the rabbis around the time of Yeshua to describe an expression of Elohim.

However, in spite of the many similarities in this text between the concept of “the Word” and the Aramaic expression “Memra”, it is not this word that is used in the Peshitta manuscript, but “Melto”. We are not going to dig deeply into this subject, but just mention it in passing for those who are interested.

In the previous chapter we spoke about how the Eternal used the Word to create and communicate with creation. The Eternal uses the Word to express himself. That means that the Word is the expression of the Eternal’s innermost thoughts and desires. It is therefore not something that can be separated from the Eternal. The Eternal is one with his word and in that way the Word becomes the Eternal himself as his expression. Since the Eternal only communicates through his Word, it is only the Word – in all its forms and stages of development (see previous chapter) – which becomes an expression for the Eternal. Even though the Eternal is set apart and far above creation, he can relate to creation and he chooses to do so through the Word, and only through the Word. Only that which the Eternal decides to express of himself can be comprehended by creation. This means that the Word is the only part of the Eternal that creation can see. The Word is the Eternal’s delegate and it is the only expression of the One who lives in unapproachable light and whom no person can comprehend fully. This means that in relation to creation, the Word has the function of Elohim. We can also look at it from another angle and say that the Eternal becomes the Word when relating to creation.

It is crucial that we understand that John 1:1 is not speaking of the Word as Elohim the being, but as Elohim the function. That is why it says that the Word was with Elohim and Elohim was the Word.

Notice the difference between the Greek and the Aramaic texts. In the Greek text it says that the Word was “Theos” (without the definite article, i.e. the Word was given the delegated position of serving as Elohim as we mentioned in a previous chapter). However, in the Aramaic it says that Eloah was the Word. In the Greek text it emphasizes that the Word held the position of “God” (Elohim). The Aramaic on the other hand does not say that the Word was Eloah, but that Eloah was the Word. Franz Delitzsch wrote it this way in his Hebrew translation of the Apostolic Writings as well.¹² Here the emphasis is on the Eternal expressing himself through his Word and thus the Word becomes Elohim since it is the expression of the Invisible One.

When the Eternal wants to express himself in this world he can do it through a person. That is why he caused the Word, the expression of who He is, to become flesh, i.e. a person like you and me, but without sin. The Word that became flesh is therefore the expression of the Eternal in human form. Everything that the Eternal can express of himself through a person he does through the Living Word. This does not mean however that this person is everything that the Eternal is for the Eternal is not a man or a son of man. It does mean that all that he can express through a person, he expresses through this perfect man, Yeshua. Therefore Yeshua is not merely an expression of the Eternal’s

¹⁰ For more information regarding the word “memra” see *the Jewish Encyclopedia*.

¹¹ See David H. Stern’s *Jewish New Testament Commentary*, page 135.

¹² See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Franz_Delitzsch and <http://www.kirjasilta.net/ha-berit>.

power as a delegate, because with his entire being he also reflects the character of the One who has chosen to express himself through a man. Therefore it is written in John 1:14b,

We saw his glory, such glory as of the one and only Son of the Father, full of grace and truth.
(HNV)

The Eternal's characteristics of grace and truth were expressed in this man to such a degree that looking at him one saw the Invisible One who revealed himself in this manner. Those who saw Yeshua saw the Eternal, as it also is written in John 14:9b,

He who has seen me has seen the Father.

John 20:27-29

Then he said to T'omas, "Reach here your finger, and see my hands. Reach here your hand, and put it into my side. Don't be unbelieving, but believing."

T'omas answered him, "My Lord and my God!" Yeshua said to him, "Because you have seen me, you have believed. Blessed are those who have not seen, and have believed."

Thomas had not been able to believe the words in the Scriptures and the teaching that Yeshua had given saying that the Eternal would raise up the son of man from the dead (see John 20:24-25). However, when he saw with his own eyes the one whom the Eternal had raised from the dead he cried out, "My Lord and my God!" If he spoke in Hebrew, which is most likely that he did, he would have said, "Adoni ve-Elohai!" If he spoke Aramaic he would have said, "Mari Valohi!" Naturally, he would not have spoken Greek with his rabbi, so we can conclude that he did not use the Greek words "Kurios" and "Theos".

Both the Aramaic word "Mar" and the Greek word "Kurios" are used in the same way as the Hebrew word describing either the Eternal, angels, or humans. So the expression *my Lord* cannot be proof that Tomas was referring to the Eternal when he said this. He called Yeshua "Adoni", *my Lord*. According to Psalm 110:1 King David also called the Messiah "Adoni", as it is written,

The LORD ("YHWH") says to my Lord ("Adoni"), "Sit at my right hand,

Until I make your enemies your footstool for your feet." (HNV)

Our Rebbe Yeshua's commentary on this text is recorded in Matthew 22:41-46 where it is written,

Now while the Pharisees were gathered together, Yeshua asked them a question, saying, "What do you think of the Messiah? Whose son is he?" They said to him, "Of David." He said to them, "How then does David in the Spirit call him Lord, saying, 'The Lord said to my Lord, Sit on my right hand, Until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet?' "If then David calls him Lord, how is he his son?" No one was able to answer him a word, neither dared any man from that day forth ask him any more questions. (HNV)

Normally a son does not stand above his father. This was the reason that Yaakov questioned his son Yosef's dream about the sun and moon bowing before him (see Genesis 37:9-10). The dream entailed that his parents would bow before him and acknowledge his lordship over them which was a highly improbable thing. This part of Yosef's dreams was not fulfilled when Israel's family came down to

Mitzrayim. It will be fulfilled after the resurrection however, when the patriarchs and the matriarchs will bow before the Son of Yosef, the Messiah Yeshua. From this we learn that the Messiah is greater than Yaakov.

In the same way, Yeshua was showing the Pharisees through Psalm 110 that the Messiah would be greater than David since David called him Adoni – *my Lord* – even though he would be his physical descendant, i.e. his son.

The expression *my Lord* is no proof whatsoever that Yeshua is the Eternal, only that he would come to hold a position of authority that would be greater than the position King David held in his time. King David acknowledged this position by calling him “Adoni” and Thomas acknowledged it as well by calling him “Adoni – *my Lord*.”

The expression *my God* (“Elohai”) however is a great deal more difficult to interpret. What did Thomas mean when he spoke this way? Here are three possible interpretations of this text:

1. Thomas uttered an expression of astonishment.
2. Thomas meant that Yeshua was his lord (“Adon”) and that the Eternal was his God (“Elohim”).
3. Thomas meant that Yeshua was both lord (“Adon”) and his God (“Elohim”).

The first option we mentioned, which is that Thomas used an exclamation of astonishment, could be explained like this:

John explains how Thomas could not have believed that the Eternal had raised Yeshua from the dead. Thomas had said that as long as he did not see the nail holes in Yeshua’s hands and put his fingers through the holes and his hands in Yeshua’s side, he would not believe that Yeshua was raised from the dead. Therefore when he got to see and touch Yeshua’s resurrected body he was completely overwhelmed and astonished and used an expression that could easily have been in use among Hebrew speaking Jews in Israel at the time, “*My Lord and my God!*”

The second option, the option claiming that Thomas said “Adoni” to Yeshua and “Elohai” to the Eternal, can be explained like this:

The context shows that Thomas’ doubt was not over the issue of whether or not Yeshua was “God” as some erroneously teach. John did not write his gospel to get people to believe that Yeshua is “God” but to get them to believe that he is the Messiah, which is the same thing as “Son of God” (see John 20:31). When Yeshua revealed himself alive and saw how Thomas confessed “Adoni ve-Elohai”, he confirmed Thomas’ faith by saying, “*Because you have seen me, you have believed. Blessed are those who have not seen, and have believed.*” (v. 29b). Here it does not say that Yeshua was glad that Thomas believed that he was Elohim, but that he believed that Yeshua lived, i.e. that the Eternal had raised him from the dead. The context clearly shows that Thomas had at first not believed in Yeshua’s resurrection, not that he had doubted that Yeshua was Elohim. That is not the issue here. The issue is whether or not Thomas could believe that Yeshua was alive.

Who was it that raised Yeshua from the dead? Did he raise himself up? No, he could not have done this. The Scriptures testify unanimously to the fact that it was the Eternal who raised Yeshua from the dead, not that he raised himself from the dead. He was completely destitute and had no way of

getting out of the kingdom of death without the Father coming down and pulling him out. Thus the main character in the resurrection becomes the Father and not Yeshua. It was the FATHER who raised Yeshua from the death. HE is the great redeemer. HE is the great savior who is able to even raise people from the dead and cause them to never die again.

