

# Focus on the Kingdom

Vol. 16 No. 11

Anthony Buzzard, editor

August, 2014

## Losing Luke and Jumping to John

Church members tend to accept without careful examination the “Jesus” presented to them in church. The question of the **origin** of a person is crucial. A person is defined by his origin. We frequently seek for this information when we ask, “Where are you from?”

The most important question to be asked in relation to the Son of God is about his *origin*. Where did he come from, how and when? There is a yawning chasm of difference between a person who has existed for eternity as **eternal God**, before appearing as a human being, and one who **begins to exist in the womb** of his mother. A genuine human being must, by definition, begin to exist in his mother’s womb!

There is also a chasm of difference between a person who originates as an angel and then reduces himself, or is reduced by God to a fetus and is born from a woman. Hebrews 1:5 and 13 definitively say twice that Jesus was never, ever an angel! But this does not prevent some seven million Jehovah’s Witnesses from asserting the very opposite — that Jesus was in fact an angel, Michael. Such is the power, demonstrably, of deception on a massive scale!

In order to qualify as the promised Messiah, Jesus must be a **human person**, a lineal, blood relative and descendant of King David. Psalm 132:11 and 89:35-37 (cp. Luke 1:69) make this crystal clear. The Messiah is to be a direct, biological descendant of the royal king of Israel (the genealogy of Joseph as legal father and Mary as actual mother are found in the gospels, both tracing the royal line to Nathan, son of David, Luke 3:31).

The Messiah is in fact the ultimate and final royal ruler of Israel, and he is going to bring peace to our war-torn world. That is the whole point of the Gospel about the coming Kingdom. The **government** of the world will be on his shoulders (Isa. 9:6). Look around you and be assured that this has never yet happened! But it will.

Luke was a meticulous, educated Christian historian, determined to lay out in order the precise content of the Christian faith (Luke 1:3-4), so that Theophilus, for whom Luke wrote, could be reassured of the absolute accuracy of the Christian facts he had received as the only true faith.

We too are immensely blessed by having the inspired words of Luke, defining with pristine simplicity the true Jesus and the true Christian faith, available all these years later.

The crucial issue is whether we are prepared to believe in the Jesus who was fully a man, descended from David, the second Adam — and of course miraculously fathered, brought into existence in the womb of his mother, by miracle (Luke 1:35; Matt. 1:18, 20, 1 John 5:18, not KJV).

My purpose in this article is to show that the beautifully crafted account by Luke of the **origin** of Jesus, the Son of God has been subtly undermined, in fact rejected by churchgoers, who unwittingly and uncritically received and continue to receive in church a longstanding tradition about Jesus which *negates, obliterates and denies the account given by Luke* (and Matthew).

This is a very serious matter of identity and possible *mistaken* identity! The issue is worthy of our earnest investigation as Bereans (Acts 17:11).

The truth about the identity of the only genuine Jesus of the Bible was of such massive import that God saw fit to dispatch the angel Gabriel to communicate the vital identity facts necessary for clear understanding. When angels speak we are meant to pay close attention! When angels communicate we may take it for granted that they were skilled enough with words to be easily comprehended.

The Bible was never intended to be a brain-breaking, inscrutable puzzle fit only for learned experts! You, as a devoted lover of God and Jesus, can understand who Jesus is! And you *must*, on pain of remaining in a colossal muddle and misunderstanding of easy language.

We remember that Gabriel was commissioned to perform a task on behalf of God on two momentous occasions. Firstly in Daniel 9, where Daniel, in deep distress over the disastrous condition of Jerusalem and the Temple, begs God to forgive his own and his nation’s sins and restore peace and security to Israel. Daniel’s impassioned pleas are met by an extraordinary visit from Gabriel, speaking for the One God. Daniel is given blessed reassurance, in answer to his persistent question about “how long” it will be before **final restoration comes**. He is told that at the end of a period of 70 “sevens,” 490 years, all will be finally well. Restoration will come to Jerusalem and Israel.

The fanciful idea that the prophetic period of 490 years would end in either 33 AD or alternatively in 70 AD should be set aside as quite untrue! It would be the worst sort of cynicism to offer Daniel a “resolution” of his prayer request, by telling him that at the end of 490 years the city would experience another equally appalling

disaster! As is well known, the Romans devastated Jerusalem, burned the temple and killed or deported well over a million Jews! This happened in AD 70. That event is *certainly not* the fulfilling of a prophecy about restoration!

