

November 2019

Frank W. Nelte

## **JESUS CHRIST HAS ALWAYS EXISTED WITH GOD THE FATHER**

In a recent article I talked about **the introduction of heresies** into God's Church by the leadership that succeeded Mr. Armstrong. When we come down to it, the introduction of all such heretical ideas is always presented more or less the same way. And that is as follows:

- 1) There are clear biblical statements that explain the correct teaching (e.g. Jesus Christ has always existed with God the Father, God is creating a Family, etc.), which teaching the Church understands correctly.
- 2) The heretical teaching (e.g. Jesus Christ was created by God the Father, the trinity, etc.) in opposition to this correct teaching is then based on either mistranslations, or on misinterpreting specific scriptural statements.
- 3) The **numerous Scriptures** that contradict the heretical teaching that is being introduced **then have to be disproved** by those who wish to introduce the heresy into the Church, if the heresy is to attract followers.

At that point, when clear scriptural statements that contradict the heresy need to be dealt with, it becomes clear whether those either introducing or endorsing the heresy are sincere and themselves deceived, or whether they know better and are in fact hypocritical. **When those responsible actually know better, then they are in fact brazen liars** in their efforts to get God's people to accept some heresies.

Here is the way to know whether those seeking to establish heretical teachings are themselves sincerely deceived, or whether they know better and are deviously hypocritical. The criterion is always:

### **How do they deal with the Scriptures that contradict their heretical teaching?**

**Those who are genuinely deceived themselves, and who themselves believe that the heretical teaching is correct, will approach all the Scriptures openly and honestly. They will actually appeal to those specific Scriptures to support their position, because they don't yet understand that the Scriptures they are appealing to in actual fact destroy their positions. So people in this group will freely present such relevant Scriptures.**

When it is pointed out to them that the very Scriptures they are presenting in fact contradict the teaching these men seek to introduce, then **they are genuinely caught off guard!** They had not understood the obvious implications of the Scriptures they themselves have quoted. You know, that's what Paul meant when he said that "the things of God knows no man but (by) the spirit of God" (see 1 Corinthians 2:11), that without God's spirit people don't grasp the correct meanings. So then they come to understand the real implications of the Scriptures they themselves have presented. And then they have a decision to make: **either** to accept that the heresy is wrong and that it needs to be rejected, **or** to double down and to look for ways to discredit the Scriptures that contradict their heretical ideas.

On the other hand, **those who from the beginning know that the Scriptures contradict their teaching**, but who seek to introduce their heretical ideas into the Church anyway, will invariably have a devious approach to the Scriptures. That devious approach is always **an attempt to disprove the**

**Scriptures!** They don't care what those specific (and correctly translated) Scriptures actually mean. They don't care about how those Scriptures impact on our understanding of God's laws and God's way of life.

No, all they care about is trying to prove that these Scriptures supposedly don't mean what they say in plain words.

They never make any attempt to prove what those very same Scriptures do mean. Who cares what those Scriptures mean? Important is that they supposedly don't mean what they say. The obvious meaning must at all costs be argued against. The obvious meaning can't possibly be correct, is their argument.

**When you see that approach towards Scriptures that challenge their beliefs, then you should realize that you are dealing with hypocritical minds.**

When people try to argue away the Scriptures that disprove their ideas, then you should know that you are dealing with people who handle the Scriptures **deceitfully**. And those who handle the Scriptures deceitfully will die the second death (see Revelation 21:8).

The Apostle Peter pointed out that there are people who twist Paul's writings just as much as they twist other Scriptures.

As also in all *his* (Paul's) epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which (epistles) are some things hard to be understood, **which they** that are unlearned and unstable **wrest, as they do also the other scriptures**, unto their own destruction. (2 Peter 3:16)

"Wrest" here means "twist, pervert". And "unto their own destruction" means that they will be destroyed in the lake of fire. The point for us to understand is that **people who knowingly twist the Scriptures**, to uphold some heretical ideas, will be burned up in the lake of fire. Such people cannot be trusted by God. They have to be destroyed.

And when someone argues **against** the obvious meaning of a correctly translated Scripture, with a disdain for what that Scripture actually does mean, then that person is being hypocritical and devious.

So after Mr. Armstrong's death the new leadership in the Church very deviously introduced heresy after heresy. For example, the trinity teaching was introduced with this negative approach to the Scriptures, arguing against the actual scriptural statements that disprove the trinity.

In this present article here I want to focus on **another heretical teaching** that has already affected several hundred people, if not more, amongst those who were a part of God's Church. **This teaching likewise relies on arguing against the Scriptures**, deviously trying to do away with statements that expose it as a heretical teaching. And that heretical idea is the claim that Jesus Christ was created by God the Father. That is what I want to discuss in this article.

## **THE HERETICAL CLAIM**

The Scriptures show in an unmistakable way that Jesus Christ has always existed with God the Father. The Scriptures show that Jesus Christ is the One who, at the Father's instructions, created everything that has been created, as well as creating everyone who has been created.

Specifically, there is nothing created in existence today that was not created by Jesus Christ. And there is no created spirit being in existence today who was not created by Jesus Christ. The Scriptures make no provision for Jesus Christ Himself to be a created being, none whatsoever.

Now the heretical claim is that **Jesus Christ was supposedly created by God the Father**. In other words, **Jesus Christ supposedly had a beginning**. Jesus Christ is supposedly just one of many other "sons of God" that God the Father supposedly created at some point.

To say that Jesus Christ was created by God the Father is a heresy that is extremely offensive to Jesus Christ. By "heresy" I mean: a teaching that is contrary to the truth. This heresy is typical of the devious ways that Satan seeks to discredit Jesus Christ's status and position. And it is an offense against Jesus Christ that will not go unpunished.

Those people who assert that Jesus Christ is only a created Being commonly identify themselves as "unitarians", believing that only God the Father has always existed. For the record, those who teach that Jesus Christ was created by God the Father fall into at least two different groups.

1) There are those who teach that Jesus Christ did not exist before His human birth as a baby. In other words, these people deny that Jesus Christ existed during Old Testament times.

2) Then there are those people who teach that God the Father created Jesus Christ at the same time as God the Father supposedly created all of the angels. These people claim that Jesus Christ was just one of the many "sons of God" in Old Testament times. These people teach that the Hebrew name "YHVH" applies only to God the Father, and that in Old Testament times Jesus Christ was supposedly **"the angel of YHVH"**. Christ was supposedly just a created angel before His earthly ministry.

So one group claims that Jesus Christ did not exist during Old Testament times. And the other group acknowledges that Jesus Christ did exist during Old Testament times, but they believe that God the Father had created Him along with all the angels at an earlier time.

Now there are many Scriptures that contradict both of these heretical claims, and shortly we'll look at a large number of those Scriptures. And when we examine those Scriptures you should recognize that unitarians take this very negative approach to dealing with all of these Scriptures. **They always seek to prove what these Scriptures supposedly don't mean.**

That approach is a giveaway that **those people know** that all these Scriptures contradict their particular belief, and therefore the only thing they can do is **try to destroy the credibility of the verses** that contradict their teaching.

That is devious! And for that attitude God will surely punish them.

Before they realized that many Scriptures contradict their teaching, they in some cases were actually willing to examine all these Scriptures. But once they realized that these Scriptures refute their ideas, then their attitude towards these Scriptures changed dramatically. Now all they are interested in is trying to assert that all these verses don't really mean anything at all, and certainly not what they seem to be saying so clearly.

Now several hundred people, if not more, have already been snared into accepting these heretical and highly offensive ideas. Each one of us should be armed to emphatically refute these false teachings, if we are ever confronted with these heretical and very offensive ideas.

While some of the following Scriptures apply more to one of these two versions of Unitarianism, many of

the following Scriptures apply to both groups. So now let's consider some Scriptures that unitarians need to deal with in a negative way, i.e. the way they deal with Scriptures when they know that a positive approach to all these Scriptures will blow their heretical ideas clear out of the water.

