

Focus on the Kingdom

Vol. 15 No. 1

Anthony Buzzard, editor

October, 2012

The Biblical Sign of the Second Coming in Mark 13:14

Mark 13:14: “Verse 14 marks the beginning of something quite extraordinary...In Daniel 9:27, ‘The Awful Horror’ [Abomination of Desolation] designates the pagan altar which was erected at that time upon the altar of burnt offering in the temple courtyard. [There is a yet future fulfillment too.] The discussion which follows clearly indicates that here in Mark 13:14 [Jesus’ famous Olivet Discourse] the term **refers to a person**. Perhaps the seer expected a sacrilege similar to what Caligula planned when he ordered his statue to be set up in the temple. Is it possible that he used this expression to signify the appearance of the Antichrist in the temple? The suddenness of the event might favor this interpretation (2 Thess. 2:3ff). Undoubtedly the phrase ‘where **he** should not be’ refers to the temple, since the entire passage presupposes a Jewish situation” (Schweizer, *The Good News According to Mark*, 1966, p. 272).

“But the sacrilege, whatever it may be, is perpetrated by some **person**. Hence **person and thing are intermingled in the imagery**. In the Gospel accounts exactly the same thing occurs. **In Matthew the abomination is described as a thing** which stands in a holy place (24:15). But **in Mark a neuter noun** (‘abomination’) is modified by a masculine participle. This **strange grammatical shift** shows that for Mark the abomination is a **person who stands where he ought not to stand (Mark 13:14)**. **The man of lawlessness in 2 Thess. 2 is clearly an individual**. He opposes and exalts himself against all that is called God or is worshipped. He arrogated to himself the prerogatives of deity. He sits in the temple of God and proclaims that he himself is God (2 Thess. 2:4). This lawless one is the offshoot or product of the mystery of lawlessness which is continually operating” (Mickelsen, *Interpreting the Bible*, p. 293).

“Mark has a masculine adjective ‘standing’ indicating that he associates the sacrilege with an individual” (Wenham, *Paul: Follower of Jesus?* p. 319).

A Kingdom of God Gem: Psalm 97:1 (LXX): “For David, when his land is established. The Lord reigns, let the earth exult, let many islands rejoice.” The Bible everywhere speaks of peace in the land and thus across the world, when Messiah and the saints rule the world after the Second Coming (the Parousia) of Jesus.

A Single Bible Verse which is Fundamentally Significant for Your Understanding of the Bible’s Chief Personalities

Please read the following 8 versions of the verse which is the NT’s favorite proof text for identifying who Jesus is. There is a matter of extreme significance here. It involves the capitalization or non-capitalization of the second lord. Jesus affirmed that this was a divinely inspired oracle given by GOD to David, and a prediction of the Messiah and his status in relation to God. With this verse Jesus stumped all of his critics (Matt. 22:46). This verse has a huge corrective potential for Bible readers. In other words Psalm 110:1 has much work to do today too!

If you look in your Bible, you may well find that the second lord is given a capital L and is written Lord. This is very misleading, because translators’ policy is to write Lord (with capital) when the underlying original Hebrew is ADONAI which means *the* (supreme) Lord, i.e. the One God. ADONAI is the title given to YHVH. YHVH is the *personal* name for the One God of the Bible, the God of Israel and the God of Jesus. It occurs 6,828 times in the OT. Readers should become familiar with this critically important difference between the title ADONAI אֲדֹנָי for YHVH, and the other word ADONI אֲדֹנִי my lord (no capital), which is never a reference to Deity.