All the great prophecies in Daniel, who lived in the sixth century BC, terminate in the only climax which ultimately counts, the future establishment of the Messianic Kingdom of GOD on earth, to be introduced by Jesus at his second coming (chs. 2, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12).

The other equally momentous occasion for which Gabriel was dispatched on an amazing mission, was his visit to the young Jewess, the virgin Mary, who was engaged to Joseph. These were members of the royal house of David, scrupulously recorded by public genealogies, not currently ruling of course as royal family, and it was to that family that the Messiah had to be born. The integrity of the whole of Scripture was at stake.

Luke is most specific in his detailing of how and when and where the promised Messiah would originate. The first important fact to note is **that Luke did not describe the arrival, from outside the womb, of a “preexisting” second member of a triune Godhead!** It is regrettably confusing to read one’s own traditions into Luke’s account and thus alter it, falsify it, drastically. This is unfair treatment of Holy Scripture. Luke deliberately excludes any idea that the **Son of God**, whom Luke says was fathered by miracle in Mary and born to Mary, was *already alive* before being conceived! Could it be that your church’s misreading of Luke confuses the identity of Jesus?

Here is how Luke details the vastly important event of the **origin and thus identity** of the Son of God, Jesus. Luke recalls first that Zacharias had been punished with loss of speech for nine months, for having refused to believe the straightforward words of the angel Gabriel: that his elderly wife Elizabeth would, contrary to normal expectation, become pregnant and bear John the Baptist (Luke 1:19-20).

Then comes the astonishingly significant visit of Gabriel, in the 6<sup>th</sup> month of Elizabeth’s pregnancy (Luke 1:26). The angel reassures Mary, who was very naturally alarmed at the appearance of an archangel in her house, that she is not to be afraid (Luke 1:30).

Gabriel then explains in easy, clear and concise language, how and when the promised Messiah was *to come into existence*. The biblical words are offered to us all as powerful, up-building information, certainly not as a matter for argument or dispute!

“The holy spirit, the power of the Most High God” was to overshadow her, and “**precisely for that reason**” (*dio kai*), the one to be begotten, fathered, would be “called the **Son of God**” (Luke 1:35). (Avoid the

deceptive addition of “also” in the KJV!) To be called Son of God, to be Son of God, is an identity statement. Son of God would be exactly who the one begotten = brought into existence would be! There is not the slightest difficulty or complication about this matchless account. It is lucidly clear. It must be believed as a fundamental building block of Christian faith.

It was meant to be definitive and decisive, and worthy of all trust. Unifying and comforting. Every NT writer based his understanding of who Jesus was and is on these inspired instructions of Gabriel. The NT does not present the hopelessly confused denominational scene of today. That chaos should alert us to the fact that something terribly wrong has happened! Could this be the problem? “Christendom has done away with Christianity without being quite aware of it” (Soren Kierkegaard, cited in *Time* magazine, Dec. 16, 1946).

The Messiah would evidently be related to David by being conceived and begotten in the womb of one who was of royal blood, and that person, so conceived and begotten, would therefore be the Son of God, *precisely for this one easy reason* — God was Jesus’ Father by biological miracle wrought through holy spirit, the creative power of God. This miracle occurred in Jesus’ mother Mary. In this way, too, the son of Mary/Son of God would qualify as the second and final Adam, who is also son of God (Luke 3:38).

We are blessed by having a superb and detailed account of and commentary on the birth narratives by the late Raymond Brown. This is a classic analysis of the detail of Luke and Matthew’s account of the origin of the Son of God, Messiah Jesus.

Brown points to an amazing fact! Church tradition about **a second member of the Godhead** wiped out the account given by Luke, altering it and explaining it away. Brown’s comments should cause urgent rethinking. They are cause for alarm. Brown points out that a fundamental obscuring of Luke’s and Gabriel’s words occurred when later tradition altered the account, by imposing on it the alien idea that the Son of God did NOT begin in the womb of his mother, as every human being by definition must.

Brown says, “For preexistence...the conception of Jesus is the beginning of an earthly career but *not* the begetting [bringing into existence] of God’s Son.” The later idea of a “preexisting” Son canceled and contradicted Luke’s account of the beginning of the Son of God. “The virginal conception,” Brown says rightly, “was **no longer seen** as the begetting of God’s Son, but as the Incarnation of a [preexisting] Son, and **that became orthodox doctrine**” (*The Birth of the Messiah*, p. 141). I hope our readers will receive a salutary shock from this amazing admission.