The following Scriptures are not in any particular order.

### **BEFORE ABRAHAM**

Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, **Before Abraham was, I am.** (John 8:58)

That is a clear statement. Christ said that He had existed before Abraham. This should be all that is needed to dismiss all those who claim that Christ had not existed before New Testament times. The other group, who believe Christ was created earlier along with all the angels, is not affected by this Scripture.

So can the first group explain what this Scripture **does** mean? Or is all they can do focused on trying to prove what this Scripture supposedly **does not** mean? If it supposedly does not mean that Jesus Christ already existed before Abraham was born, what does it mean? Or is it a meaningless statement?

### **SATAN'S FALL**

And He said unto them, **I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven.** (Luke 10:18)

When did Satan fall as lightning from heaven: before or after the creation of Adam and Eve? It could not have been after the creation of man. It had to be before God created Adam and Eve, because Satan was already on Earth as a deceiver when Adam and Eve were in the Garden.

In the previous Scripture Jesus Christ claimed to have existed before the time of Abraham. Now Jesus Christ goes even further back, and claims to have existed before the creation of mankind.

Okay, so how does group one explain this Scripture away? This Scripture still does not challenge the position of group two. But we are now going back into pre-history, i.e. before human beings were created.

### **THE GLORY**

And now, O Father, glorify You Me with Your own self with **the glory which I had with You before the world was.** (John 17:5)

Two things to notice here. Firstly, Jesus Christ is boldly asking God the Father to give Him the identical glory that God the Father has right now, and has always had. **No created being would ever dare** to approach God the Father and then say: I want You to give me the same glory that You have.

The principle here should be obvious!

**Only someone who is also God, someone who has the same traits and attributes as God the Father Himself could ever say this to God the Father. If Jesus Christ had not existed as a God Being before the creation of Adam, then this request in John 17:5 would have amounted to the same sin that Satan is guilty of. Recall that Satan had said, amongst other things:**

I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; **I will be like the most High.** (Isaiah 14:14)

For that attitude Satan will be punished for all future eternity. But that is exactly what Jesus Christ was saying in John 17:5, that He, Jesus Christ, wanted to be like God the Father, with the same glory.

Satan had also said:

For you have said in your heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: **I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north:** (Isaiah 14:13)

For that attitude Satan will be punished forever. But Jesus Christ had the same desire ... to sit with God the Father on the Father's throne.

To him that overcomes will I grant to sit with Me in My throne, **even as I** also overcame, and **am set down with My Father in His throne.** (Revelation 3:21)

Only someone who Himself is also God can possibly ever sit with God the Father on the Father's throne! That is a principle that can never be violated!

No created being can ever, ever sit on the throne of God the Father! Revelation 3:21 is **absolute proof that Jesus Christ was God** during Old Testament times and also before the creation of this universe. Anyone who attempts to negatively explain away that **the God-attribute** is required for anyone to sit on the Father's throne understands nothing about the mind of God, never mind deliberately trying to explain away an "uncomfortable" Scripture.

**Why would God the Father ever want to share His supreme position with someone whom God had created? That idea is absurd! It is one thing for those in the first resurrection to share the throne of Jesus Christ, who Himself had also lived as a human being. And Jesus Christ's throne is on a lower level than the throne of God the Father. The throne of God the Father can only be occupied by individuals who have always been God.**

Secondly, let's note that Jesus Christ asserted that **He had possessed this glory with the Father before the creation of mankind.** Anyone who has "the glory of God" must also be God. It is impossible to have the glory of God without actually being God! In this verse the Greek word translated as "world" is "kosmos", which refers to the creation of mankind.

So Christ was saying: restore to Me My God Being status, which I had with You before the creation of mankind. This statement means that Jesus Christ had been God in the past! And it means that being glorified as a God Being after His resurrection was not something new for Jesus Christ.

Further, when Jesus Christ said that He had shared in God the Father's glory **before the creation of mankind**, then this means that Jesus Christ had shared the Father's glory **before He became the Messiah.** In other words, **being glorified** by God the Father **was not some kind of reward** for having lived a sinless life, and for the monumental responsibility Christ had fulfilled in giving His own life for all our sins. Being glorified and receiving the God Being status was simply a matter of God the Father **giving back** to Jesus Christ something Jesus Christ had voluntarily surrendered for a while, in order to live a human life.

When it comes to "glory", consider what the Apostle Paul explained:

There is **one glory** of the sun, and **another glory** of the moon, and **another glory** of the stars: for *one* star differs from *another* star in glory. (1 Corinthians 15:41)

Paul explained that there are different categories of glory. And no star has the same glory as the sun.

The point is: **none of the angels have the same glory as God the Father**. They have a different glory from the glory possessed by God the Father. And anyone with a different glory cannot possibly sit with God the Father on the Father's throne. You can't have two different categories of glory sitting on the Father's throne, because that would lower the value of God's throne.

But Jesus Christ claimed the same category of glory as the Father, and He also claimed the right to sit with God the Father on the Father's throne, both of which attributes are restricted to God Beings. **Therefore the only possibility** here is that Jesus Christ has also always been God together with God the Father. And for that reason He can claim access to the Father's glory and also access to the right to sit on the Father's throne together with God the Father.

**The principle involved in sharing the Father's glory and the Father's throne requires Jesus Christ to have always existed together with God the Father as a God Being. Nothing less is possible.**

But unitarians will no doubt argue against that. And it will undoubtedly be negative arguing. So let's move on.

### **WHO SPOKE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT?**

- In Genesis 2:16 YHVH Elohim **spoke** to Adam.
- In Genesis 4:6 YHVH **spoke** to Cain.
- In Genesis 6:13 Elohim **spoke** to Noah.
- In Genesis 12:1-3 YHVH **had spoken** to Abram.
- In Genesis 22:1 Elohim **spoke** to Abraham.
- In Genesis 26:24 YHVH **spoke** to Isaac.
- In Genesis 28:13 YHVH appeared to Jacob and **spoke** to Jacob.
- In this last verse YHVH identified Himself as YHVH Elohim.
- In Exodus 3: 4-6 YHVH Elohim **spoke** with Moses.
- In fact YHVH Elohim **spoke** very many times with Moses.
- In Exodus 20 YHVH Elohim **spoke** to the whole nation of Israel.
- In Exodus 33:19-23 YHVH **spoke** to Moses, **and Moses saw** "the shape of YHVH" from the back.

This is a very small sample of the many Scriptures that show that YHVH or Elohim or YHVH Elohim repeatedly spoke to various human beings. And it is always the same God Being, whether He is identified as YHVH or as Elohim or as YHVH Elohim. And when YHVH Elohim spoke to various human beings, then **they very obviously heard His voice!**

In addition **Moses** was given the privilege **to see the shape of YHVH Elohim**, albeit only from behind.

None of the above Scriptures are difficult to understand. None of them require any convoluted

explanations. We just need to read them at face value. Two irrefutable facts are:

1) **Many people** in the O.T. actually **heard the voice of the God of the Old Testament**, who identified Himself as either YHVH or as Elohim or as YHVH Elohim.

2) And **Moses** actually **saw the shape of the God of the Old Testament**.

In each case the God Being identified Himself with either one or two different names or titles. Those two names/titles are YHVH and Elohim. In none of these Scriptures does the Being claim to be an angel.

Now you also know what Jesus Christ said in John 5:37.

And **the Father** Himself, who has sent Me, has borne witness of Me. **You have neither heard His voice at any time, nor seen His shape.** (John 5:37)

This statement by Jesus Christ means that God the Father Himself had **never** at any time during the Old Testament interacted with any human beings! John 5:37 proves that God the Father could not possibly have been the God of the Old Testament, because the God of the Old Testament had repeatedly spoken to human beings, and in one instance Moses had even seen His shape.

John 5:37 is proof that Jesus Christ was the God who dealt with human beings during Old Testament times.

### **GOD DOES NOT LOOK LIKE AN ANGEL**

Notice something Jesus Christ said to Philip.