Now please inspect these 8 translations:

Basic Bible in English: “The Lord said to my lord”

English Revised Version (1881): “The LORD saith unto my lord”

Jewish Publication Society: “The LORD saith unto my lord”

New American Bible (Roman Catholic): “The LORD says to you, my lord”

New English Translation: “Here is the LORD’s proclamation to my lord”

New Revised Standard: “The LORD says to my lord”

Revised Standard Version: “The LORD says to my lord”

TNK, Jewish translation: “The LORD said to my lord”

You will observe that in all of these 8 versions, the second lord is *correctly* written as “lord,” not “Lord.” The underlying Hebrew noun is the word *adoni* (pronounced in English “adonee”), and this word, occurring 195 times in the OT, never refers to Deity, i.e. to God. The custodians of the Hebrew text, Jews, were meticulously careful to distinguish God from man. They gave both God and men of rank the title of lord, but in the Hebrew there are two clearly distinguished forms of “lord.” One is ADONAI, the supreme and only Lord God (YHVH), and the other is ADONI, a human (occasionally angelic) superior.

Let us now see how beautifully clear this is. If we start in Genesis we are going to be introduced to ADONI first as a reference to Abraham. Sarah remarks that she is too old to bear a child “and my lord (*adoni*) is also old.” Abraham is “my lord,” certainly not GOD! Then in Genesis there is “my lord Esau,” and “my lord Jacob,” and “my lord Joseph.” When we get to the books of Samuel and Kings there is a marvelous series of *adoni* personages.

David is *adoni*, my lord, as addressed by the intelligent woman Abigail (married to a fool, Nabal). Abigail is inspired to recognize that God is fighting His battles through this gifted messianic King David. She falls on her face before him and uses the royal protocol *adoni*, my lord, of him many times. David is Abigail’s lord, certainly not LORD GOD!

Other kings and dignitaries, the king of Assyria, and sometimes angels who represent God are called *adoni*, my lord. We lack space to detail all of the 195 appearances of this precious word ADONI אֲדֹנָי

Is the Bible’s Definition of God So Difficult?

After these decades of pondering and reading about how believers have struggled to define God in the Bible, I am left wondering: Was this really meant to be such a torturously difficult brain-breaking subject? The history of this subject is littered with contentious church councils and often a cruel dogmatism which banished or even killed those who did not submit to ecclesiastical authority.

Have theology and Christology — who is God and who is Jesus — really warranted anathemas, excommunications and even murders in the name of “right doctrine”? Yes, I know that conventional systems of belief warn you never, on pain of the loss of your salvation, to veer from “orthodoxy.” The fear factor is very great! But the fact remains that the average churchgoer cannot defend the doctrine of the Trinity!

Here is what I propose as an easy way to approach the subject of defining God biblically. When Jews and Jesus and Paul made **definitive** and **decisive** statements about their creed, which is nothing less than a declaration of the constitution of the universe, they model a refreshing simplicity. When asked by a fellow Jew about the greatest of all the commandments, Jesus replied by citing what was really Judaism’s only “creed”: “Listen, Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord” (Deut. 6:4 cited by Jesus in Mark 12:29). That God, and no other, was to be understood and loved. All else meant an inevitable lapse into idolatry, the most awful sin — the sin to be avoided at all costs.

When Jesus replied to the inquiring scribe (professional scholar) that “the Lord our God is one Lord” (Mark 12:29) the scribe responded warmly and enthusiastically: “You have spoken well, rabbi, that God is one and that there is no other than He.”

Will you, reader, now face this question? Is this creed of Jesus and the Jewish scholar your creed, or have you been taught a creed of a different sort? Are the words of Jesus, the Savior, your prime concern?

What about the Jewish Christian Paul, minister in Christ to the Gentiles? What was his creed? Was it complex, requiring pages of technical language for its expression? Definitely not. In 1 Corinthians 8:4-6 Paul tackles our issue by discussing the many gods and lords of the pagan world. Then by contrast he states the Christian creed: “To us [Christians] there is ONE God, the FATHER, and no other God but He.”

There are 1300 similar verses in the NT in which the Greek word *theos* (GOD) means the Father! Each of these is a unitarian proof text! Not once when the Bible says GOD, in either Testament, does it mean a triune, Trinitarian God! How can we conclude otherwise than that the God of the Bible and of Jesus is not a Trinity!

Does this require the help of an army of learned theologians to grasp that “To us there is one God, the Father”? Did not Paul obviously declare the same creed as uttered by Jesus and the Jewish scribe? God is one and there is no other. That one God is the Father and there is no other God but He. This is the essence of simplicity and clarity.