Note that Luke's account was directly contradicted and annulled by the later view which became orthodox, i.e. required by dogma to be believed by church members. As Brown says, as soon as the later preexistence theory became standard orthodox belief, "the virginal conception/begetting was *no longer seen* as the begetting of God's Son." **Luke and Gabriel were, in other words, no longer believed as revealing the true account of the origin of the Son of God!** The point of origin and thus the *identity of Jesus*, Son of God, was radically altered. "Orthodoxy" contradicted and superseded Luke, Gabriel and the Bible! This shift ought really to be called what it in fact was and is — a departure from Scripture and the imposition of a new and different identity on the Son of God. Is no one alarmed by this re-identification of the Son of God? Does no one see the disturbing possibility that a "different Jesus," a "different Christ" was smuggled in? "Church" could be much more of a "crime scene" than you imagined!

That new unbiblical origin and identity of the Son of God replaced the scriptural one announced by God through Gabriel, and that new unscriptural account took up residence as orthodox and standard in all the denominations! Few seem to have thought about the consequences of any interference with Luke and Matthew regarding the keys to the true Son of God.

We saw how refreshingly frank Raymond Brown was in his classic account of *The Birth of the Messiah*. He pointed to the subtle shift by which tradition negated Luke and Gabriel. Luke's account was "no longer" allowed to speak in church, once tradition took over. Tradition swamped Luke and Gabriel and swamps them to this day.

According to Luke, Mary is the one through whom and in whom the Son of God is **brought into existence**, fathered by miracle, begotten as unique Son of God. Jesus is the Son of God from the moment of his beginning to exist, i.e. the conception/begetting which took place in Mary. This is transparently clear and should not provoke any argument. Mary did not argue with Gabriel, or misunderstand him, but today many are ready to bury the truth of Gabriel's words in brain-breaking argumentation!

Brown takes note of the "crime scene" to which Luke's simple account became subject. "Some church fathers and medieval theologians thought that the reference in Luke 1:35 [‘the holy spirit and power of God’] referred respectively to the third and second Persons of the Trinity, so that ‘power’ was the second Person descending to take ‘flesh’ in Mary's womb. As we shall see **there is no evidence that Luke thought of the Incarnation of a pre-existent Son**" (p. 290).

The tragic overlaying of Luke with pagan philosophical ideas of a Trinitarian Godhead should be exposed and rejected. Brown goes on to remark how

embarrassing Luke 1:35 was to the Church leaders. He comments on the all-important **causal** "therefore" in Luke 1:35. This links the virginal begetting **explicitly** to Jesus being the Son of God. "This has embarrassed many orthodox theologians, since in preexistence [Trinitarian] Christology a conception by the Holy Spirit in Mary's womb *does not* bring about the existence of God's Son. Luke is unaware of such a Christology. For Luke **conception is causally related** to divine Sonship" (p. 291). There is a glaring mismatch between Luke and Scripture and what developed from the second century as dogma.

The flagrant contradiction of Luke by "theology" must not be missed, since it calls in question the whole of tradition for the past 1900 years. Raymond Brown drives his point home: "I cannot follow those theologians who try to avoid [try to avoid the Bible!] the connotation in the word 'therefore,' which begins this line. They argue that for Luke the conception of the child does *not* bring the Son into being, but only enables us to call him Son of God who already was Son of God." Brown summarizes his biblical findings with this: "Both narratives develop the Christological insight [how to define the identity of the true Jesus] that Jesus was the Son of God **from the first moment of his conception**" (p. 561). Not before!

That of course is straightforwardly and factually true, and it should cause readers to wonder with some urgency if they are learning the real account of the real identity of the real Jesus of history, of the Bible and of faith.

The contradiction is simple: Luke and Matthew based the fundamental identity of the Son of God, the Messiah, on the marvelous miracle effected by God in Mary. The connection is logical and absolutely clear. Its meaning really cannot be avoided. Gabriel was delightfully free of the waffly, confusing language so often found in some writing on the Bible.

The cause of the endless argument and inconclusiveness, and also often fierce dogmatism, is really the church tradition which has taken us all away from Scripture. If tradition were laid aside, we could all experience the joy of being in touch directly with the inspired words of Luke and Matthew and Gabriel.