Therefore when Thomas discovered that the Father in his power had truly raised Yeshua from the dead, he cried out in joy and astonishment, first “*My Lord*” to Yeshua, and secondly “*My God*” to the Father who had raised the Lord from the dead.

The third possible interpretation would be that Thomas called Yeshua both “Adon” and “Elohim”.

For Thomas to have acknowledged Yeshua as the Eternal is completely out of the question since as a Jew he was well familiar with the Scriptures which state four times that the Eternal is not a man or a son of man.¹³ Furthermore, the Eternal can neither change, die, nor be resurrected from the dead since he is the source of life.

On the other hand it is very possible for a messenger to be given the same title as his sender as we pointed out in a previous chapter. This would then mean that Thomas called Yeshua both his “Adon” and his “Elohim”.

Is there enough evidence in the Scriptures as well as in the Jewish history of interpretation to claim that the Messiah can be called by the same name as the Eternal in heaven?

Yes, there is. In Talmud we read,¹⁴

Rabbah in the name of R. Johanan further stated: The righteous will in time to come be called by the name of the Holy One, blessed be He; for it is said: Every one that is called by My name, and whom I have created for My glory. I have formed him, yea, I have made him. (Isaiah 43:7)

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Johanan: Three were called by the name of the Holy One; blessed be He, and they are the following: The righteous, the Messiah and Jerusalem. [This may be inferred as regards] the righteous [from] what has just been said. [As regards] the Messiah — it is written: And this is the name whereby he shall be called, The Lord is our righteousness. (Jeremiah 23:6) [As regards] Jerusalem — it is written: It shall be eighteen thousand reeds round about; and the name of the city from that day shall be ‘the Lord is there.’ (Ezekiel 48:35) Do not read, ‘there’ but ‘its name’.

When Rav Gershom ben Yehudah¹⁵ (960-1040) commented on this text in the Talmud, he wrote, “Hashem mamash yikrahu” – “Precisely HaShem will he (the Messiah) be called”.

Maharsha (Samuel Eidels 1555-1631)¹⁶ interprets it less radically by saying,

Three things have the Name of the Holy One Blessed Be He called upon them: It would seem that since it does not say that they are called by the name of the Holy One Blessed Be He but rather have the name of the Holy One Blessed Be He called upon them – it would seem that the name of the Holy One

¹³ Num 23:19; 1 Sam 15:29; Job 9:32; Hos 11:9

¹⁴ Baba Batra 75b. *The Soncino Talmud*, Davka Corporation/Judaica Press.

¹⁵ See <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?letter=G&artid=172> and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rabbenu_Gershom.

¹⁶ See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samuel_Edels.

Blessed Be He will become for them an accompanying name; by Mashiach Mashiach-of-HaShem, by Yerushalayim the City-of-HaShem and also by a Tzadik, Tzadik-of-HaShem and also by Mashiach that it says that they will call him HaShem-Tzidkenu, it is meaning to say that he is a Tzadik to HaShem as was written above about Tzadikim who will also be called thus, since all of their deeds are for the sake of Heaven and so too by Mashiach since all of his deeds will be for the sake of Heaven and also Jerusalem in the future, the only people who will be invited to enter are those who all of their deeds are for the sake of Heaven as was written above.

Radak (R. David Kimchi 1160-1235)¹⁷ wrote,

In his days Yehudah shall be saved, and Yisra'el shall dwell safely; and this is his name by which he shall be called: the LORD our righteousness. (HNV)

“In his days” - And this is the name that they will call him by HaShem Tzidkenu (HaShem is our righteousness), Israel will call him, they will call the Mashiach by this name, HaShem Tzidkenu since in his days will be the righteousness of HaShem for us established eternally, and this calling is similar to the calling by Moshe Rabbenu a"h when he called an alter HaShem Nissi (HaShem is my miracle) and that Yaacov called an alter El Elohei Israel each one according to its inyan (matter/context) and also the name of the city from the day that HaShem was there, and Yonatan translated that they would call it etc...

According to Jewish theology, the Messiah can be called YHWH “the Eternal”. This lines up with Philippians 2:9, where it is written,

*Therefore God also highly exalted him, and gave to him the **name which is above every name** (HNV)*

There are several persons throughout the history of Israel that were given the name Yeshua, the longer form of which is Yehoshua. For example Moshe’s successor was called Joshua (Yehoshua in Hebrew) the son of Nun¹⁸ and there was the high priest called Joshua son of Jehozadak.¹⁹ The name Yeshua occurs 28 times in the Hebrew Tanach (OT)²⁰ and once in the Aramaic.²¹ From this we learn that the name that is above every name is not Yeshua.

According to Philippians 2, the Eternal gave to the Messiah Yeshua the name that is above every other name because he was willing to suffer and die in obedience and that he received the name after he was raised from the dead. Since he was already called Yeshua before he suffered, died, and was raised from the dead we can see once again that Yeshua cannot be the name that is above every other name.

In the Scriptures, the concept “name” is more than just the title given to living beings and objects in order to identify them and be able to tell them apart. The name also reveals the person’s, animal’s, or object’s character and purpose in creation.

¹⁷ See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Kimchi och <http://www.ou.org/about/judaism/rabbis/radak.htm>.

¹⁸ In Num 13:17 (v 16 in Hebrew) Moshe gives him the name Yehoshua. The same person is mentioned in Nehemiah 8:17 by the short form of the name Yeshua.

¹⁹ In Zec 3:1; Hag 1:1, he is called Yehoshua (Joshua) and in Ezra 5:2 Yeshua (Jeshua).

²⁰ 1 Chron 24:11; 2 Chron 31:15; Ezra 2:2, 6, 36, 40; 3:2, 8, 9; 4:3; 8:33; Neh 3:19; 7:7, 11, 39, 43; 8:7, 17; 9:4, 5; 10:9 (v 10 in Hebrew); 11:26; 12:1, 7, 8, 10, 24, 26.

²¹ Ezra 5:2

A name can also be one's reputation. One of whom all speak well has a good reputation and a good name. One of whom all speak ill has a bad name and a bad reputation.

Moreover, a name has to do with authority. Depending on the name one is given, one has authority to act within the area where one's name has influence. This means that when one name is above another, that person with the higher name has a higher position of authority. When it says that at the resurrection Elohim gave Yeshua the name that is above every other name, it means that Yeshua was placed in a position of authority and a commission that is far above the authority and commission of all other created beings.

What did the Eternal call Yeshua when he raised him from the dead?

We can read in Acts 13:32-33, where it is written,

We bring you good news of the promise made to the fathers, that God has fulfilled the same to us, their children, in that he raised up Yeshua. As it is also written in the second psalm, 'You are my Son. Today I have begotten you.'

According to this text, Yeshua was given the honor of becoming Elohim's Son at the resurrection. At the resurrection, the Eternal gives man a unique position as sons of Elohim, as it is written in Luke 20:35-36,

*but those who are accounted worthy to attain that age and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; for neither do they have the power to die anymore, for they are equal to angels, **and are sons²² of God, being sons of the resurrection.** (MRC²³)*

Yeshua was given the honor of becoming Elohim's Son at the resurrection. However, his position as Son of Elohim is higher than that of the angels or those people who will partake of the resurrection and become sons of Elohim. Both before and after the resurrection, Yeshua was and is the Son of Elohim in a unique way and therefore on several occasions he is called the only begotten Son.²⁴ However, the Scriptures testify at least three times to the fact that after the resurrection, Yeshua was given the name of the Son of Elohim in a very extraordinary way.

A second witness is found in Romans 1:4, where it says that,

*who was **declared²⁵** to be the **Son of God** with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead, Yeshua the Messiah our Lord. (HNV)*

This text shows us that Yeshua was proclaimed as the Son of Elohim at the resurrection.

A third testimony is found in Hebrews 1:4-5

²² Note that it is written sons and not children. Child and son is not the same thing.

²³ Messianic Renewed Covenant.

²⁴ The Greek uses the word "monogenes" (Strong G3439 μονογενής) – only begotten. This word occurs in the following passages of the Greek versions of the Apostolic Writings: Luke 7:12; 8:42; 9:38; John 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18; Heb 11:17; 1 John 4:8. The Peshitta text uses words taken from the root word "yhd" – only, only begotten, alone – in Luke 7:12; 8:42; 9:38; John 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18; 1 Tim 5:5; Heb 11:17; 1 Joh 4:9.