Now think about this: What does a Trinitarian creed sound like? The proposition is “There is one God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.” Such a creed is never stated in Scripture. Could that be because the Bible writers had never heard of such a creed?

Do we realize that Jesus is not once called the LORD GOD? He is called the lord Messiah in Luke 2:11, and this title for the Messiah ought to be trumpeted everywhere. Luke recorded a splendid fact of human history when he announced the birth not of GOD (God cannot be born) but of the lord Messiah (Luke 2:11).

The blind men seeking to regain sight hailed Jesus and appealed to him as “lord, son of David.” “Lord” here obviously and plainly did not mean LORD God!

Add now the simplicity of Malachi 2:10. “Do we not all have one Father? Has not one God created us?”

You probably know that one of the basic features of the Hebrew Bible (the OT) is that two statements like this reinforce each other. Two propositions repeat the same idea for clarity and emphasis. Malachi summarized the whole OT (indeed the whole Bible) in one beautifully non-complex idea. “There is One God who is the Creator and Father of the nation of Israel and of the whole universe.” Why not let your mind rest in that glorious health-giving truth?

This same God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob was of course the God of Israel, and of the prophets, and the “God and Father of our lord Jesus Christ.” Is this difficult? That One God, the Father, had revealed Himself as a single Divine Person by means of thousands of singular personal pronouns. You know, I am sure, that a singular personal pronoun defines a single person. God is called one Person, too, when the Bible speaks (21 times) of God’s soul, His self. He is a single, individual divine Self.

How complicated was Paul’s later and final declaration about God? Not so hard. “There is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Messiah Jesus” (1 Tim. 2:5). Paul could have so easily written, “There is one God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.” But he did not!

How frequently the Bible says that he who believes that **Jesus is the Christ, or the Son of God**, is pleasing to God. Never once does it say that he who believes that Jesus IS GOD is doing well. It is amazingly significant that John wrote his whole gospel with the express intention of conveying to us all that “Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God” (John 20:31). It was in that great truth and nothing else that we are to find rest, peace and spiritual security. (But you may find a considerable hostility to that easy creed in many church circles!)

If we turn to Trinitarian attempts to describe and define a belief in one God, we have moved from biblical simplicity to frightening complexity. Dr. James White’s *Forgotten Trinity* contains a chapter titled “What Is the Trinity?” Dr. White rightly complains that many a discussion of the Godhead becomes mired in confusion, because terms are not defined. He then leads with this heading: “Can You Define the Undefinable?” He asks us to consider that in trying to define God “we have real difficulty right at the start: language itself. Christians have struggled for centuries to express within the limitations of human language the unique revelation that God makes of His mode of existence. We struggle because language is a finite means of communication.

Finite minds are trying to express in finite language infinite truths” (p. 24).

Has it not occurred to Dr. White that God’s revelation in Scripture about how many He is is given us in normal grammatical language? Otherwise it would not be a revelation at all.

I note right away that Dr. White cites some 250 Bible verses but he has not mentioned Malachi 2:10 nor the creed of Jesus in Mark 12:29, nor Paul’s summary description of God in 1 Timothy 2:5. When he gets to 1 Corinthians 8:4-6 he cites Paul’s reference to “one God, the Father.” This is a typical Jewish Christian unitarian assertion, echoed by Jesus in Mark 12:29, that God is a single Person, the Father. Yes, indeed the Lord Jesus Christ is immediately associated with the Father, but Dr. White assumes that “one Lord” for Jesus is equivalent to one God. Some, he recognizes, say that because Paul restricts the Father to the category One God this means that Jesus is not also the One God.

After all, Jesus is called the “one *Lord* Jesus Christ.” If, so the argument goes, Jesus is the one Lord, then the Father must be excluded from Lordship. The argument is fallacious. Dr. White’s assumption is that Lord when used of Jesus and God has the same meaning. That is not so. As early as Luke 2:11 Jesus is defined as the lord *Messiah* and in 2:26 he is the LORD’s Messiah. Both Jesus and God are “lord” but in quite different senses.