We would then stop using John to contradict Matthew and Luke. We would not rush to John 1:1 and read it in a way which would confuse and obfuscate Matthew and Luke. John would be seen as announcing the plan and design of God: the word, not Word, from the beginning. Not the existence of a second GOD (the Son) which violates the creed of Israel and of Jesus (Mark 12:29; John 17:3) and negates the obvious contrast between the One God (Yahweh) and the Messiah who is the non-Deity "my lord" (*adoni*) of Psalm 110:1. This is the most favorite verse from the OT in the NT and it

should act as a warning barrier against interfering in any way with the most important of all commands, affirmed by Jesus in Mark 12:29 and John 17:3. God is a single Divine Person, so described by thousands of singular personal pronouns!

### More on the Crime Scene: the “Nunc Stans”

What on earth is that, you may well ask? It is the Latin phrase (“standing now”) meant to describe the idea that **for God all time is present!**

“Nunc stans” is the “eternal now,” the idea of eternity as standing still in the present. You could conceive of being around eternally as being around to watch all of history happen forever, but the idea of *nunc stans* is **as if you experience all of time in a single moment which never ends**. So a God who perceives the *nunc stans* would know everything that has happened and that will happen at the same moment for all eternity. It would be like being able to see all of time spread out before Him in another dimension or something.

Now comes the crunch! Let our readers pause and think here! In Psalm 2:7 we read a brilliant statement about the origin of the Son of God. It is God Himself who utters the following proposition: “You [the Messiah] are My Son: **Today** I have become your Father = brought you into existence.”

When you go to church in a Protestant or Catholic setting you are committing yourself to the belief that the “today” of the begetting, coming into existence of the Son (Ps. 2:7; repeated in LXX Ps. 110:3) **is not a day in time, but an endless day, because with God there is no today!**

This argument was constructed by the church fathers of the 4<sup>th</sup> century in order to justify the belief that Jesus is the eternal Son of God, who had no beginning in time. As one of the church fathers wrote, “The Son had a beginningless beginning.”

Now the critical question: Is that notion of a “beginningless beginning” and the companion idea that “today” with God means endless time an honest and honorable concept? Or is it sheer obfuscation and confusion of easy language?

One is reminded of a drug company selling the benefits of its new therapy. But hidden from the public are some dire side effects. In church the pew-sitters seem so little interested in the basis of their avowed belief. Do they *know or care* that the engineers and fabricators of their central doctrine about Jesus as GOD THE SON, the “eternally begotten Son,” were candid enough to say that belief in God the Son automatically commits you to believing that “today with God does not and cannot mean ‘today’”? Is “beginningless beginning” a fit phrase for rational, intelligent human beings? How about

“1+1+1=1” which millions of believers do not hesitate to declare as central dogma?

Let us finish by inviting you to ponder the words of world famous Christologist Dr. James Dunn: “There is of course always the possibility that ‘popular pagan superstition’ became ‘popular *Christian* superstition,’ by a gradual assimilation and spread of belief at the level of popular piety” (*Christology in the Making*, p. 251). ✧

## The Christian Destiny and Reward

The popular idea that the destiny of a Christian is going to heaven as a disembodied soul at death is a most unbiblical idea in need of radical reformation. Jesus said that “the meek are going to inherit the land or the earth”! (Matt. 5:5). Jeremiah 27:5 promises that God is delighted to “give the land/earth” to those whom He loves, that is “the one who pleases Him.” Those who please Him are the ones who obey His Son Jesus (Heb. 5:9). And Jesus repeated Jeremiah 27:5 with these words: “Fear not, little flock; it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the Kingdom” (Luke 12:32). Jesus of course based his understanding on the Hebrew Bible and echoed Psalm 37 which no less than 5 times promises that the faithful “will inherit the land/earth and dwell in it forever” (Ps. 37:9, 11, 22, 29, 34). Peter’s question in Matthew 19:27 was a refreshingly real one! He said to Jesus: “What is in it for us? What do we get? What is our reward?” See verses 28-29 for the reply.

## Psalm 110:1

by Allon Maxwell, Australia

“The LORD said to my lord, ‘Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool.’” This Old Testament verse from Psalm 110:1 is quoted in the New Testament no less than 22 times! The Messianic significance attached to it by the New Testament writers demands our closest attention.