²⁵ Here the Greek has the word "horidzo" (Strong G3724 ὀρίζω) which means to call out, determine, specify, declare, ordain. The word also occurs in the following passages of the Greek Apostolic Writings: Luke 22:22; Acts 2:23; 10:42; 11:29; 17:26, 31; Rom 1:4; Heb 4:7. The Peshitta text uses the word "yda" which means to know, to be known, to acknowledge. The word occurs very frequently in the Aramaic text. Some of the places it is found are: Rom 1:23; 8:3; Phil 3:21; James 3:9.

having become so much better than the angels, as he has inherited a more excellent name than they have. For to which of the angels did he say at any time, "You are my Son, Today have I become your father?" and again, "I will be to him a Father, And he will be to me a Son?"

Notice that Yeshua did not inherit the name that is greater than the names of the angels until after the resurrection. Before the resurrection, he was lower than the angels according to Hebrews 2:7, 9. After the resurrection, he inherited the name "Ben Elohim" – Son of Elohim – a name which is greater than the angels' names.

As we have mentioned earlier, the concept "Son of God" is not a matter of origin or nature, but of title and function as the representative of the Eternal. However, even though angels and judges are called "sons of God" and King Shlomo was called "Ben Elohim" – Son of God – Yeshua received a position after his resurrection that is far above both kings and angels. He was placed as the highest authority above all of creation, both visible and invisible.

But, was not Yeshua the Son of Elohim before the resurrection as well?

Yes, certainly he was. On several occasions, Yeshua was acknowledged as the Son of Elohim both by the Eternal as well as by angels, evil spirits, he himself, and other people.²⁶ When it says that at the resurrection, he inherited the name that is far above the angels and that he was given the name that is above every other name it means that even though others have been given the title "Son of God" it was not to the extent that Yeshua was given at the resurrection. At that point, he was exalted to the highest position in creation to be the great Son, the greatest representative of the Eternal himself, as King of kings and High Priest in heaven. In this sense, Yeshua's sonship after the resurrection was much greater than before he died since it was not until after he had suffered and died that he was exalted above all and was given the name that is above every other, Phil 2:8-9. It was not until he was raised from the dead and was given immortality that he said that he was given all power in heaven and on earth (Matthew 28:18).

Beyond the title "Son of God", there is yet an additional name that Scripture places above every other name and that is the Eternal's own name YHWH (Yod He Wav He). Could it be that Yeshua received this name when he was raised from the dead and exalted to his position in heaven?

Yes, a deeper study of the Scriptures teach us that the Son has been given the right to carry the Father's name. Blessed is he who comes in the Name of the Eternal! Yeshua, however, not only comes in the Eternal's Name, he has been given the Eternal's Name. He is also called YHWH. One could say that in one sense he is YHWH.

In Philippians 2:9-11, it is written,

Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. (ASV 1901)

²⁶ See Matt 3:17; 8:29; 13:33; 17:5; Luke 1:35; 20:13; John 1:34, 49; 11:4, 27; 1 John 3:8 among others.

In this text we see the connection between the name Yeshua and the name that is above every other name. In and of the resurrection, the name Yeshua was exalted to the position of the Eternal himself. That is why we can see in the Apostolic Writings that the person who calls on the name of Yeshua is calling on the Eternal himself. This is what causes many to miss the difference between Yeshua and the Eternal and they draw the conclusion that Yeshua is part of a twofold or triune God. In the coming chapter we will talk about the texts that prove that Yeshua bears the Eternal's Name and that there is an intimate connection between Yeshua and YHWH.

If Paul had meant that all will confess that Yeshua is Lord, i.e. the Eternal, it would be in the sense of representing the Eternal and not of **being** the Eternal. If it is the Eternal's Name that is referred to when it says that the Eternal gave Yeshua the name that is above every name, it would clearly mean that he did not have this name in and of himself before it was given to him by the Father. One cannot receive something that one already possesses, and one cannot become something that one already is. The fact that Yeshua **was given** the name YHWH by his Father after the resurrection is proof that he did not have it earlier and that he had to be given the Name in order to be called by that Name.

The text in Philippians 2 thus proves that Yeshua is not the Eternal himself, but that he has been given the honor of bearing the Eternal's Name, the Name that is above every other name. The Greek word that is translated *gave* is the word "charizomai"²⁷ which means grace.²⁸ Yeshua was therefore given the grace of bearing the Name that is above every other name. This is therefore a matter of representation, not of the being or nature of Yeshua.

In a previous chapter we learned that a messenger often bears the name of the one who sent him. That is why the Messiah could be called both Elohim and HaShem (YHWH).

If we go back to John chapter 20 and the story of Thomas' confession, we can state that it is fully possible for Thomas to have called Yeshua Elohim with the definition of being the Eternal's representative and highest delegated judge. Remember also that the title Elohim can be given to others who are not the Eternal whenever they are his representatives.

We could then summarize this and say that there are three possible ways of interpreting Thomas' words to Yeshua when he said "My Lord and my God!" without having to draw the conclusion that he meant that Yeshua is the Eternal. Even if he called Yeshua his Elohim, it is not proof that Yeshua is the Eternal. The expression "My Lord and my God!" is not proof that can be used to support the trinity doctrine.

Philippians 2:5-11

*Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, **existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion***

²⁷ Strong G5483 χαρίζομαι charizomai *khar-id'-zom-ahee* Middle voice from G5485; to grant as a *favor*, that is, gratuitously, in kindness, pardon or rescue: - deliver, (frankly) forgive, (freely) give, grant. The word is also found in the following passages of the Greek Apostolic Writings: Luke 7:21, 42, 43; Acts 3:14; 25:11, 16; 27:24; Rom 8:32; 1 Cor 2:12; 2 Cor 2:7, 10 (twice); 12:13; Gal 3:18; Eph 4:32 (twice); Phil 1:29; 2:9; Col 2:13; 3:13; Philemon 22.

In the Peshitta text, the word "wyahab" is used. It means "gave". The same word occurs in many other places, among them are Matt 10:3; 2 Cor 1:22; 5:18.

²⁸ Strong G5485 χάρις *khar'-ece* From G5463; *graciousness* (as *gratifying*), of manner or act (abstract or concrete; literal, figurative or spiritual; especially the divine influence upon the heart, and its reflection in the life; including *gratitude*): - acceptable, benefit, favour, gift, grace (-ious), joy liberality, pleasure, thank (-s, -worthy).

as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. (ASV 1901)

The Greek word in this text that is translated as *form* is the word “morfe” which means shape.²⁹ This word only occurs three times in the Greek version of the Apostolic writings, Phil 2:5, 6 and Mark 16:12. Advocates of the trinitarian doctrine often interpret this word according to a definition of it that was used between five and six hundred years before the days of Paul and say that that definition speaks of what is essential and permanent. However, according to William M. Wachtel³⁰ archeological discoveries of manuscripts written in Koine Greek, the language used in the Greek version of the Apostolic Writings, confirm that many Greek words underwent a change of definition. One of these words was “morfe”. According to Kenneth S. Wuest, Greek professor at the Moody Bible Institute and himself a defender of the trinity doctrine, the word “morfe” changed to take on the definition of place, position, or rank.³¹

The word “morfe” – shape, form – ought therefore to be understood in its historic context and not according to the definition that it had several centuries earlier. This means that we cannot say that “morfe” has anything to do with nature, but rather with position, which would correspond with what we have learned in the previous chapters.

The context in Philippians also shows that the word “morfe” ought not to be interpreted as nature, but as position. The same word is used twice in the text, in verse 5 and 6. The second time it speaks of Yeshua taking the *form* (“morfe”) of a servant or slave. Now, a slave is not a different type of being than any other free human being. The word here cannot mean nature or being when it is used about a slave but it must mean position. The chances are very small that the same word would be used in the previous verse with another definition when it speaks of Yeshua’s likeness to Elohim!

Paul presents Yeshua as one who had the choice either to take personal advantage of his likeness to Elohim or to humble himself and take on the likeness of a slave. He chose between two positions, not two natures. This teaches us that the word “morfe” does not have to do with being or nature but with position.

In the Nicene creed³² we can read,

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father... who... came down and was incarnate and was made man...

When the Nicene creed was established in the 4th century, one of the things it was based on was the word “morfe” in the Greek text of Philippians 2. They interpreted the word to mean that the Messiah should have the same essence as the Father before he became a man at which time he left his

²⁹ Strong G3444 μορφή morphē *mor-fay'* Perhaps from the base of G3313 (through the idea of *adjustment* of parts); *shape*; figuratively *nature*: - form.