Elizabeth knew this when she recognized Mary as “the mother of my lord” — not the mother of YHVH. **All this goes back to the centrally important Psalm 110:1** where there are two lords. The one Lord God, YHVH, utters a solemn oracle in favor of David’s lord, “my lord.”

The word in the Hebrew for the second lord is *adoni*, which in all of its 195 occurrences never means GOD or Deity. *Adoni*, my lord, is the supremely important royal title for the king of Israel and other leading personalities, but *adoni*, my lord, never means God. The word for God is *Adonai*, the supreme Lord God. The distinction in the Hebrew and the Greek is fundamental, lest we fall into the trap of believing in two Lords who are both Lord God!

The distinction between Lord God (*Adonai*) and a human superior, my lord, is essential to good understanding. The famous *International Bible Encyclopedia* stated the truth: “It is essential to distinguish carefully between the divine and non-divine title **adonai** and **adoni**.”

The *whole of the NT* is built on the scheme proposed by the oracle in Psalm 110:1. Jesus knew this well when he stumped his antagonistic audience by citing Psalm 110:1. He told us that it was the **Son of Man** at the right hand of God (Mark 14:62), and Stephen at his death saw Psalm 110:1 in action and defined the second lord as the

Son of Man (Acts 7:56). That demonstrates that *adoni* (my lord) is a human being. Psalm 80:17 had also defined the Messiah as the “man of Your right hand.”

No one ought to imagine that the second lord was God! The whole picture of God and man was distorted when Jesus was defined as a second God in a triune Godhead. This unfortunate theological development from the second century removed the creed of Jesus (Mark 12:29) from the foundation of the faith. It led to endless squabbles and centuries of unnecessary argument, dividing and confusing. The end product was an imperial-ecclesiastical decision to anathematize anyone who dared say the Son of God began to exist in history! Matthew’s and Luke’s accounts of the coming into existence of the Son of God were ruled out of bounds. They are in fact simple statements about the origin of the Son in Mary, by miracle (Luke 1:35; Matt. 1:18, 20).

Equally confusing was the loss of the Hebrew Bible’s long preparation and fore-announcing of the Messiah (Christ) to come. David had already referred to the Israelite King Saul as the Lord’s anointed. The Hebrew reads “the Lord’s Messiah” (I Sam. 24:6). The people were looking forward to the ultimate righteous **human** king, not a visitor from a complex Triune Godhead. Israel knew nothing of such a God, and still does not.

It is really amazing to imagine Jesus believing in a Trinitarian God! If he did, how could he possibly have kept a straight face while agreeing with a learned Jew about the “Hear, O Israel”? About the One True God?

Christians should be encouraged to engage a gentle conversation with all-comers on this point: **Is Christianity the only world religion which begins by discarding its own founder’s creed?** I ask this seriously; it is a really interesting question.

Jesus in multiple passages makes obedience to his teachings the absolute key (John 12:44ff; 3:36; Heb. 5:9, etc.) and criterion for a successful relationship with him and his Father. Is anyone going to argue that Jesus in Mark 12:29 was proposing a Triune God?

Luke knew well that the promised Savior was to be born, and he brilliantly introduces us to the ultimate Christ, Messiah, the Anointed One. Using the same language as the 16 references to the OT “anointed one,” Luke presents Jesus to us as “the Lord’s Anointed,” i.e. Christ, “the Lord’s Christ” (Luke 2:26). Here then is the *final* David, the final perfect king in the line of earlier flawed kings. Yes, Jesus was the sinless king, as well as the King Messiah of ancient expectation.