Philip said unto Him, Lord, show us the Father, and it suffices us. Jesus said unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet have you not known Me, Philip? **he that has seen Me has seen the Father;** and how say you *then*, Show us the Father? (John 14:8-9)

Now the point is this: **no created angel looks like God the Father!** No angel would ever be able to say: if you have seen me, then you have also seen God the Father. That's because if we were to see any created spirit being, we most certainly have not yet seen what God the Father looks like.

**The only individual who could possibly make this statement is someone who was also of the same "kind" as God the Father. And the Father is of the "God kind". Therefore only someone who is also of the "God kind" could possibly say: if you have seen Me, then you have also seen God the Father.**

Jesus Christ's statement in John 14:9 proves that Jesus Christ cannot possibly be a created being, because no created being could possibly make such a statement.

### **TWO DISTINCT BEINGS**

**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.** (John 1:1-2)

People want to argue about all kinds of things here. But the issue really is this:

The Apostle John was obviously trying to communicate some information to his readers. So we need to ask ourselves: **what was John trying to tell us?** A few verses later John wrote "and the Word was

made flesh" (John 1:14).

Forget about all the garbage arguments about what "logos" does mean and doesn't mean. The point is: **John wanted to talk about Jesus Christ!** Is there anyone who doubts that intention? Is there anyone who doubts that John was referring to Jesus Christ when he used the expression "the Word" (i.e. logos in Greek)?

So the truth is that here in John 1:1-2 **the Apostle John**, who had known Jesus Christ personally, and who received special additional revelation from God before the end of his life, **is speaking about two distinct individuals!** It doesn't matter whether you know squat about Greek or whether you have a triple PhD in ancient Greek. John's intention in these two verses was to refer to **two distinct individuals**.

One individual John called "**the Word**", and the other individual John called "**God**". These verses are not speaking about only one individual. And they are not speaking about three or more individuals. These verses speak about **exactly two distinct individuals**.

Is that correct or is that not correct? It is correct! Still want to argue, negatively of course?

Furthermore, there is also a significant mistranslation in this verse. Our English text reads "... and the Word was with God". But that is not what the Greek text says. The Greek text here reads "... kai ho logos en pros ton theon", and this text means "... and the Word was with **the** God". In the beginning Jesus Christ was with **the** God, which is a reference to God the Father.

The difference between "... was with God" and "... was with the God" is that the correct translation is very emphatic in identifying two different individuals, by identifying one as "the God" and the other as "the Word".

Having identified one Being as "the God", the next statement makes clear that **the other Being** (the Word) **was also (a) God**. That statement is translated as "... and the Word was God". But the Greek text reverses this order, and it should correctly read "... **and (a) God was the Word**" (i.e. "... kai theos en ho logos").

John 1:1 proves that Jesus Christ was "a God" in the beginning.

Now it is correct that the Greek text does not contain the definite article in the expression rendered as "in the beginning". The Greek expression "en arche" means "in beginning", which we would usually render as "in a beginning". The biblical Greek language didn't have an indefinite article, as we do in English.

But we need to ask ourselves a question: To what period of time in the distant past did the Apostle John mean to refer? **What was John thinking** when he wrote this sentence? The answer here should be obvious. Do you know the answer?

In his own mind the Apostle John obviously wanted to refer to a time **before** this physical universe was created, and also to **before** the time when Satan rebelled, and also to **before** God had created any of the angels.

When the Apostle John wrote "**in beginning**" in his own mind he was trying to refer to a time **before God had created anything**, because anything and everything God has created would obviously be "after (a) beginning".

Try to see this from the writer's point of view. John was basically saying: **before God did anything at all**



there were two distinct Beings. Try to understand the thoughts going through the author's mind.

Does this text sound like John is saying:

**In the beginning God the Father created a large number of angels, one of whom was Jesus Christ. And then God chose one of those angels to be called "the Word", because God the Father was planning to build His Family through that one created angel He called "the Word", and who was destined to live a sinless human life before being given back his previous immortal angelic existence. It's a good thing God the Father chose "the angel" Jesus Christ and not "the angel" Satan to become "the Word". If God the Father had made the wrong choice here, that would have had devastating consequences, right? But if God could predict that "the Word" would turn out okay, why couldn't God predict that Satan would not turn out okay?**

That's more or less how you have to see it as a unitarian. But does that make sense? And does that fit in with the facts?

No, it doesn't fit in with the facts, and it doesn't make sense at all!

The Apostle John with this particular wording in John 1:1 was trying to refer to a time before anything or anyone had been created. That's what John was trying to say with "in beginning". Can we understand this? After all, the word "beginning" does have a real, specific meaning, whether or not it is used with the definite article, right? The word "beginning" means something. All the arguments here about "in the beginning" versus "in a beginning" are foolish distractions.

The point is this:

From the Apostle John's point of view, Jesus Christ had existed with God the Father before anything or anyone was ever created. **That is what John is trying to say in these verses!** And John is also saying in these verses that Jesus Christ was "a God".

Can a unitarian deny this? Can he argue against this? Sure he can. But do his arguments actually change anything? **Do we or do we not accept that the Apostle John was referring to two God Beings before any angels were created?**

**The implication of the statement "in (a) beginning was the Word, and the Word was with the God" is that there were no other beings in existence. John could not possibly have made this statement if at that time 100,000,000 angels were already in existence. The obvious implication of John's statement is that these two Beings were the only ones in existence. That obvious implication is further reinforced by verse 3.**

All things were made by Him; and **without Him was not any thing made that was made.** (John 1:3)

What do these first three verses tell us? They tell us that these two individuals, God and the Word, existed before anything or anyone was created. They tell us that the Word was involved in the creation of all the created spirit beings, and the Word was also involved in the creation of all physical matter. These verses tell us that the Word existed **before there were any angels.**

These verses tell us that the Word must of necessity be a God Being who has always existed together with God the Father. And **it is immaterial** whether John 1:1 reads "in the beginning" or "in a beginning". The statement in verse 3, that the Word was involved in the creation of absolutely everything that was created, makes quite clear that **the Apostle John was trying to refer to a time before any angels had been created.**

These verses also tell us that **the Word is the Creator of all things** that were created. The obvious and only conclusion is that the Word is the same individual who created Adam and Eve back in Genesis 1-2. This is further reinforced by verse 10.

He was in the world, and **the world was made by Him**, and the world knew Him not. (John 1:10)

The Greek word here translated "world" is "kosmos", which refers to "**humanity**" and not to this planet Earth. So we could render verse 10 as:

"He was in the kosmos, and the kosmos was made by Him, and the kosmos knew Him not" (John 1:10).

In plain language this verse basically says:

"Jesus Christ was in **human society**, and **human society** (i.e. humanity) was made by Jesus Christ, and **human society** did not know Jesus Christ." (John 1:10 clarified)

In this verse John has very clearly identified Jesus Christ as the Creator of human beings. That again makes Jesus Christ the God who spoke in Genesis 1. And "Logos" does have something to do with speaking, right?

Furthermore, if Jesus Christ was supposedly an angel, then that implies that human beings were created by an angel. And that "angel" was creating human beings "in his own image". So John 1:10 would mean that man has been created "in the image of an angel" ... **if** Jesus Christ was supposedly a created angel. But being created in the image of an angel is an absurd position.

### **CREATOR OF THE AGES**

Has in these last days spoken unto us by *his* Son, whom He has appointed heir of all things, **by whom also He made the worlds**; (Hebrews 1:2)

Here the Greek word translated as "worlds" is "aionas", and this word means "ages, time, eternity". So where John 1:10 tells us that **humanity** was created by Jesus Christ, Hebrews 1:2 tells us that Jesus Christ also created **the ages**. Jesus Christ is revealed as the Creator of both.

Hebrews 1:2 says in unequivocal terms that God the Father used Jesus Christ to create the time-plan needed for the plan of salvation. Christ created the time periods involved, which periods are referred to as "the ages".