³⁰ William M. Wachtel, *The Form of God*. Internet article: <http://www.focusonthe kingdom.org/philippians.htm>.

³¹ Kenneth S. Wuest, *The Practical Use of the Greek New Testament*, page 84, also quoted in the article we mentioned before.

³² Was adopted at the church council in Constantinople year 381. It is also known as the Nicene-Constantinople Creed since this final revised version of what was written at the church council of Nicea year 325 was only made 56 years later.

divinity outwardly and lived and died as a man. It is this interpretation of these verses that lays at the foundation for most Christian translations of these verses. This means that these translations have a certain angle that would cause an honest Bible reader to be led to believe that Paul is speaking of "Christ" (the Messiah) being God before he became man. With this preconceived idea in mind one reads into the text something which is not written there.

Let us take a look at the Aramaic text, as it is closer to the Hebrew, and see what is written there.

In the Aramaic Peshitta text of Philippians 2:6-7, the word "d'muta" is used twice which means form, image, likeness, mold, example, or pattern. This word occurs approximately 60 times in the Apostolic writings.³³ In the Peshitta translation of the books of Moses we find the same word ("d'muta") in Genesis 1:26 as we find in Philippians 2:6-7. This term comes from the Hebrew word "d'mut" which is found in the Hebrew text of Genesis 1:26 where it is written,

God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness ("d'mut")..." (HNV)

Apparently there is a close connection between Philippians 2:5-6 and Genesis 1:26.

In Philippians 2 our Master is called *Messiah Yeshua* ("Christ Jesus"). What does that name mean? Yeshua is the name that the Eternal, through his angel, commanded his parents to give him after his birth, Matthew 1:21, 25; Luke 1:31. Yeshua is therefore the name of the man borne of a woman. Messiah is a title meaning "the anointed" and which is given to people whom the Eternal has equipped with his Spirit in order to function in a particular office and to accomplish a specific assignment. The name *Messiah Yeshua* in Philippians therefore does not speak of a divine being but of a man. It was Yeshua the **man** anointed by the spirit who existed in *God's image*, not a heavenly being. This is one proof of the fact that Paul could not have been speaking of a divine being who became man. When he was called *Messiah Yeshua* he existed in *God's image* as a man and thereafter he took upon himself the image of a slave, also as a man.

If we conclude that Paul is not speaking of a divine preexistence of Yeshua but rather of his condition as a human, borne of a woman, we find a very significant parallel between Yeshua and what took place with the first Adam, the first man. Yeshua was born as the second man (1 Corinthians 15:47). Just as the first man, the second man was also made without sin and called son of Elohim (Luke 3:38; 1:35). The first man was created in Elohim's image to be like ("d'mut") him (Genesis 1:26; 5:1). In the Aramaic version of the Apostolic writings it is easier to see the connection between what Paul writes about the Messiah Yeshua and what happened with Adam since the same word is used in Philippians 2:6 as in Genesis 1:26 and 5:1. Both the first Adam and the second Adam were made in *God's image* ("d'muta").

After having compared the Messiah Yeshua with Adam, both of whom were in *God's image*, Paul describes how the second Adam faced the same choice as the first. The first Adam was also tempted to take personal advantage of his position and in his disobedience he sought independence wanting to become *like Elohim* (Genesis 3:5 compare with Matthew 4:3, 6). The second Adam on the other hand, instead of choosing the path of disobedience as the first Adam had done, bowed his will to that of the Eternal and chose to obey Him in everything, fulfilling the role of the suffering servant that the

³³ Mark 16:12; Luk 3:22; Acts 7:43, 44; Rom 1:23 (2); 5:14 (2); 6:5, 17; 8:3, 29; 1 Cor 11:7; 15:49 (2); 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4; Phil 2:6, 7 (2); 3:17, 21; Col 1:15; 3:10; 1Thess 1:7; 1 Tim 4:12; Tit 2:7; Heb 1:1; 4:11; 5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:3, 11 (2), 15, 17, 21; 8:5 (2); 9:23, 24; James 3:9; 5:10; 1Pet 5:3; 1 John 3:2; Jude v 7, 8; Rev 1:13; 4:3 (2), 7 (2); 9:7 (2), 10; 11:1; 13:2; 14:14; 21:11.

prophets spoke of beforehand. The second Adam triumphed where the first fell. The second man obeyed where the first man was disobedient. The first man wanted to cling to his godlikeness like plunder while the second man chose not to hold on to his godlikeness but to take on the attitude of a servant in humble obedience. He bowed to his Father's will and became the slave of all mankind. Not even when he was faced with the worst imaginable death did he hold on to his place as the Son of Elohim but he gave himself over to death in humble obedience.

These two opposing choices also had opposite consequences. When the first Adam considered his godlikeness something to be grasped he fell into sin, lost his position, and began his descent to death's destruction. However, when the second Adam declined any personal advantages of his godlikeness, through his suffering and death he was acknowledged by Heaven as a perfect man and was therefore exalted, made divine, and placed in creation's highest position far above all others.

The text in Philippians 2 can therefore not be used as proof claiming that the Son existed in some sort of "god-state" before he became man. It speaks only of what took place after Yeshua was borne of a woman. In this sense he is our great example. We can have the same mentality as he did, (v. 5).

Notice that it is written in verse 10 that every knee shall bow *in Yeshua's name*.³⁴ It is therefore not before Yeshua that knees will bow, but before the Father *in Yeshua's name*. Through the name of Yeshua we have access to the Father (compare with John 16:23-24). He is the path that goes from man to the Eternal. That every knee shall bow in the name of Yeshua therefore means that all will come to bow before the Eternal through Yeshua. It also means that all will acknowledge the fact that the Eternal has delegated all authority to Yeshua. This way, it is not primarily Yeshua who is exalted but the Father, as it is written,

...to the glory of God the Father.

It is therefore before the Father that all knees will bow and it is the Father who is honored when they bow in Yeshua's name and acknowledge that he has been given the position as Lord, Adon.

The quote that Paul uses here from the words written in Isaiah 45:23-24 affirm this³⁵,

*By myself have I sworn, the word is gone forth from my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, **that to me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear.** Only in the LORD, it is said of me, is righteousness and strength; even to him shall men come; and all those who were incensed against him shall be disappointed. (HNV)*

Through the ministry of the Messiah Yeshua, all forms of idolatry will be wiped out from the earth. Then all will bow their knees before the Eternal through Yeshua who is the way to Him. This is why is written that it will be done *in Yeshua's name*.

One Swedish translation has translated the Greek word "kurios" in Philippians 2:11 as *the Lord* instead of *Lord* which looks like an inference to the Eternal's Name YHWH which is often translated and written as *LORD*. This is a very unusual and bold translation. The great majority of Bible translations write only *Lord*.

³⁴ The Greek version has the preposition "en" which is found in Acts 4:7, 10, 12, 30; Col 3:17 and more. The Peshitta text has the word "D'bashmeh" – in the name – which can only be found in Acts 4:10; 1 Cor 5:4 and Phil 2:10.

³⁵ Compare with Rom 14:11

The Greek word “kurios”³⁶ means master, governor, Lord, or owner. It comes from the word “kuros”, which means power and might. In the modern Greek language it is used as the word “mister”. In the Septuagint “kurios” is used to translate the three Hebrew words, “adon”, “Adonai”, and “YHWH”. This means that when the word “kurios” is used in the Apostolic writings we must be careful not to draw hasty conclusions concerning the translation. Since this one word in the Greek translation of three Hebrew terms, the context must decide whether it is referring to “adon”, “Adonai”, or “YHWH”. On some occasions it is unclear which of these Hebrew terms is used and then it is very important to be careful in one’s interpretation in order not to risk a mistake that would lead to a severe judgment on the day of the Eternal. This goes especially for those who are teachers of the Scriptures.

We cannot say based on the word “kurios” in the Greek texts of Philippians 2 that Yeshua is YHWH. It could just as easily mean “adon” which would concur with the word that David spoke of the Messiah in Psalm 110:1, where it is written,

*The LORD (YHWH) says to my Lord (“Adon”), “Sit at my right hand,
Until I make your enemies your footstool for your feet.” (HNV)*

According to Peter’s sermon on the day of Pentecost, Yeshua was made both Lord (“Adon/Kurios”) and Messiah by Elohim after he raised him from the dead as it is written in Acts 2:36,

Let all the house of Yisra'el therefore know assuredly that God has made him both Lord (“Adon/Kurios”) and Messiah, this Yeshua whom you crucified.