When he arrived, supernaturally begotten in Mary (Matt. 1:20; Luke 1:35; 1 John 5:18, not KJV), his people were so drugged by the religious establishment of the day that they were unable to recognize him! They killed him as a false Messiah. They thought he ought to have freed them from Rome and inaugurated the

promised worldwide Messianic Kingdom there and then. Jesus instructed his inner circle, those who recognized him as indeed the long-promised King Messiah of Israel, that after a period undetermined (left in the counsels of God, Acts 1:7) he would reappear, this time from heaven, to commence his royal rule in Jerusalem. And to involve his true followers of all the ages to assist him in managing the world (Matt. 19:28; Rev. 2:26; 3:21; 5:10: “on the earth”; 1 Cor. 6:2, Dan. 7:18, 22, 27).

It was not long before even some of his followers, beginning late in the first century, abandoned this hope and substituted a vague promise of heaven for individuals at death! Added to this, they transformed the man Messiah Jesus of Paul’s easy creed in 1 Timothy 2:5 (exactly echoing Ps. 110:1!) into a second God. Of course they loudly proclaimed that they believed in one God! But they conveniently left out the NT definition of that One God. The NT, echoing thousands of OT verses, and based on the unitarian creed of Moses and Jesus (Deut. 6:4; Mk. 12:29), was that “there is one God, the Father.” You will look in vain for any reference to “one God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit”! That is not the belief of the early Christians. There are 1300 verses in the NT which make the same unitarian proposition. That is, the word GOD means the Father 1300 times. Each of these statements, ranging across the whole NT, signals the easy fact that God is one Person.

Psalm 110:1, with its unique oracle from YHVH, penned as Jesus said under inspiration and given to David, places a *human* Messiah, Son of God and of David, “at My right hand until I make your enemies your footstool.” Astonishingly today you can walk into the average Christian bookstore, pick up one of several commentaries on the Psalms, and find that the second lord in Psalm 110:1 is *Adonai*, the Lord God! How is the protest against this unwarranted piece of misinformation going to begin? It is time for the public to be warned that its traditions are not solidly biblical. A mindless, uncritical approach seems to lull churchgoers into a cheerful acceptance of the status quo! But all is not well when Scripture is being misrepresented at its heart.

Psalm 110:1 has yet to have its day! The LORD gave an utterance to “my lord” (*adoni*). *Adoni* is the standard royal protocol address to the king and other superiors. No one calls GOD *adoni* in the Bible. The Lord God is *Adonai* and the distinction has been long understood — but not to the Bible-reading public.

The 6,828 occurrences of YHVH never appear as *kurios mou* (my lord) in the LXX, the Greek version of the NT which is very frequently cited by the NT.

In desperation to maintain the notion that God speaks to God in Psalm 110:1, some have tried to argue that the vowel points in the Hebrew text of today have been corrupted. Happily the NT provides inspired evidence for

this very false allegation. *Adoni* (my lord) in Hebrew is properly rendered as *kurios mou* (my lord) in Greek. Scores of verses show the standard contrast between a human leader (*adoni*, my lord) and *Adonai* or YHVH = the Lord God.

It is a grand fallacy to think that in the times before the vowel points were added to the written text, no one read the text aloud! It was read week by week in the synagogue and the difference between YHVH (Lord God) and *adoni* (my [human] lord) was well understood, and it is reflected in the Greek OT Bible (the LXX) in BC times. That difference is confirmed by the NT when it translates *adoni* (my lord) into the Greek words *kurios* (lord) *mou* (my). Scores of times this distinction is found in the LXX, the Greek Bible quoted often and thus affirmed as true by the NT writers.

In complete desperation some have ventured to challenge the word *adoni* appearing in the standard Hebrew text, faithfully transmitted over the centuries. Some have found three exceptions to the rule that *Adonai* is *kurios* (the Lord) and not *kurios mou* (my lord)! What they did not notice is that the 3 exceptions (exceptions do not make the rule!) occur when GOD, one Person (unlike Ps. 110:1 where God speaks to another), is given a double address as Lord and God. In these unusual and exceptional cases the Greek adds a *mou* (my) to Lord to address God. The two main examples are found in Psalm 16:2 and 35:23. You will see at a glance that neither is in any way parallel to Psalm 110:1 and the scores of examples like it. One must not compare apples with oranges.