### **CREATOR OF ALL**

For by Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether *they be* thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: **all things were created by Him**, and for Him: (Colossians 1:16)

Paul is here speaking about Jesus Christ, and for anyone to deny that this verse states that Jesus Christ is the Creator of everything that has been created requires a blatant lie!

"All things in heaven ... earth ... visible ... invisible ... thrones ... dominions ... principalities ... powers" is a pretty exhaustive way of saying "**everything**"! And that includes all the righteous angels, like Michael and Gabriel; and it also includes all the demons, like Satan. The One who created everything cannot possibly be a created spirit being Himself. That is an impossibility!

**If Jesus Christ had been created as an angel by God the Father, then it would mean the following:**

- 1) God the Father Himself supposedly created Jesus Christ.
- 2) Then **a created being created everything else in existence.**

All things were created by Jesus Christ (Colossians 1:16), who Himself **supposedly** is a created Being. So God the Father supposedly delegated the responsibility for the entire creation to this created Being named Jesus Christ. That's a rather novel parallel version of evolution, that the created Being becomes fully responsible for all future developments.

But to suppose that the whole creation is the product of a created being is extremely illogical, to put it mildly.

Consider God's plans for all future eternity:

The New Heaven and the New Earth and the New Jerusalem (see Revelation 21:1-2) will all be the creation of God the Father Himself. Everything in that initial new environment will be **the work of God the Father Himself**, without any input from any other being. It is God the Father who will create the permanent living environment for His Family: the New Jerusalem on the new Earth within the new heaven. That permanent living environment will not be created by Jesus Christ, but by God the Father Himself.

Now it follows that the **first** heaven and the **first** Earth were also the creation of a God Being and **not the creation of a created being** (i.e. if Jesus Christ had supposedly been created by God the Father). So when Jesus Christ created "the first heaven and the first Earth" (again Revelation 21:1) He absolutely had to be a God Being! That creation could not possibly have been performed by a created being.

Rather, the created beings (i.e. the angels) all "shouted for joy" when they saw that first heaven and first Earth being created (see Job 38:7). **The angels were not shouting for joy because one of their number** (i.e. if Jesus Christ was supposedly created by the Father) **had just created this present universe**. No, they shouted for joy because a God Being had just created the universe, a creation which is way beyond the ability of any created angel to perform!

No angel or other created being has the ability to have created this present universe.

### **JESUS CHRIST THE CREATOR OF ALL**

And to make all *men* see what *is* the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in **God, who created all things by Jesus Christ:** (Ephesians 3:9)

God the Father instructed Jesus Christ to create "all things". But God the Father would never have delegated this responsibility to a created being. It is totally absurd to claim that this whole creation in its entirety is supposedly the work of a created being. **Ephesians 3:9 demands that Jesus Christ has existed with God the Father for past eternity.**

It requires extremely devious reasoning to look at Ephesians 3:9, and to then claim that Jesus Christ Himself is supposedly nothing more than a created being, when Jesus Christ is responsible for bringing this entire present creation into existence.

### **THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST**

But you are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that **the spirit of God** dwell in you. Now if any man have not **the spirit of Christ**, he is none of his. (Romans 8:9)

For I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of **the spirit of Jesus Christ**, (Philippians 1:19)

These Scriptures, amongst others, equate the spirit of God with the spirit of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ said:

But the comforter, *which is the holy spirit, which the Father will send in my name*, it shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. (John 14:26)

The unavoidable conclusion here is that God the Father and Jesus Christ both send out the holy spirit. "The spirit of Jesus Christ" is the holy spirit, and "the spirit of God" is the holy spirit. God the Father and Jesus Christ are both **sources of the holy spirit**. To send out the holy spirit "in my name" means that the holy spirit is also correctly called "the spirit of Jesus Christ".

And he showed me a pure river of **water of life**, clear as crystal, **proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb**. (Revelation 22:1)

This "pure river" is the holy spirit, the very power of God. "Proceeding out from the throne" is a reference to **the source** of the holy spirit. This verse shows that the holy spirit **originates with**, and flows out from **both God the Father and Jesus Christ**.

**Now only a God Being can be a source of the holy spirit.**

Angels (i.e. created spirit beings) cannot ever be the source for the holy spirit. The holy spirit cannot possibly originate with angels. It can only come from a God Being.

These Scriptures here once again show that already during His earthly ministry (and before then) Jesus Christ was a God Being.

## **IN OUR IMAGE**

And God (Elohim) said, **Let us make** man in **our** image, after **our** likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth. (Genesis 1:26)

The pronouns "us" and "our" show that Elohim was speaking for at least two individuals. Elohim did **not** say: "let **Me** make man in **My** image, after **My** likeness". That's what you would expect if there was only one God Being. But that's not how it is written.

The words "us" and "our" absolutely demand that Elohim was speaking for (at least) one other individual besides Himself. These words demand that **there must be at least two Elohim!** This is also required by the word "Elohim" itself, because it is a plural word, referring to two or more individuals.

So the opening chapter of the Bible demands that there are **at least two God Beings**. That is absolutely basic!

When you say "let us go to town" you mean that there is someone who will go with you to town. You don't mean that you are going on your own. No, when you say "let us ..." you always mean that there is someone else with you.

Any arguments that deny that "us" and "our" must refer to two or more individuals are **hypocritical** and devious. People who argue against "us" and "our" in this verse referring to two God Beings **know better**, and they **cannot be trusted** to deal honestly with the Scriptures.

Next, the words "us" and "our" also mean that the two Beings grouped together by the word "us" must be of **the same kind**, who share a common "image" and "likeness". When one is a God Being, then the other must also be a God Being. "Us" doesn't work for one eternal and immortal God Being who has always existed, and one created spirit being who started his existence as an angel, when **both have the same "image" and "likeness"**.

The angels have not been created in the image and likeness of God. **Angels don't look like God**. So the expressions "in our image" and "in our likeness" demand that the two Beings must be of the same "kind"; i.e. They are both of the "God kind".

### **JESUS CHRIST THE SAME YESTERDAY, TODAY & FOREVER**

Jesus Christ the same **yesterday**, and **to day**, and **for ever**. (Hebrews 13:8)

What was the Apostle Paul trying to say here? Do you know?

**Paul was saying that the nature of Jesus Christ has never changed!**

Jesus Christ is a God Being right now. He will always be a God Being. And He has always been a God Being. That's what Paul meant by "yesterday and to day and for ever".

Hebrews 13:8 means that Jesus Christ existed in Old Testament times and before. And it means that Jesus Christ could not possibly have been "an angel" before His present existence. He is still the same type of Being today as He was before the creation of Adam. Hebrews 13:8 proves that Jesus Christ has always been God.

### **THE SAVIOR**

And she shall bring forth a son, and you shalt call His name JESUS: for **He shall save His people from their sins**. (Matthew 1:21)

To Titus, *mine* own son after the common faith: Grace, mercy, *and* peace, from God the Father and **the Lord Jesus Christ our Savior**. (Titus 1:4)

There are very many Scriptures that identify Jesus Christ as our Savior. The Savior was predicted in the Old Testament. But that raises one important issue. And that is this:

**The Savior for mankind could not possibly be a created being!**

No created being can ever be "the Savior" for other individuals. That's an impossibility, because the most that any created being has to offer as payment for the sins of others is **his own created existence**. A created being has nothing more to offer. At a maximum any created being could, theoretically, pay for the sins of one other created being. But in order to do that, the created being who is to be the savior must himself be perfectly sinless.

Nobody short of a God Being could ever fulfill the role of a savior for mankind. And to fulfill that role requires that particular God Being to be the Creator of mankind. A spirit being who is not the creator of mankind (e.g. the archangel Michael) can never become a savior for humanity. The one who is to

become the savior of mankind must have a **direct relationship to all of mankind**. Without a direct relationship to all human beings someone cannot become the savior for all human beings.

Now "the direct relationship" that Jesus Christ has to all human beings is that Jesus Christ is the Creator God of all human beings. **That relationship** makes it possible for Jesus Christ to become the Savior of His creation. But if Jesus Christ is only a created being, then He cannot become our Savior.