He did not own the title of “Adon” or “Messiah” in and of himself but they were given to him by Heaven.

Romans 9:3-5

*For I could wish that I myself were accursed from Messiah for my brothers’ sake, my relatives according to the flesh, who are Yisra’elites; whose is the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the service, and the promises; of whom are the fathers, and from whom is Messiah as concerning the flesh, **he who is over all, God, blessed forever. Amen.** (HNV)*

The theologian Mikael Tellbe,³⁷ himself a promoter of the trinity doctrine, writes³⁸ that there are only two instances where Paul speaks in the terms of “Jesus is God”; these two being Romans 9:5 and Titus 2:13. He goes on to say however that it is only at a first glance of Romans 9:5 that it seems as if Paul is speaking of “Jesus as God” and he points out the fact that in Paul’s day sentences were written without punctuation. This means that the text could just as well be translated like this,

...from them is the Messiah. He who is over all, God is blessed forever, amen.

Dr. Tellbe means that the second half of the verse could be an independent phrase of praise to the Father. Since this argument could go both ways, theologians are of divided opinions and “some believe it refers to Christ, others to God”. He goes on to write “the norm with Paul – and certainly

³⁶ Strong G2962 κύριος kurios *koo'-ree-as* From κύρος kuros (*supremacy*); *supreme* in authority, that is, (as noun) *controller*; by implication *Mr.* (as a respectful title): - God, Lord, master, Sir.

³⁷ Instructor of the New Testament at Örebro Teologiska Högskola.

³⁸ Mikael Tellbe, *Med framtiden i ryggen (With the Future At Your Back)*, © Libris 2002, ISBN 91-7195-619-0, p.179-180.

within Judaism – seems to be that praise is directed to God... It would therefore be quite noteworthy if Paul – who in Romans 9 directs his writings to Jewish Christians and who otherwise is so careful to differentiate between God and Christ – now ignores this distinction and in plain words speak of Jesus as God.”

According to the note of Romans 9:5 in the Swedish translation “Bibel2000” one can translate the second part of the verse in the two following ways,

*...he who is over all. God is blessed forever.*³⁹

*...God, who is over all is blessed forever.*⁴⁰

The Greek papyrus manuscript P46 “Chester Beatty Papyri” dated 180-250 CE is considered the oldest known and preserved manuscript.⁴¹ This manuscript is written in “scripto continua” which means that there is practically no punctuation or spaces between the words. In P46 there is some form of punctuation however, a handful of dots or colons above the lines, and in several instances there are small spaces in the text to make the reading easier.⁴²

In Romans 9:5 of P46 there is a period between the word *flesh* (Greek “sarx”) and *he* (Greek “ho”) which means that the person who inserted the dot there wanted to show that there is a break in the reading after the word *flesh*. The sentence that follows the period thus becomes a phrase of praise to the Eternal who is over all and not to the Messiah. This fits well with the rest of the Pauline texts which also have these typical Jewish words of praise to the Eternal, compare with Romans 1:25; 11:36; 2 Corinthians 11:31; Ephesians 3:20-21. These types of blessings are also common in rabbinic literature, especially whenever the Eternal is mentioned.

One could then translate the Greek text of P46 literally in the following manner,

*...from which the patriarchs [are] and from which the Anointed [hails] according to the flesh.
He who is over all, God, [be] blessed forever. Amen!*

The period in this ancient manuscript shows us that the text should not be read as the Messiah being God, which is the way most Christian translations have presented it.

Helge Åkesson, however, translated the verse like this,⁴³

...whom the fathers belong to and from whom Christ is according to the flesh. God, who is above all, be praised for all ages. Amen.

Hebraic-Roots Version translated the verse from the Aramaic in the following manner,

³⁹ Translation from the Swedish text that says, *han som är över allting. Gud är välsignad i evighet.*

⁴⁰ Translation from the Swedish text that says, *Gud, som är över allting, är välsignad i evighet.*

⁴¹ See <http://www.bible-researcher.com/papy46.html>,

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Papyrus_46,

<http://www.cbl.ie/getdoc/fe648b84-98d5-4f15-a681-113cdffe1850/5.aspx>,

http://wwwapp.cc.columbia.edu/ldpd/app/apis/search?mode=search&invnum_num=6238&sort=institution&resPerPage=25&action=sor t&p=1

⁴² See <http://www.lib.umich.edu/pap/k12/reading/Paul/diacritics.html>

⁴³ Translation from the Swedish text that says, *vilka fäderna tillhöra, och från vilka Kristus är efter köttet. Gud, som är över allting, vare högtlovad i tidsåldrarna. Amen.*

And the fathers from whom the Messiah was seen in the flesh. He who is Eloah who is over all, to him [be] our praises and our blessings forever and ever. Amen.

Acts 20:28

*Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed **the church of the Lord** which he purchased with **his own blood**. (ASV 1901)*

*Be on guard for yourselves and for all the flock, among which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to shepherd the **church of God** which He purchased with **His own blood**. (NASB)*

*Look after yourselves and everyone the Holy Spirit has placed in your care. Be like shepherds to **God's church**. It is the flock that he bought with the **blood of his own Son**. (Contemporary English Version)*

If we compare these English translations we will note that there is a lack to consistency as to whose the assembly is and whose blood is in question. This is the result of variations found in the different Greek manuscripts.

- *God's assembly... his own blood* – Textus Receptus
- *God's assembly... his son's blood* – Westcott-Hort
- *The Lord's assembly... his own blood* – Certain Byzantine manuscripts

The Aramaic texts also have different versions,

- *The Messiah's assembly... his own blood* - Peshitta⁴⁴ (Khaburis Codex) (This version can be found in George M. Lamsa's and John Wesley Etheridge's⁴⁵ English translation and in José L. Hernández' Spanish translation.)
- *Eloah's assembly... his own blood* – Peshitta, westernized version⁴⁶ (used for James Murdock's⁴⁷ English translation.)

How are we to explain these significant differences the Greek and Aramaic manuscripts concerning this verse? Evidently someone or several of those who copied these text has either consciously or unconsciously incorporated changes that are not found in the original. The question is which of the

⁴⁴ "The Peshitta is the official Bible of the Church of the East, whom was called the Nazarenes for some centuries in its early history. The name Peshitta in Aramaic means "Straight", in other words, the original and pure New Testament. The Peshitta is the only authentic and pure text which contains the books in the New Testament that were written in Aramaic... It includes all of the books except 2Peter; 2John; 3John; Jude and Revelation (and also the story of the woman taken in adultery in John 7:53-8:11). These books were not canonized by the Church of the East,... the words of His Holiness Mar Eshai Shimun, Catholicos Patriarch of the Church of the East, are summarized as follows: "... as the Patriarch and Head of the Holy Apostolic and Catholic Church of the East we wish to state, that the Church of the East received the scriptures from the hands of the blessed Apostles themselves in the Aramaic original, the language spoken by our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and that the Peshitta is the text of the Church of the East which has come down from the Biblical times without any change or revision."⁴⁴

The New Testament Peshitta Aramaic Text with a Hebrew Translation; Bible Society in Israel; 1986 (Peshitta text, with four of the General Epistles and Revelation from the Mosul edition of 1891).

⁴⁵ See <http://www.standardversion.org/p-eth-book-introduction.php>

⁴⁶ The western version of the Peshitta is used by the Syrian Orthodox Church and the Chaldean Orthodox Church. In their dialect it is called "Peshitto". The Peshitto is nearly identical to the version used by the Eastern Church. It has some differences in two places (Acts 20:28 and Heb 2:9). "The Peshitto is likely a revision of the Peshitta and intended to put the Peshitta text more in line with the Greek text as well as supplying the missing five books (and John 7:53-8:11)." The Syriac New Testament; British and Foreign Bible Society; 1950. The eastern version of the Peshitta is also called the Nestorian version and the western one is called Jacobite (compatible/translated from the Greek).

⁴⁷ See http://www.hebrewaramaic.org/james_murdock/

different versions of this verse is the original one. The fact that one is older than the other does not make it more reliable. It all depends on where and when the changes were made.

The important thing for us to do in this situation is to be careful when forming doctrines based on passages that have evident discrepancies in the manuscripts since we have no way of knowing which of them is the original.