In the scores of verses in which *kurios* (Lord God, Yahweh) is **contrasted with a non-Deity superior**, that non-Deity superior is called *adoni*, *kurios mou*, my lord. The system of distinction is secure and obvious. Two exceptions in which God is called “my Lord” are readily explicable because of a single addressee.

Your Bible is not corrupted in its original Hebrew in Psalm 110:1 (except for the translators’ false capital on the second lord). The Hebrew word is entirely secure. It is *adoni*, a word which needs to come out of hiding worldwide and shine as the beacon light defining the human Messiah Jesus. Paul said it all well in 1 Timothy 2:5: “There is one God [obviously the Father here, as in 1300 other NT verses!] and one mediator between God and man, the man Messiah Jesus.” God has planned to judge the world by a MAN whom he has appointed. He raised that man from the dead, and God cannot raise God from death since God cannot die! (For all this read Acts 17:30-31.)✧

Who Is the True God in 1 John 5:20?

The Truth that Few Want to See!

By Mario A. Olcese, Peru

“And we know that the Son of God has come and has given us an understanding, that we may know Him who is true; and we are in Him who is true, in His Son Jesus Christ. **This** is the true God and eternal life.”

Many of those who mistakenly believe that the Messiah is the true God maintain that the final sentence in this verse, “This is the true God and eternal life,” refers to Jesus, the Messiah, since the nearest noun to the word “This” is “Jesus Christ.” However, since God and the Messiah are both referred to in the first sentence of the verse, the final sentence can refer to either one of them. The word (a pronoun) “this,” which begins the final sentence, is *outos*¹ in Greek, and a study of it will show that the context, not the noun nearest the pronoun, must determine the reference of “this.”

The Bible provides examples to help us, and a good one can be found in Acts 7:18-19: “Till another king arose who did not know Joseph. **This** [Greek *outos*] man dealt treacherously with our people, and oppressed our forefathers, making them expose their babies, so that they might not live.” It is clear in this example that “this” (*outos*) cannot refer to Joseph, although Joseph is the nearest noun. “This” refers to the king, the first one in the verse, although that evil king is not the nearest noun.

If it is true that pronouns always refer to the nearest noun, this would lead to serious theological problems. Another example is found in Acts 4:10-11: “Let it be known to you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom you crucified, whom God raised from the dead, by him this man stands here before you whole. **This** [*outos*] is the ‘stone which was rejected by you builders, which has become the chief cornerstone.’” If “this” in the last sentence refers to the nearest noun, then the man who was healed is really the stone rejected by the builders who has become the cornerstone, that is to say, the Messiah. Of course this conclusion is not true.

The context, not the placement of the noun or pronoun, is the vital key for correctly understanding 1 John 5:20: “And we know that the Son of God has come and has given us an understanding, that we may know Him who is true; and we are in Him who is true, in His Son Jesus Christ. **This** [*outos*] is the true God and eternal life.” As in the two previous examples, the pronoun “This” in this verse is not referring to the nearest noun, but rather to the Father, one of two persons who are mentioned in the verse.

¹We use the modern Greek pronunciation of Greek when teaching the language at Atlanta Bible College. This is also the case at Harvard University.

A last example: 1 John 2:22. This interesting text says, “Who is the liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? **This** [outos] is the antichrist, he who denies the Father and the Son.” If we conclude that “This is the antichrist” refers to the Messiah, the person who immediately precedes this sentence, we would have to conclude that the Messiah is the antichrist, and this would be a serious blasphemy! So we see that we cannot conclude that the sentence “This is the true God and eternal life” refers to the immediately antecedent person, because if we read it this way, we would have to read the same thing in 1 John 2:22, and then we would be blaspheming against the Son.