## **LORD OF THE SABBATH**

For the Son of man is **Lord even of the Sabbath day**. (Matthew 12:8)

"The Lord" of the Sabbath day is the individual who controls the Sabbath day. It is the individual who created the Sabbath day, and who also decides how and when it is to be observed. Jesus Christ was saying: **I'm in charge** of the Sabbath day and everything about it.

This ties in with Hebrews 1:2, that Jesus Christ is the One who created the ages. He created time periods. And the Sabbath day is a time period that was established by Jesus Christ. That is what qualified Jesus Christ to be "Lord of the Sabbath day", the fact that He created it.

Now the Sabbath day and its observance is a part of **the law of God**. It is not a part of the law of an angel, or the law of a created being. It is the law of God. Now angels can certainly speak the words that express the laws of God. But **angels cannot add new components to the law of God**. And whoever created the Sabbath was creating a **new component to the law of God**.

Only a God Being can possibly create any new components to the law of God. **The principle** underlying the "Lord of the Sabbath" statement **requires** Jesus Christ to be an eternal God Being, because a created being could not do anything that adds to or modifies the laws of God.

## **THE LORD SAID TO MY LORD**

A Psalm of David. **The LORD** (Hebrew YHVH) said unto **my Lord** (Hebrew Adoni/Adonai), Sit you at my right hand, until I make your enemies your footstool. (Psalm 110:1)

This verse has spawned a multitude of explanations, all in an attempt to do away with the obvious meaning of this verse. About 10 years ago I wrote an article on the meaning of Psalm 110:1, which examines most of the technicalities. I have also discussed Psalm 110:1 in my two articles about unitarianism.

But this is in fact **an easy verse to understand**. It only becomes difficult when people try to deny the correct meaning by trying to confuse us with technicalities, like "it is Adoni and not Adonai". Here is how to examine this verse.

- 1) Who is the author of this Psalm? The author is **King David**. That is not disputed by anyone.
- 2) Was David talking about one individual or about two individuals in this statement? David was talking about **two individuals**, with One speaking to The Other One. That's also clear.
- 3) Who did David speak about as "the LORD" (i.e. as YHVH) in this verse? David in this verse used the name **YHVH** to refer to **God the Father**, because here David shows YHVH as being in authority over the other individual. In most other places David has used YHVH to refer to Jesus Christ. But here he has used YHVH to refer to God the Father. There is no other possibility in this specific context.

4) How can we identify the other individual in this verse, the one addressed as "my Lord"? It makes no difference whether people want to argue about "Adoni" or "Adonai". The Hebrew word with the pronoun attached to it means **"my Lord"**, and the separation into the two words Adoni and Adonai is totally artificial and very devious. That is explained in my other articles.

5) The question is: would King David, the highest ranking person in the nation of Israel, have used the word "my Lord" to refer to any other human being? Which human being could possibly be considered to have been David's Lord? The answer is: the expression **"my Lord" could not possibly apply to any human being**, because King David did not have any human "lords" over him. David certainly did not have any human "lord" to whom God the Father would have spoken in a favorable way. Besides, God the Father Himself did not speak to any human beings at any time (John 5:37). This also means that "my Lord" could not have been a human being.

6) Several different Hebrew words all with the meaning of "lord" are used in **700 different verses** just in the Book of Psalms alone. These Hebrew words are very common in Psalms. And in none of his psalms does King David ever refer to any human "lords" that he had to serve. The only "Lord" in all of the psalms is **always a spirit being** (i.e. either God the Father or Jesus Christ). So David's reference to **"my Lord" must refer to a spirit being**. There is no other option, because King David had no human "lords".

7) So **which spirit being** would King David have referred to as "my Lord"? Could it be an angel, like Michael or Gabriel? Certainly not! Could it be an evil spirit being like Satan or some demon? Absolutely not. Okay, now we are running out of spirit beings to choose from. Who is left if "my Lord" does not refer to an angel or to a demon?

8) The only two possible spirit beings left to choose from are: God the Father and Jesus Christ. But in this verse David has already addressed God the Father as YHVH. Therefore **the only remaining possibility is that "my Lord" refers to Jesus Christ**. There are no other options when "my Lord" cannot be either God the Father or a human being or an angel or a demon.

Now how much Hebrew do we have to know in order to understand this? We need zero understanding of Hebrew to reach this correct conclusion. That is because we have eliminated every other possibility.

**Now let's consider the lying and the hypocrisy of those who deny that David was referring to Jesus Christ as "my Lord".**

If you are dealing with someone who denies that this is a reference to Jesus Christ, then you should ask them:

**"Okay, if this is not a reference to Jesus Christ, then tell me who David was referring to as "my Lord"? Who is it? Give me a name! Or better still, give me a Scripture. At least tell me: is "my Lord" a human being or a spirit being? And if you refuse to answer these questions, then you are a hypocrite!** I am telling you outright that "my Lord" refers to Jesus Christ. You deny my answer, but you provide no alternative. And if you can't provide an alternative name, how can you be so dogmatic in denying the name I am putting forward? Your bias is glaringly obvious! Which of the above 8 points I have presented to you is not correct?

When my beliefs are attacked, I hate having to defend them! When my beliefs are attacked by heretical teachings, then I don't defend. Instead of defending, I always go on the counter-attack! I don't tolerate heresies! **The only way to deal with heresies is to attack the heresies with a vengeance!** That's what the Apostle Paul did, assigning the teachers of heresies to the lake of fire (see Galatians 1:6-9). Expose the errors and the hypocrisy inherent in heretical teachings that someone, anyone, attempts to

introduce to the people of God! God expects nothing less from us.

The truth sets us free. We are on solid ground. It is the people who want to peddle heretical ideas to God's people, who are on shaky ground. And when people refuse to tell you who "my Lord" in Psalm 110:1 is, while emphatically denying that this is a reference to Jesus Christ, then they are on extremely shaky ground.

And that is just the beginning. The next statement in this verse increases that shaking to "magnitude 7"! Let's have a look at it.

So here God the Father says to the One David calls "my Lord":

**"Sit you at my right hand!"**

So we ask the same questions:

- 1) Is God talking to a **human being**? Does God the Father tell any human being: sit you at My right hand"? The obvious answer which hypocritical heresy-peddlers may refuse to give you is: **absolutely not!**
- 2) And it is equally **obviously not** a demon or a righteous angel!
- 3) So **who is left** to sit at God the Father's right hand? The field has been thinned out pretty well, hasn't it?
- 4) There is in fact only one possible individual left for sitting at the right hand of God the Father. And that is Jesus Christ! **Nobody else will ever sit at the right hand of God the Father!**
- 5) Anyone who refuses to acknowledge that the "my Lord" who will sit at the right hand of God the Father can only be Jesus Christ is obviously a hypocritical liar! There is no other possibility.

The Apostle Paul made the point that God the Father has never said to any angel "sit at My right hand".

But to which of the angels said He **at any time**, Sit on My right hand, until I make your enemies your footstool? (Hebrews 1:13)

Paul's point in Hebrews 1 is that this statement applies to Jesus Christ, and to no other individual.

So how much Hebrew did we have to understand to examine this part of verse 1? None at all!

Are there still people who want to deny that "my Lord" in Psalm 110:1 is a reference to Jesus Christ? If so, they are exposed as dealing deceitfully with the Scriptures.

**We could carry on with the last part of Psalm 110:1, and ask: whose enemies is God the Father going to turn into someone's "footstool"? By now you know the drill regarding the questions we need to ask in order to eliminate all the individuals to whom this statement cannot possibly apply. You go ahead and ask the right questions yourself. It is the enemies of Jesus Christ who are going to be crushed; you know, the people who say "we will not have this man to reign over us" (see Luke 19:14).**

It is hypocritical for anyone to deny that Psalm 110:1 is about something that God the Father said to Jesus Christ. And this verse makes clear that Jesus Christ is also a God Being.