Since there are different versions of the text, these versions need to be looked at in the light of the witness given by the rest of Scripture since the Eternal's doctrine is one and the same from one age to another.

Does the Eternal have blood? Is not blood something that earthly beings have? The word blood in Hebrew is "dam"⁴⁸ which is related to the word "adam" – man. The Hebrew word for earth – "adama" – is also related to "dam" – blood. Linguistically therefore, blood is strongly connected to both earth and man. Furthermore it is written in John 4:24 that Elohim is Spirit and a spirit has neither flesh, bones, nor blood. It is therefore very probable that those versions of the texts which say that Elohim has purchased his assembly with his own blood have been manipulated.

John 1:18

*No one has seen God at any time; **the only begotten God** who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him. (NASB)*

*No one has ever seen God, but **God the One and Only**, who is at the Father's side, has made him known. (NIV)*

*No one has seen God at any time. **The one and only Son**, who is in the bosom of the Father, he has declared him. (HNV)*

Here is yet another example of different versions of the texts in the Greek manuscripts. In the oldest Greek manuscripts it says "Theos" – God – while there is a greater number that read "uihos" – Son.

The Aramaic manuscripts also have different versions. The ancient Syrian text says *Son* while the Peshitta says *Eloah*.

Once again we see that the original text has been manipulated in one direction or the other. Since it is difficult to judge which text is the original, Spirit-inspired, and divine text one cannot base a doctrine on this verse. This would be to risk quoting a contaminated source.

Once again the text must be viewed in the light of the whole of Scripture. If we look at the thread of thought that is woven throughout all of Scripture it would make much more sense to say that the Son was the only begotten one, i.e. the one and only of his kind, than to say that God was begotten. Can God be born? Could the Unchanging, Eternal, Life-giving, Invisible, and Exalted One be born? This idea would be dangerously close to the pagan teachings about the births of the gods.

⁴⁸ Strong **H1818** *dâm dawm* From H1826 (compare H119); *blood* (as that which when shed causes *death*) of man or an animal; by analogy the *juice* of the grape; figuratively (especially in the plural) *bloodshed* (that is, *drops* of blood): - blood (-y, -guiltiness, [-thirsty]), + innocent.

1 Timothy 3:16

*And without argument, great is the secret of religion: **He who was seen in the flesh**, who was given God's approval in the spirit, was seen by the angels, of whom the good news was given among the nations, in whom the world had faith, who was taken up in glory. (BBE)*

*And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: **God was manifest in the flesh**, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. (KJV)*

Here is an additional example of the original text having been tampered with. Textus Receptus, among other manuscripts, has the word "Theos" – *God* – while the other Greek texts say "hos" – *who or which*. The Aramaic texts do not have Eloah here.

This verse can therefore not be used in order to claim the Messiah's divinity.

2 Thessalonians 1:12

that the name of our Lord Yeshua may be glorified in you, and you in him, according to the grace of our God and the Lord Yeshua the Messiah. (HNV)

Some translations have deviated from the majority of Christian Bible translations taken from both the Greek and Aramaic. Analytical-Literal Translation has written the verse like this,

in order that the name of our Lord Jesus {Christ} is glorified in you, and you in Him, according to the grace of our God and Lord Jesus Christ.

The International Standard Version and The New Living translation have a similar translation.

Notice that they have written here *our God and Lord Jesus Christ* instead of *of our God and **the Lord*** which gives the text the meaning of Jesus being God.

The translation *the Lord* fits better with the many instances in Paul's letters where he often mentions God, many times as the Father, and then mentions Yeshua as Lord ("Adon").⁴⁹ The Apostolic Writings are very particular not to combine these two concepts.

Titus 2:13

*looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great **God and Savior, Yeshua the Messiah** (HNV)*

*Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of **the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ** (KJV)*

According to Mikael Tellbe, whom we mentioned earlier, this is the only verse where Paul expressly states that Jesus is God according to the construction of the Greek grammar. However, in order to

⁴⁹ Rom 1:7; 5:11; 10:9; 1 Cor 1:3; 6:11; 8:6; 2 Cor 1:2; 13:14; Gal 1:3; Eph 1:2; Phil 1:2; 2:11; 1 Thess 1:1, 3; 3:11, 13; 2 Thess 1:1, 8; 2:16; 1 Tim 1:2; 2 Tim 1:2; Filem v 3. Compare with Acts 2:36; 20:21; James 1:1; 2 Pet 1:2.

come to his conclusion Tellbe has had to assume that either two or more much less obvious facts are true:

- That Paul or his secretary wrote in Greek
- That the Greek manuscripts that we have today are identical to the text that Paul originally wrote

Both of these preconceived ideas that Tellbe's reasoning is based on must be questioned. Did Paul really write in Greek? Are the Greek texts we have today faithful copies of the original that Paul wrote, assuming that he did write in Greek?

The Peshitta text has the word *and* in this verse preceding the word *savior/life-giver* which means that this verse speaks first of Eloah and secondly of the Messiah. This fits well with Paul's other similar texts. The Aramaic text therefore does not say that Yeshua is Eloah.

Tellbe's statement must therefore be brought to question both by the testimony of the remainder of Scripture as well as by the testimony of the Aramaic manuscripts.

If it is true that Paul wrote in Greek and that the text we have today is a faithful copy of what he wrote, then this text would be the one and only witness of Paul calling Yeshua Elohim, not considering the book of Hebrews. One doubtful witness is not enough to build a doctrine on, especially not if one considers belief in this doctrine necessary for the eternal salvation of one's soul. There must be at least two or three witnesses in order to establish a thing and in this case we have only one and that one is doubtful. What is more, the Aramaic text contradicts this one single witness. That means that there are two witnesses testifying of opposite things. Since they are not in agreement it is impossible to pass a conclusive judgment. The case must therefore be dropped on account of lack of conclusive proof.

The conclusion that we come to from all this is that there is not enough proof to claim that Paul believed or taught that Yeshua is God/Elohim.

In his commentary on the Jewish NT⁵⁰ David H. Stern, who himself believes in the trinity doctrine, writes that this verse does not speak of Yeshua as God but of God's Shechinah – manifest glory – which at the same time is our Redeemer, Yeshua the Messiah. He ties this verse with Hebrews 1:3 where it is written that the Son is the radiance of the Shechinah. He says that those who claim that this verse expressly speaks of Jesus' divinity are forcing the idea into a passage in the Bible which is not dealing with this subject. He adds that Jesus' divinity is not clearly stated in the New Testament but can only be found there by reading between the lines.

If this is the case, why has this become a matter crucial for salvation? Ought not salvation to be based upon clear statements that cannot be misunderstood in any way? Is this not rather a case of the church wanting monopoly of its special interpretation thus having control over the Scriptures and people's souls? If the Bible does not contain a clearly expressed trinity doctrine, then why is it so important to declare as heretics and in every manner silence and do away with those who dare question it? Does not this only serve to prove that there are other forces at work behind this teaching than those that flow from a pure love for the truth of the Scriptures and the Spirit who

⁵⁰ See David H. Stern, *Jewish New Testament Commentary*, page 656.

inspired them? Our Master teaches that by the fruit we will know the tree. What is the fruit that the trinity doctrine has produced throughout the course of church history? Does not this fruit speak of what kind of spirit lies behind this doctrine?

If the Scriptures do not contain a clear statement of the trinity doctrine, why is it that this doctrine is used as a weapon and a reason to create enmity between spiritual brothers and sisters? Do we not have freedom enough to read for ourselves what the Scriptures teach concerning this and to draw our own conclusions without being labeled one way or another? Why has this become such a crucial subject when the Scriptures do not mention it? This very fact ought to cause us to stop and question the spirit behind it?

I am convinced that we are dealing with a spiritual principality, the same principality that was behind the trinity doctrines of the false religions in the nations around Israel. The teaching of a triune god was found in Egypt and other heathen kingdoms long before the harlot system incorporated it into Christianity. These spiritual forces then came in and took over the Christian church and now the results of this doctrine speak for themselves. Just the fact that many of those who read this book are very upset by my questioning the trinity doctrine proves how strongly rooted this principality is in Christian circles.

Hebrews 1

God, having in the past spoken to the fathers through the prophets at many times and in various ways, has at the end of these days spoken to us by his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds. His Son is the radiance of his glory, the very image of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself made purification for our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; having become so much better than the angels, as he has inherited a more excellent name than they have. For to which of the angels did he say at any time,

*“You are my Son,
Today have I become your father?”
and again,*

*“I will be to him a Father,
And he will be to me a Son?”*

*Again, when he brings in the firstborn into the world he says,
“Let all the angels of God worship him.” Of the angels he says,
“Who makes his angels winds,
And his servants a flame of fire.”*

but of the Son he says,

“Your throne, O God, is forever and ever;

The scepter of uprightness is the scepter of your kingdom.