Finally, it is the same teacher, Jesus the Messiah, who revealed the Father to us, saying: “And this is eternal life: that they know You [not “know us”], the only true God, and Jesus, the Messiah, whom You sent” (John 17:3). Here our dear Lord clearly teaches us a truth that few want to accept because of Catholic and Protestant tradition. This truth is that the same Messiah taught that his Father is the only true God and nobody else. Even in heaven, Jesus continues calling His Father “**my God**” four times in Revelation 3:12: “He who overcomes, I will make him a pillar in the temple of **my God**, and he shall go out no more. I will write on him the name of **my God** and the name of the city of **my God**, the New Jerusalem, which comes down out of heaven from **my God**. And I will write on him my new name.” We wonder, Can a true God have his own true God? I believe that this point deserves serious consideration. ✧

The Trinitarian idea of God is fundamentally a contradiction of simple language:

Have you ever looked at the Trinitarian claim this way?

[1 HE] + [1 HE] + [1 HE] = [3 HE's] Claimed to be True in Trinitarian doctrine. 1+1+1 = 3

[1 HE] + [1 HE] + [1 HE] = [1 HE] Also claimed to be True in Trinitarian doctrine (one Triune HE).

1+1+1=1

Therefore:

[1 HE] + [1 HE] + [1 HE] = [3 HE's] = [1 HE] or
1+1+1=3=1

Hence:

[1 HE] = [3 HE's]

I believe this may be the simplest way to illustrate the muddled confusion of the Trinitarian position.

There Is No Word “Yahshuah”!

I wrote this in an email to a correspondent:

Please do note this in the interests of accuracy: You say that “the original text states that the actual name given to Jesus is Yehoshua” (back of your book). But you must deal with this question: Where is your original text of Scripture **for the NT** which makes any issue over Hebrew names or writes Yeshua or Yehoshua? (much less Yahshuah). The danger is that you imply that the Holy Scripture in Greek is flawed. (We all acknowledge the Hebrew Bible and of course the LXX which is often cited in the NT.) What is your answer to that point? (I know of course that Mary and the family did not speak Greek, certainly not as a first language.) But you and I do have HOLY SCRIPTURE in Greek. That is all we have for making any point of truth. Nowhere is any issue made about Hebrew names in the Greek Scripture. So why make it?

Thanks for listening,

Anthony

BTW there is no such word as **YAHSHUAH!** Not that I think you recommend it, but many do!

Comments

“I grew up in the church and have been part of many denominations but always had questions about the Trinity, hell, immortality of the soul, pre-tribulation rapture and the Incarnation of Christ. These things did not add up when I read the Scriptures; I had these questions in the back of my mind but never questioned them publicly. My family and I have not attended ‘church’ regularly (to say the least) in the past couple of years. It all started when after listening to a Christian radio program I started to question what the Church as a whole practiced and taught — church property, senior pastors, youth pastors, secretaries, incorporation, tithes (to the point of damning people), hallelujah parties (‘christian’ halloween parties) and more. This made me keep my distance from the Church and in researching all of this and looking back at how Jesus and the apostles established it, I began to see a big difference between the Bible and church.

“From a gathering of believers in a small family atmosphere to now a mega ‘church’ with thousands of people seating in a stadium-like building and only a few, if not one person doing all the talking — all of this has put me off somewhat. I enjoy the interaction with others and the exchanging of ideas and point of views. I am not opposed to leadership, but when it gets in the way of Jesus manifesting himself in the meeting then I think it is wrong; we all have a gift, and by gift I do not mean taking care of babies in the nursery while others ‘enjoy’ the presence of God in the sanctuary...I also do not want to be put in a box by the titles we Christians give

ourselves, whether Protestant, Pentecostal, Baptist or any other. Instead I hope others see that I am a child of the Living God whose throne is in heaven. I hope that maybe in the not so distant future I will be able to have a meeting of believers in our house or be part of one. Thank you for opening my understanding on the Person of God. I just got the *Focus on the Kingdom* September 2012 edition, cannot wait to read it.” — *Indiana*

“I need to give you more thanks for the *Focus on the Kingdom*. I had a good debate with several denominations. The areas which pastors were convinced are: December, 2011 *Focus on the Kingdom* articles by Robin Todd, ‘Recovering the True Gospel’ and by Ken Lokken, and James Yates, ‘Vindication of Unitarianism, 1816.’ These newsletters are helping me to know more about God, Jesus, etc.” — *Malawi*