But we aren't finished yet. So now let's look at what David said in Psalm 16.

Michtam of David. Preserve me, **O God** (Hebrew "**EI**"): for in You do I put my trust. *O my soul*, you have said unto **the LORD** (Hebrew "**YHVH**"), You *are my Lord* (Hebrew "**Adonai**"): my goodness *extends* not to You; (Psalm 16:1-2)

For a start, here the Jewish scribes did vowel-point "my Lord" as "Adonai", and not as "adoni". So in these verses King David is addressing only one individual. And he addresses this **one individual** as "**EI**" and as "**YHVH**" and as "**Adonai**". That is obvious if you just read this whole psalm. One individual with at least three different appellations.

So here King David very clearly refers to YHVH as "Adonai", because this YHVH is in fact "my Lord", as far as David was concerned. So David can address this God Being as either YHVH or as Adonai.

**Psalm 16:1-2 is irrefutable proof that when David refers to someone as "my Lord", then he is thinking of a spirit being who is also identified as YHVH, the God of the Old Testament. That's what David said right here! So when David later in Psalm 110:1 said "YHVH said to my Lord ...", then that cannot be some human "adoni". David has already identified that this must be the spirit being God "Adonai", who happens to also have the name YHVH. And God the Father also has the name YHVH. The name YHVH expresses an attribute, which attribute God the Father and Jesus Christ happen to share.**

Anyone who looks at Psalm 16:1-2 and then refuses to acknowledge that "my Lord" in Psalm 110:1 must refer to Jesus Christ, one of whose names is also YHVH, is a total hypocrite.

Yes, Psalm 110:1 is a very powerful proof that Jesus Christ, who is currently sitting at the right hand of God the Father, with the time when His enemies will be crushed nearer than at any time in the past 2000 years, has always existed as a God Being with God the Father.

## **A COMPARISON**

Let's compare verse 1 with verse 5. Here is Psalm 110:1 again, with the vowel pointings provided by the Hebrew scribes:

A Psalm of David. The LORD (YHVH) said unto my Lord (supposedly **Adoni**), Sit You **at My right hand**, until I make Your enemies Your footstool. (Psalm 110:1)

And here is verse 5:

The Lord (**Adonai**) **at Your right hand** shall strike through kings in the day of His wrath. (Psalm 110:5)

This once again shows the hypocrisy that is involved here. Without vowel pointings the Hebrew word for "Adoni" in verse 1 is exactly the same as the word for "Adonai" in verse 5. And both words mean "my Lord", though the Jewish scholars disguised that by claiming that "Adonai" supposedly means "**the** Lord", when in actual fact it really means "**my** Lord". The Hebrew for "Adonai" does not contain the definite article "the". It only contains the pronoun "my".

So here is what the hypocrites did:

In verse 1 they vowel-pointed the word for "my Lord" to read "**Adoni**". Four verses later, in verse 5, they vowel-pointed the exact same word within the same context and dealing with the same subject to read "**Adonai**". And in so doing they exposed their deceitful actions. How?

According to the scholars who invented the vowel-pointing system, in verse 1 **Adoni** sits on the right hand of God the Father. But according to verse 5 it is **Adonai** who sits on the right hand of God the Father. **They both supposedly sit on the right hand of the Father!**

But that cannot be if they are supposedly two different individuals! Only one individual can sit at the right hand of God the Father. And you don't even need to understand anything at all about Hebrew, to understand that the individual David called "**my Lord**" in **verse 1** must be the same individual who in **verse 5** in our translations is called "**The Lord**". That should be a no-brainer! This is based on the simple logic that only one person can sit at the Father's right hand.

Now the vowel-pointing for "Adonai" in verse 5 shows that they understood that verse 5 is speaking about a **God Being**. Whenever they want to indicate that it refers to a God Being, they have vowel-pointed this word to read "Adonai", and whenever they want to indicate that it refers to a human being, they have vowel-pointed it to read "adoni".

But in addition they also then employed a devious mistranslation! The word they vowel-pointed to read "**Adonai**" **does not mean "the Lord"**! The word vowel-pointed to read "Adonai" correctly means "**my Lord**"! This relationship they have deviously hidden. The adjective "my" always expresses a relationship.

And so, to look at just one example, Psalm 110:5 should actually be correctly translated as: "**My Lord** (Adonai) **at Your right hand** shall strike through kings in the day of His wrath". And this correct translation repeats the fact that "Adonai" is the same individual as "Adoni" in verse 1, with both verses referring to the individual at the right hand of God the Father.

To simplify this for those who use Strong's numbers: The Hebrew word vowel-pointed as "**Adonai**" has the number **0136**. It is never correct to translate number 0136 as "the Lord". That is a mistranslation. Number 0136 must **always** be correctly translated either as "**my Lord**" or as "**my lord**". Number 0136 always expresses a **personal relationship** to the individual so addressed. That relationship is expressed through the pronoun "my". Number 0136 always includes the pronoun "my". So whenever you come across a translation of 0136 in any Old Testament verse that does not include the pronoun "my", then you are looking at a mistranslation.

So in reference to the same individual, the One who sits at the Father's right hand in both instances, the Jewish scribes have in Psalm 110 vowel-pointed it once to indicate a God Being and once to indicate a human being. So **in verse 5 they admit** that the individual at the Father's right hand is a God Being. But **in verse 1 they deny** that the same individual at the Father's right hand is a God Being, and there they try to relegate Him to being only a human being.

Here is a key towards understanding the hypocrisy underlying this heretical teaching that Jesus Christ is supposedly only a created being:

To get around the obvious meaning that Jesus Christ was a God Being during Old Testament times, **they focus on grammatical technicalities** in the Hebrew text. And then they build a case on those flawed technicalities. They are flawed because the vowel-pointing system was only invented more than 1000 years after King David's time. When King David himself wrote Psalm 110, he did not use any vowel-pointing system at all.

It is well-known that the Jewish scholars many centuries later **deliberately added wrong vowel points** to thousands of words in the Old Testament, to make the text conform to their distorted and twisted understanding. **Vowel points have no value at all**, as far as establishing the truth is concerned.

So let's get one thing straight: people who **deliberately** add wrong vowel points to even one single text of the Bible have **no respect for the Word of God!** They only have a respect for their own traditions, exactly like Jesus Christ said in Mark 7:9.

And then those scholars **totally ignore the implications of the actual text** of the Old Testament. They couldn't care less as to what the text actually says!

Thus, they don't care that when verse 5 shows that "my Lord" must be a God Being, then it requires that "my Lord" in verse 1 must also be a God Being ... because both verses say that this "my Lord" sits at the right hand of God the Father. It is the meaning of the words in the text that makes plain that "my Lord" can only refer to Jesus Christ. Grammatical technicalities cannot change that one way or the other. Grammatical technicalities are in this instance nothing but a devious distraction.

And this devious tactic of trying to get around the actual meaning of the literal text (i.e. by vowel-pointing this word for 'adoni') exposes that **they really know** that they are trying to obscure the truth. They really do know that they are dealing deceitfully with the Scriptures. And for that God will surely punish them.

Let's move on from Psalm 110.

### **THE EXPRESS IMAGE OF HIS PERSON**

Notice Hebrews 1:3, which speaks about Jesus Christ.

Who being the brightness of *his* glory, and **the express image of his person**, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; (Hebrews 1:3)

Ask yourself some honest questions. **Paul had seen Jesus Christ in visions** when Paul was in Arabia, when Paul was "caught up to the third heaven" (see 1 Corinthians 12:2). So in vision Paul had seen Jesus Christ in the presence of God the Father. So the questions are:

When Paul wrote Hebrews 1:3, **did Paul himself think of Jesus Christ as a God Being?** Or did Paul think of Jesus Christ as a created being? This verse tells you the answer. Never mind all the technicalities we could examine. Just look at the actual text.

When you read Hebrews 1:3, are you reading about someone who is like God the Father? Or are you reading about someone who was created by the Father? Look at the actual wording of this verse. What else could Paul possibly have said to get us to understand that Jesus Christ is God just like God the Father is God? What more did Paul have to say to make that point?