You have loved righteousness, and hated iniquity;

Therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness above your fellows.”

And,

“You, Lord, in the beginning, laid the foundation of the earth.

The heavens are the works of your hands.

They will perish, but you continue.

*They all will grow old like a garment does.
As a mantle you will roll them up,
And they will be changed;
But you are the same.
Your years will not fail.”
But of which of the angels has he said at any time,
“Sit at my right hand,
Until I make your enemies the footstool of your feet?”
Aren’t they all ministering spirits, sent out to do service for the sake of those who will inherit
salvation? (HNV)*

In order to understand this chapter correctly, we must understand three foundational facts:

- The letter to the Hebrews was written to Jews who were very familiar with the Jewish Scriptures and their different levels of interpretation.
- The letter was not penned in Greek but in Hebrew.
- The first four verses are a summarization of what is laid out in the rest of the chapter.

The letter to the Hebrews was written to Jews – possibly to the Essenes – who were very well versed in the different levels of interpretation found in the Hebrew Scriptures. This means that much of what is written in this letter can easily be misunderstood by those who are not familiar with Jewish reasoning and concepts. This letter is often misused by ignorant people to speak of the Levite priesthood as opposed to the heavenly priesthood, the bloody animal sacrifices versus the Messiah’s bloody sacrifice on Golgotha, the law versus the renewed covenant, etc. For Jews who understand the different levels of interpretation and have a deeper understanding of the revealed Word, these things are not considered as being one *or* the other, but and one *and* the other. It is a matter of *both* the Levite priesthood *and* the heavenly ministry according to the order of Malki-Tzedek, *both* animal sacrifices *and* the Messiah’s sacrifice, *both* the earlier *and* the renewed covenants. This means that the higher levels of interpretation do not cancel out the lower. The lower levels are there in order for us to understand the higher levels, but the higher are more important (compare with John 3:12).

According to the writings of the church fathers, the letter to the Hebrews was first written in Hebrew and was later translated to Greek. In the 4th century, Eusebius referred to a lost manuscript written by Clemens of Alexandria around year 200 CE. This is his quote of that text,

In the text called *Hypotyposes*, he (Clemens of Alexandria) has given us the summarized description of all the canonized Scriptures. He affirms that the letter to the Hebrews was written by Paul in the Hebrew language, and also that most likely it was translated by Luke and published among the Greeks.⁵¹

Eusebius himself wrote,

⁵¹ Clemens of Alexandria, *Hypotyposes* (circa 200 CE, quoted by Eusebius in Eccl.Hist. 6:14:2).

Since Paul wrote to the Hebrews in the language of his native land, some say that the evangelist Luke, other say that Clemens, translated the letter.⁵²

Jeronimus wrote,

He [Paul] who was a Hebrew wrote in very eloquent Hebrew, which was his native tongue, and the things that were eloquently written in Hebrew were even more elaborately translated into Greek.⁵³

Since this letter was originally written in Hebrew, most likely by Paul, one must be careful when looking at the Aramaic or Greek texts. Translations have flaws, no matter how good they are, and therefore there is always a risk of misunderstandings when reading them. We ought to be careful and humble when trying to understand this letter.

The first four verses summarize what is laid out in the rest of the chapter. Paul begins by describing the Son's relationship to the Father in short and then goes on to elaborate on this relationship with proof from Scripture passages that speak to the world of interpretation and theological concepts that the readers lived in. That means that if we go through the text word for word we must ask ourselves what each term meant according to the thought pattern and theology of the recipients of the letter.

Let us look into the text:

According to the HNV, verses 1-2 read,

*God, having in the past spoken to the fathers through the prophets at many times and in various ways, has at the end of these days **spoken to us by his Son**, whom he appointed heir of all things, **through whom also he made the worlds.***

Looking at these verses in a previous chapter, we saw that the Eternal did not speak to the people of Israel through the Son in the past, but only through the prophets. Since the Son had come, he now speaks through him as well.

This is the first instance in this text where we must understand the concepts as being *both and* rather than *instead of*. The messages of the prophets have not stopped speaking to us now that the Son has come. There are hundreds of prophecies given through Moshe and other prophets that have not yet been fulfilled so it would be completely erroneous to believe that since the Son has now come, the Eternal no longer speaks to us through the prophets. The Son himself spoke from the prophets and showed how they spoke of him (Luke 24:26-27). Furthermore, there are several examples in the Apostolic Writings of the Eternal speaking to the assembly through the prophets that ministered after Yeshua had come. One does not cancel out the other.

Note that it says that *God* spoke through his Son. Elohim, therefore, is the Father who has spoken through his Son, his primary representative. It was not the Son who spoke, but the Father who spoke through the Son.

The Son is, as stated, the main purpose for all of creation. That is why the Eternal had the Son in mind as he created everything. For this reason it is written that he created everything through him.

⁵² Clemens of Alexandria, *Hypotyposes* (circa 200 CE, quoted by Eusebius in Eccl.Hist. 6:14:2).

⁵³ Jeronimus (4th century) *Lives of Illustrious Men*, Book V.

As we said earlier, the Son is not the Creator, but rather a channel, a master plan by which the Eternal created the world. We need this truth as a background in order to understand what is written in verses 10-12 which are quotes from Psalm 102:26-28,

*Of old, you laid the foundation of the earth.
The heavens are the work of your hands.
They will perish, but you will endure.
Yes, all of them will wear out like a garment.
You will change them like a cloak, and they will be changed.
But you are the same.
Your years will have no end.*

Notice that the word *Lord* is not in the Hebrew text of Psalm 102:25. The Greek version of Hebrews quotes almost literally the Septuagint translation of Psalm 102 where the word “*Kurios*” – *Lord* – is found. In the Aramaic text, the word for Lord is not in Hebrews 1:10 which shows us that the Aramaic text is not translated from the Greek but is based on the Hebrew text in Psalm 102.

This Psalm is a cry to the Eternal for help and rescue from a person in need. This is followed by the answer to the cry of the man in need when it speaks of the Eternal intervening and having compassion on Zion, (v. 13). All nations will fear the name of the Eternal and all the kings of the earth his glory when he rebuilds Zion and reveals himself in his glory (which is a picture of a restored political kingdom in the land of Israel with the twelve restored tribes of Israel, v. 16).

In Psalm 102:18, it is written,

*This will be written for the generation to come.
A people which will be created will praise the LORD. (HNV)*

In the Hebrew it literally says *a last generation*. This Psalm is speaking of the time of the Messiah’s second coming. It describes how the Eternal looks down from heaven and delivers the children of death so that his name will be proclaimed in Jerusalem when all nations will gather to serve the Eternal (v. 19-22).

It is in this context that is clearly speaking of the Messiah’s return that we find the verses of Psalm 102 that is quoted in Hebrews 1 and which refer to the Son.

Psalm 102 speaks of the time of the Messiah’s second coming when the Eternal will judge the earth through him. He is the Eternal’s servant and highest representative. When the Son comes, it is the Eternal who is coming through him. He is coming in the Eternal’s Name. With this in the background along with what we learned earlier through the Hebrew Scriptures, it makes more sense to interpret this quote as an acknowledgement by the Eternal who is coming through his representative to establish his kingdom on the earth than to say that the entire quote concerns the Son.

I must admit however that this is one of the texts in the Apostolic Writings that are difficult to understand and that seem to present the Son as the Creator. Yet if we look first at verse 2 where it says that Elohim created through the Son we must understand the following text within the frame of this relationship in order for all the pieces to fit. First of all the text is speaking of the Father but it is

also speaking of the Son since he was in the plans before creation and will exist through eternity after the heavens have been consumed with fire. This is therefore a matter of “*both and*”. In the next chapter we will speak more about how the Son carries the Eternal’s name and how Scripture passages that are clear references to the Father are used about the Messiah in the Apostolic Writings.

Hebrews 1:3 says,

His Son is the radiance of his glory, the very image of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself made purification for our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high

This verse is speaking of the Son’s present position after the resurrection when he was made divine and was delegated the power to rule all by his word.