“I enjoy reading your articles because they make sense. Can you tell me why those who can read and write Greek and Hebrew and can translate the Bible, come to the conclusion that there is a Trinity and that Jesus is God the Son? How is it that your understanding of Greek and Hebrew is so different than those who translate the Scripture and produce versions of the Bible such as the KJV, New American Standard and Scofield? I do not understand Greek or Hebrew but what you write takes away most of my confusion of Scripture. One more thing: How can these Jewish Messianic congregations believe that Jesus is God and the Trinity? Their minds must be in a turmoil believing this, especially when they have a Jewish heritage!” — *Michigan*

“I enjoy reading the *Focus on the Kingdom* magazine. It has been so eye-opening for me. And your videos on YouTube are so enlightening to say the least. I have always had a hard time believing that God/The Almighty was a Trinity or that Jesus had a dual nature. The teachings that you have provided as well as the ones from the 21st Century Reformation folks (21stcr.org) have created in me a deeper appreciation for the PLAN of God.” — *Indiana*

“Just finished reading the September *Focus on the Kingdom*. To me nothing is more important than understanding the Kingdom of God, and the fact that Jesus is not and never was God! Are Trinitarians really willing to say that God came from the Davidic bloodline? If Jesus was God in the flesh when he ascended to heaven wouldn’t he have reclaimed the throne as God? Instead Jesus sat at His right hand as High Priest. Thanks for the articles. I really enjoy learning from you!” — *Alabama*

“I was confused, but thank you for clarifying the very confusing concept of the Trinity! Perhaps you should write a commentary on the Bible, where you clarify all the confusing passages in one book?” — *England*

“To me ‘preexistence’ could only mean before something or someone existed. It could only imply they

didn’t exist yet. You can preexist someone else but not yourself. That would be laughable! It would be like beating yourself in a race or a tennis match! Neither Christ nor anyone else has ever existed before their existence. Don’t let the word get hijacked or warped in your mind.” — *Ohio*

“Thank you for your excellent articles in *Focus on the Kingdom* on pre-existence and on what ‘one’ really means. Your scholarship is equivalent to the Cornish definition of a farmer: A man out standing in his field. I appreciate your insight very much.” — *Australia*

“I will definitely contact you soon. I am kind of at a loss as to what to do. I am beginning to be more bold about my beliefs because I am reading it all over the Bible! I have a great reputation here at my university as a follower of Jesus Christ. I want to use all that God has given me here to share the truth of God’s word. Any encouragement would be great. Also there are several passages that prove difficult for me to teach. One of my friends is struggling with Philippians 2. He now does not believe that Jesus is God but he thinks he was pre-existent. I am not sure how to help him. Thank you for your help. I am beginning to see a Jesus that is so much more approachable and understandable, and that fits with Scripture. The identity of Jesus is so elusive in our Christian culture. They say he has to be God or he is nothing, but they have left out option C, the uniquely born, Son of God, the Messiah and Savior of the world. Satan has blinded so many to believe in a false Jesus and a false gospel. It is absolutely huge! I have to keep focused because sometimes I question myself, but the Scriptures are so clear. God is most definitely not three but one!” — *Tennessee*

“On page 5 of the September *FotK* you asked readers to email if the point is clear about *echad* meaning one, period. Although I was already fully convinced I thought I would just write and tell you that I thought you did a great job explaining it. I really appreciate getting *FotK* each month. Our friend in Kansas mentions nearly every time I talk to her how she closely reads every single word in each edition. It is a great privilege to get to be exposed to the benefits of your many thousands of hours of diligent research into the most important of all subjects.” — *Indiana*

“I am a student in the university but I teach and preach people the word of God. I must say I have a lot of people who say I preach heresy because I said and do preach that Jesus is not God but rather the lord Messiah or Christ. I have said to myself I will continue to teach and preach that no matter the insults and hatred I may have from people. I will be glad if you always remember me in your prayers so that God will send me far to preach this hidden truth to many people.” — *Ghana*