This verse tells us that Jesus Christ:

- 1) Has the same glory as God the Father.
- 2) Has the same power as God the Father.
- 3) Has sat down at the right hand of God the Father (back to Psalm 110).
- 4) Looks like God the Father.
- 5) Has the same character as God the Father.

What does it all mean? It means that Jesus Christ is a God Being, and that before His human life He had always been a God Being. These five points don't allow any other conclusion. And all these statements in verse 3 make absolutely clear that the Apostle **Paul wanted to tell the Jews in the Church that Jesus Christ is indeed a God Being!**

To apply the above five points to any created spirit being would be highly offensive to God the Father, by elevating a created being to the level of God the Father. That is never going to happen, that a created being will somehow be elevated to the level of God the Father. This verse once again means that Jesus Christ has always been God.

## **I AND MY FATHER ARE ONE**

### **I and my Father are one. (John 10:30)**

Jesus Christ is "one" with God the Father. That means that Jesus Christ has to be like God the Father. To be "one" with God the Father is only possible if Jesus Christ is also an eternal God Being.

Now notice a distinction that we can easily overlook.

That **they all may be one**; as You, Father, *are* in Me, and I in You, that **they also may be one in us**: that the world may believe that You have sent Me. And the glory which You gave Me I have given them; **that they may be one**, even as **we are one**: I in them, and You in Me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that You have sent Me, and have loved them, as You have loved Me. (John 17:21-23)

Let's understand exactly who is "one" with whom. It is **not** that **everybody** is going to be "one" **with everybody else**. That's not how it is going to work. So let's get this straight.

In order for two or more to become "one" there has to be **something that binds** two or more individuals together, something they must have in common. Here is how being "one" in the Family of God is going work.

1) All those who are going to be in the first resurrection will be "one" with one another. That is the 144,000.

2) All those in the first resurrection will in addition also be "one" with Jesus Christ.

3) But Jesus Christ alone is going to be "one" with God the Father. We in the first resurrection will be the happy, respectful children of God the Father, and God the Father will love us; but according to these verses we will not really be "one" with God the Father. Oneness with God the Father is reserved for Jesus Christ alone.

4) Those people who come into God's Family from the millennium and from the second resurrection will all be "one" with one another. For them God the Father will be "their God" (see Revelation 21:3).

**Being "one" with certain other individuals is an expression of the standing or status within the Family of God. God structures His Family in a very orderly way.**

If we think of the whole Family of God consisting of **four distinct levels**, with Level 1 being the highest and Level 4 the lowest, then we have the following situation:

**Level 1: This is the level of God the Father. This level is symbolized by the throne of God the**

**Father. God the Father has elevated Jesus Christ to this level, indicated by sharing His glory and His throne with Jesus Christ. This is the relationship God the Father and Jesus Christ have had for all past eternity, even before any angels and before this physical universe were created. And that relationship is going to continue for all future eternity. That relationship cannot be replicated with any other spirit being. And Jesus Christ has always been in willing submission to the authority of God the Father. As Jesus Christ said: "My Father is greater than I" (John 14:28).**

**Level 2: This is the level of Jesus Christ. This level is symbolized by the throne of Jesus Christ. In addition to having always existed as a spirit being, Jesus Christ has also lived the life of a physical, mortal human being. So Jesus Christ can also identify with the level below Himself, though Jesus Christ had lived a sinless life. And so Jesus Christ shares His glory and His throne with all those in the first resurrection. This relationship between Jesus Christ and the 144,000 is based on the real repentance towards God, and the reliable and permanent obedience to Jesus Christ, of all those in the first resurrection.**

**Level 3: This is the level of all those in the first resurrection. This level is symbolized by all in this resurrection having their own thrones to sit on. This level represents "the wife" of Jesus Christ. And "the wife" is going to have "children", those who constitute the next and final level. Jesus Christ shares His glory and His throne with these 144,000, i.e. with His "wife". All in this group have never had a prior spirit life or existence. All in this group have only had a prior physical life. And during that physical life all in this group had sinned and fallen short at various times. All in this group upon repentance had their sins forgiven by the shed blood of Jesus Christ.**

**Level 4: This is the bottom level. It consists of all those from the millennium and from the second resurrection. This level is symbolized by all of them standing, because the individuals on this level have no thrones of their own. They are represented as "a great multitude which no man could number". They stand "before the throne and before the Lamb" (see Revelation 7:9). Recall that those in the first resurrection "sit"! All in this group have sinned at various times, but then repented, and had their sins forgiven by the shed blood of Christ. Those from the first resurrection (Level 3) can identify with these people on Level 4, having gone through similar life experiences, including having sinned at various times. And so this group will in effect be "the children" which "the wife" of Jesus Christ will produce during the millennium and during the 100-year period.**

When we grasp these four levels, then we can examine the question of **who becomes "one" with whom.**

- 1) **God the Father** (Level 1) only becomes "one" with Jesus Christ (who is on Level 2).
- 2) **Jesus Christ** (Level 2) becomes "one" with the level above Him, with God the Father; and He also becomes "one" with the level below Him, with those in the first resurrection. Jesus Christ is the only individual in the entire Family of God who becomes "one" in two opposite directions, in that way bridging Levels 1, 2 and 3.
- 3) **Those in the first resurrection** (Level 3) become "one" with Jesus Christ (Level 2) and they also become "one" with everyone else on Level 3.
- 4) **For those from the millennium and the 100-year period** (Level 4) there is no particular "becoming one" with anyone else that is indicated, other than becoming "one" with all the others on Level 4. The things Jesus Christ said in John 17 were directed at those who will be in the first resurrection, and not at anyone else. The main thing that is indicated for this group on Level 4 is that they receive "salvation" (see Revelation 7:10). They have all had their sins forgiven by the shed blood of Jesus Christ. And they

will be grouped into "nations" (see Revelation 21:24).

Now let's examine all the relevant statements about becoming "one" in John chapter 17.

1) **"That they all may be one"** = This statement says that all those in the first resurrection will become "one" with everyone else in that resurrection. This statement does **not** say that they will become "one" with either God the Father or with Jesus Christ.

2) **"As You, Father, are in Me, and I in You"** = This is a comparative statement. It identifies **the type of relationship** those in the first resurrection are going to have with one another. This statement also does **not** say that they will become "one" with either God the Father or with Jesus Christ.

3) **"That they also may be one in us"** = Here the Greek preposition "en" is used with the meaning of "through us", rather than "in us". The translators lacked understanding here. This statement means that they can become "one" with everyone else in the first resurrection **through** (or because of) **the relationship** God the Father and Jesus Christ have with One Another. But Jesus Christ was **not** saying "they become one **in us**"! The rest of what Jesus Christ said in the following statements here makes clear that **Christ did not mean "in us"**. He meant "through us".

4) **"And the glory which You gave Me I have given them"** = They all share a common glory, and that enables every one of them to be "one" with everyone else in the first resurrection.

5) **"That they may be one, even as we are one"** = This is once again a **comparative statement**, reiterating the type of relationship those in the first resurrection will have with everyone else in that group. They will have **the same type** of relationship that God the Father and Jesus Christ have enjoyed for past eternity, which relationship I believe is beyond our present level of comprehension. But this statement here says nothing about being "one" with either the Father or with Jesus Christ.

6) **"I in them"** = This statement shows a oneness between Jesus Christ (Level 2) and the 144,000 (Level 3). But it says nothing about being "one" with God the Father.

7) **"And You in Me"** = This statement in turn refers to God the Father (Level 1) being "one" with Jesus Christ (Level 2). But it says **nothing about us** (Level 3) being "one" with the Father. **Jesus Christ did not say "and You in them"!** **And neither did Jesus Christ say "We in them"!** The **clear distinction** Jesus Christ made with these two statements here (i.e. 1=I in them, 2=You in Me) shows that the translation in the above statement "that they also may be one **in us**" is misleading, and that it **should be** translated as "that they also may be one **through us**".