In the Peshitta text this reads “*the image of his being*”. The word *image* in Aramaic is “*salma*” and it comes from the Hebrew word “*tzelem*” – image – that is found in Genesis 1:26-27.⁵⁴ In the Greek text it is the word “*charakter*”⁵⁵ – engraving, etching – that is used. The Greek word that is translated as “*being*” is “*hupostasis*”⁵⁶ which means foundation, substance.⁵⁷

Notice that it says that the Son sits on the right hand of the Majesty on high, not that he himself is the Majesty. The expression “*right hand*” is a Jewish expression describing delegated authority and representation and it ought not to be understood as a geographical location.

The letter to the Hebrews goes on to establish that after the resurrection and glorification, the Son received a much higher position than the angels. It says that he *has become* much greater than the angels. In other words, this is something that before the resurrection he was not. Earlier we mentioned that the Son had a position lower than the angels before he was glorified (Heb 2:7). The expression *You are my son, today I have begotten you*, is a reference to the resurrection (Acts 13:33; Heb 5:5). Only after the resurrection did he inherit the name that is much higher than the angels and then he received all power in heaven and on earth. This is therefore not speaking of the Son as some form of higher being than the angels, but of his position of authority. It is in this context we find the quotes from Psalms.

In Hebrews 1:8-9, it is written,

*but of the Son he says,
“Your throne, O God, is forever and ever;
The scepter of uprightness is the scepter of your kingdom.
You have loved righteousness, and hated iniquity;
Therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness above your fellows.”*

This is a quote from Psalm 45 which is a wedding song for the king of Israel.

⁵⁴ Variations of the same Aramaic word are found in Matt 22:20; Mark 12:16; Acts 19:35; Rom 1:23; Rev 13:14, 15; 14:9, 11; 15:2; 16:2; 19:20; 20:4.

⁵⁵ Strong G5481 χαρακτήρ, charaktēr, *khar-ak-tar'*, From the same as G5482; a *graver* (the tool or the person), that is, (by implication) *engraving* (["character"], the *figure* stamped, that is, an exact *copy* or [figuratively] *representation*): - express image.

⁵⁶ Strong G5287 ὑπόστασις hupostasis, *hoop-os'-tas-is*, From a compound of G5259 and G2476; a *setting under* (*support*), that is, (figuratively) concretely *essence*, or abstractly *assurance* (objectively or subjectively): - confidence, confident, person, substance.

⁵⁷ The word occurs in 2 Cor 9:4; 11:17; Heb 1:3; 3:14; 11:1

In Psalm 45:1-2 it says,

*My heart overflows with a noble theme.
I recite my verses for the **king**.
My tongue is like the pen of a skillful writer.
You are the most excellent of the **sons of men**.
Grace has anointed your lips,
Therefore God has blessed you forever. (HNV)*

This Psalm speaks of a king among the sons of men, i.e. a human, whom Elohim has blessed forever. First of all, this psalm speaks of one of the kings of Israel. However, in a prophetic dimension it is referring to the Messiah. This is therefore once again a matter of *both and*.

It is interesting to note in this context that the term "Elohim" is used in the Hebrew text when speaking of the king of Israel at his wedding. We have seen earlier how human judges have the title "Elohim" and this is once again emphasized in this Psalm. Since this psalm is referring to the Messiah, and especially to the great event when the wedding of the Lamb will be celebrated in the age to come (see context in Psalm 45), the title "Elohim" becomes very special proof that after the resurrection the Messiah will be given the honor to reign as highest judge, far above all angels.

This is however not proof that he should be Elohim in the absolute sense of the word as is confirmed by the words *Therefore **God, your God**, has anointed you...* To me it seems unreasonable to both *be* God and to *have* a God. How many gods are there? Only one, according to the Scriptures. The Son could therefore not both *be* the individual who is Elohim in the absolute definition of the word while at the same time *having* an Elohim since this would make him into two individuals, two Gods (compare with John 20:17). On the other hand, he could very well be given the title "Elohim" as highest regent over this creation while at the same time having the Eternal as his Elohim. This is in line with the witness given by the rest of Scripture, as we have seen in the previous chapters.

We can therefore conclude this section by saying that Hebrews chapter 1 is not speaking of the Son's identity as Elohim/God in the absolute definition, but it points out his position of authority over the angels and creation that he was given by the Eternal after he was raised from the dead. The text in Psalm 102 speaks of the creation of everything and how the Creator will remain even though all of creation is destroyed. This truth applies to the Son as well who is the channel by which the Eternal created everything and who will be the same also after heaven and earth is destroyed by fire.

2 Peter 1:1

*Shim`on Peter, a servant and apostle of Yeshua the Messiah, to those who have obtained a like precious faith with us in the righteousness of **our God and Savior, Yeshua the Messiah** (HNV)*

*Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of **God and our Saviour Jesus Christ** (KJV)*

Notice that only in one of the translations does it say that Jesus Christ is both *God and Savior*. In the other version *God and Savior* are separate. This is because once again the Greek manuscripts do not

line up with each other. If we go to the Aramaic text we see that the word *God* is not there at all but the word for *Lord* is there instead, as it is written,

...our Lord and Redeemer Yeshua the Messiah's righteousness. (my own translation.)

This verse can therefore not be used as proof to claim that Peter considered Yeshua to be Elohim/God in the ultimate sense.

1 John 5:20

We know that the Son of God has come, and has given us an understanding, that we know him who is true, and we are in him who is true, in his Son Yeshua the Messiah. This is the true God, and eternal life. (HNV)

The phrase about he who is "*the true God*" is a reference to the earlier phrase "*him who is true*" whose son is Yeshua the Messiah, in other words it is the Father who is the true Elohim and the eternal life (compare with John 17:3).

There are not two or three witnesses in the writings of the apostles which say that Elohim/God could be anything other than the Father or could include another person other than the Father. There are, however, many witnesses that claim the opposite. In their writings, the apostles express an absolute monotheism where the Father is spoken of as Elohim/God and Yeshua as Lord ("Adon").

In 1 Corinthians 8:5-7a, it is written,

*For though there are things that are called "gods," whether in the heavens or on earth; as there are many "gods" and many "lords;" yet to us there **is one God, the Father**, of whom are all things, and we for him; and **one Lord, Yeshua the Messiah**, through whom are all things, and we live through him. However, that knowledge isn't in all men.* (HNV)

Another passage that testifies to absolute monotheism is John 17:3, where it is written,

*This is eternal life, that they should know **you, the only true God, and him whom you sent, Yeshua the Messiah.*** (HNV)

If Paul would have believed in the trinity doctrine that was developed several hundred years after his death, he would have opened his letters by writing,

*Grace be with you and peace from God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit.
Amen.*

However, since neither Paul nor any of the other apostles believed in a triune Elohim/God, we find no traces of any such mixture in their writings.

The fact that hundreds and even thousands of years later, people try to read doctrines into their writings and find traces of things construed is another matter. If, on the other hand, we are honest seekers of truth and read their writings without any preconceived notions of the trinity doctrine, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to come to any such conclusion. The fact that the Father, the Spirit

and Yeshua are all mentioned in their writings does not constitute proof that there is any type of trinity. An honest Bible reader and Bible researcher can easily see that the trinity doctrine is not at the foundation of the Apostolic Writings.

Problems arise with passages that seem to emphasize divinity in Yeshua. However, since the Greek and Aramaic manuscripts show that the original text has been manipulated, specifically in those passages, we should in all honesty suspect that there have been powerful forces at work in church establishment that have incorporated such changes into the manuscripts, changes that in turn have made it possible to make out a doctrine of a double or triune God in the consecrated Scriptures. Many of the manuscripts that we have now testify of how the great harlot has manipulated the Word of the Eternal in order to make it fit with the concepts of the surrounding pagan religions which had strongly expressed beliefs in trinity. The Roman church, which in the Scriptures is described as a harlot, has always flirted with the religions of the world and incorporated beliefs and rituals that existed in the surrounding religions. The Bible calls the harlot Babylon. The name Babylon comes from the Hebrew "bavel" which means "mixture". This religion is truly a mixture of true Judaism with all kinds of paganism, including the trinity doctrine. That is why the Apostolic Writings, which were given to and through the Jewish people, were distorted by a harlot system that has in all insolent self-exaltation not shied away from changing the Eternal's Words according to its own criteria. By doing this the harlot system has mixed the clean with the unclean, divine revelation with the doctrines of demons, truth with lies, creating a confused people who are led astray to believe that salvation is found in doctrines that cannot be found in the original manuscripts of the revealed Word, including the Apostolic Writings which have erroneously been called the "New Testament".