8) **"That they may be made perfect in one"** = This statement is focused on the relationship the 144,000 will have with one another. Neither God the Father nor Jesus Christ are referenced with this statement.

And that concludes all the statements about being "one" in John 17.

Now the reason I have in this section referred to "I and My Father are one" (John 10:30) is because **that statement proves that Jesus Christ is a God Being**. Only someone who is also God can become "one" with God the Father. So this is a statement that unitarians also have to approach in a negative way, attempting to do away with the obvious implications of this statement.

Some of you might even want to make your own chart for these four levels in the Family of God? The first three levels are represented by different thrones on progressively lower levels, and the fourth level is represented by the absence of any thrones. You could then use arrows to show who will become one with whom within that Family structure. I've made my own visual representation for these four levels.

And you can no doubt do something like that equally well yourself, if you are so inclined. But such a visual representation is by no means essential for understanding these things. So if something like that is not your thing, that's also fine.

Furthermore, regarding the four levels within the Family of God, you might notice a distinct resemblance to **the hierarchy** the Apostle Paul presents in 1 Corinthians 15.

For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But **every man in his own order**: **Christ** the firstfruits; **afterward they** that are Christ's at his coming. **Then come the end ones**, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. (1 Corinthians 15:22-24)

These verses focus on Levels 2, 3 and 4, and only then reference the level of God the Father. Jesus Christ's comments in John 17 about being "one" show how all four of these levels will interact with one another.

That should suffice for the subject of being "one". Now let's look at another Scripture that shows that Jesus Christ has always existed as God.

### **YOUR THRONE O GOD IS FOREVER**

Notice Psalm 45:6-7.

**Your throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the scepter of Your kingdom is a right scepter. You love righteousness, and hate wickedness: therefore God, Your God, has anointed You with the oil of gladness above Your fellows. (Psalm 45:6-7)**

I have explained these verses in detail in my short 2011 article simply titled "Psalm 45:6-7 Explained". So I will not repeat all that information here.

These verses here are an example of people appealing to certain Scriptures for support for a heretical idea, when those Scriptures, correctly understood, in fact demolish the very thing they are trying to prove. This is a Scripture unitarians used to appeal to for support.

Here people have looked at the expression that God the Father has anointed Jesus Christ "**above Your fellows**", and then claim that "Your fellows" must mean "Your fellow-angels", and that Jesus Christ had been one of the angels, but that He was at some point anointed **above** His fellow-angels. And so this verse supposedly proves that Jesus Christ was originally a created angel.

My 8-page article thoroughly demolishes that flawed picture. Briefly:

The Hebrew word here translated as "**(Your) fellows**" does not have a precise English equivalent. And neither "fellows" nor "companions" is a correct translation. Basically the Hebrew word means "those with whom you have a close relationship". So verse 7 is better and more accurately translated as:

"... therefore God, Your God, has anointed You with the oil of gladness above **those with whom You have a close relationship**".

"Being one" with someone is certainly a close relationship. And "marrying someone" is likewise a very close relationship. So we could correctly translate the inherent meaning of this verse as follows:

"... therefore God, Your God, has anointed You with the oil of gladness above **those with whom You**

are 'one'."

In plain language:

Verse 6 addresses Jesus Christ as "**God**". That is clear. It shows that this God has **a throne and a kingdom**. Verse 7 shows that **this God** (i.e. Jesus Christ) **has been anointed by another God**, who is clearly in authority over the first-mentioned God. The whole context of Psalm 45 is the second coming of Jesus Christ.

To be anointed "above" those with whom Jesus Christ is "one" means that Jesus Christ on Level 2 is above all those on Level 3. Christ is "the firstborn among many brethren" (Romans 8:29). Being anointed "above" those in the first resurrection shows that Jesus Christ is the **King of kings** and the **Lord of lords** (see Revelation 19:16).

Consider one other point:

To be anointed with the oil of gladness "**above**" those with whom He has a close relationship implies that **all those** who have that close relationship with Jesus Christ **are also anointed!** And that anointing takes place at the time of Christ's second coming. But Christ is anointed "above" all the others who are also anointed.

These verses are explained in more detail in the other article I have mentioned. Correctly understood Psalm 45 is one more proof that Jesus Christ has always existed as a God Being. So now Psalm 45, instead of being a proof text for those who deny Jesus Christ's eternal existence, is one more Scripture that they have to argue against in a negative way.

## **MELCHIZEDEK**

We have already examined Psalm 110, verses 1 and 5. But I deliberately passed over verse 4, because that verse raises a whole new subject. So now let's briefly examine this subject.

The LORD (Hebrew YHVH) has sworn, and will not repent, **You are a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.** (Psalm 110:4)

We have already examined verse 1, which shows that in this psalm David used the name YHVH to refer to God the Father. We have also seen that in verse 1 God the Father is talking to Jesus Christ, the One who sits at the Father's right hand.

Now here in verse 4 God the Father is still talking to the same individual, to whom He was talking in verse 1. God the Father is not suddenly talking to someone completely different. No, God the Father is talking to the same individual in verses 1 and 4.

So in verse 4 God the Father tells Jesus Christ that He will be a priest after the rank of Melchizedek "for a very long time". The Melchizedek priesthood is further explained in my article titled "Are There Any Priests Today?".

Jesus Christ was Melchizedek in the days of Abraham. This is something the Apostle Paul explained to the Hebrews. Here are some of the facts about Melchizedek.

**Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abides a priest continually. (Hebrews 7:3)**



What was Paul trying to say about Melchizedek with the above statement? Why this whole list of attributes? What's the point?

With the statement "without father, without mother" Paul was saying that **Melchizedek was not a human being**.

With the statement "without descent" Paul was saying that Melchizedek did not have any kind of genealogy. This reinforces the point that Melchizedek was not a human being, that His existence could not be led back to any other individual. **His existence did not spring from any other individual**.

With the statement "neither beginning of days, nor end of life" Paul was saying that **Melchizedek was an immortal and eternal spirit being** who has always existed.

With the expression "made like unto the Son of God" Paul was saying that **Melchizedek** was the same individual who **later became the Son of God**.

With the statement "abides a priest continually" Paul was saying that **Christ's Melchizedek priesthood will endure for a very long time**, until God the Father creates the new heaven and the new Earth. That priesthood is an expression of Jesus Christ's relationship with God the Father.

Now the point in our context here is this:

Melchizedek and Jesus Christ are one and the same individual. But Melchizedek is shown to have always existed. And therefore Melchizedek cannot be a created being. And **therefore Jesus Christ cannot be a created being**.

So this is one more Scripture that those wishing to endorse the heretical teaching that Jesus Christ was supposedly created by God the Father must negatively argue against.

## **IN CONCLUSION**

Jesus Christ has always existed as a God Being together with God the Father. We have now examined **well over 20 different Scriptures** that all make clear that Jesus Christ has always been God. These Scriptures are all clear, and for the most part easy to understand. And we don't need any understanding of either Hebrew or Greek to understand this truth that Jesus Christ has always been God.

The teaching that Jesus Christ was created by God the Father is a **blasphemous** teaching. It is a **heretical** teaching, and it will not go unpunished. And this heretical teaching relies on **deviously trying to argue against all of the clear Scriptures** which we have examined in this article. All the Scriptures we have examined must be discredited in some way. But those who seek to discredit these Scriptures always ignore the actual meaning of the statements they argue against. One example of this approach is when they deny that Jesus Christ is the only possible candidate for sitting at the right hand of God the Father (Psalm 110:1). They never suggest any alternative candidate for this position of sitting at the Father's right hand, because there is no possible alternative.

So if you are ever confronted by someone who seeks to persuade you that Jesus Christ was supposedly created by God the Father, then you need to think of all the Scriptures we have examined in this article. And instead of being defensive you need to **attack the heresy**, and to expose all the flaws in that heretical teaching. God expects nothing less from you.

Frank W Nelte