It is unfortunate that most translators clouded the meaning of David’s words by assigning an upper case “L” to that second “lord” in the verse. This “lapse” has most unfortunate complications for those who are unable to read the Hebrew text themselves. It fails to follow the normally expected “translators’ convention” which uses an upper case “L” to distinguish between two quite different Hebrew words, one of which always refers to God, and the other of which *never* refers to God.

The error has been perpetuated by most later versions (NKJV, NASB, NIV), but has been recognized and corrected by some others (RSV, NRSV, NEB). That upper case “L” has led many to misuse the verse as a Trinitarian “proof text.” However, as we shall see, that is not the intention of the verse at all.

## More About that Translators' Error

In our English Bibles, the same word "lord" translates several distinct Hebrew words. A long established "translators' convention" uses different combinations of upper and lower case letters ("LORD," "Lord," and "lord") to differentiate between the original Hebrew words.

When we see "Lord" written with an upper case "L," those of us who don't read Hebrew rely on the established convention that it is, most often, a translation of *Adonai*.

The problem is that in this verse the original Hebrew word is not *Adonai*! In this *one* verse, the KJV has clouded the issue by assigning an upper case "L" to the quite different word *adoni*. In all other places where this word, *adoni*, is translated as "lord" in the KJV, it appears with a lower case "l."

## The Hebrew Lesson

We need first to look at the use of all the Hebrew words which are translated "lord." The information for the following short "Hebrew lesson" has been gleaned from *Young's Concordance* and e-mail correspondence with my good friend Anthony Buzzard.

Young lists eleven Hebrew words which are translated "lord." The four which concern us here are YHWH, ADON, ADONI, and ADONAI.

### 1. YHWH (Yahweh or Jehovah)

This word is the first "LORD" in Psalm 110:1. It is the Divine Name considered so sacred by the Jews that it is never pronounced. Instead when reading from the Scriptures they substitute the word *Adonai* (see below).

The accepted convention is that in English translations YHWH always appears as either LORD or GOD (all upper case), thus enabling us to recognize that the original word is "Yahweh."

### 2. ADON

This word is formed from the Hebrew consonants Aleph, Dalet, Nun. It appears often in this form (without any suffix). Apart from about 30 occasions where it refers to the Divine Lord, all of the other occurrences refer to human lords.

In English, it always has a lower case "l," except on those comparatively few occasions where it refers to God. In those cases it is given an upper case "L."

It is important to distinguish between *Adon* and three other similar, but quite distinct, words which are formed from it by the addition of suffixes.

### 3. ADONAI

*Adonai* accounts for two of the three other words just mentioned above. It is formed from the root word "adon" with the addition of the suffix "AI."

In its main form, **it always refers to God**, and no one else. The accepted "translators' convention" is that in this form, it always appears in English as "Lord" (with an upper case "L").

The main form of *Adonai* has a different vowel point under the "N" to distinguish it from the second much less common form of the word. (The second form of *Adonai* is used in the plural, of men, very occasionally, but even then a very subtle difference of vowel appears.)

## 4. ADONI

This is formed by adding the suffix "i" to "adon." With this suffix it means "my lord." (It is also sometimes translated as "my master.")

It appears 195 times, and is used almost entirely of human lords (but occasionally of angels). When translated "lord," it always appears with a lower case "l" (except for that one time in Psalm 110:1).

## The Vowel Points in Psalm 110:1

The Hebrew text identifies vowels by a system of "vowel points" (which, to the untrained eye, look like random "dots" and "squiggles") placed above, below, or alongside the appropriate consonant. This vowel pointing system was developed by the Masoretes.

Now for some more information provided by Anthony Buzzard.

As mentioned above, the two words *Adonai* and *adoni* are both formed from the root word "ADON."

They share the same consonants: ADNY i.e. in Hebrew ALEPH, DALET, NUN, YOD.

The difference is in the vowel pointing:

"ADONAI" is formed by placing the vowel point "quamets" under NUN.

"ADONI" is formed by placing the vowel point "hireq" under NUN.

(Just one tiny letter different, but an enormous difference in meaning!)

## Confirmation from the Septuagint

There are some who persist in reading the word *Adonai* in this verse, instead of *adoni*. This is usually justified by claiming that the Masoretes have assigned the wrong vowel points. However the "Greek factor" from the Septuagint Greek version (LXX) supports the Masoretes.

The following information was passed on to me by Bill Wachtel.

The Hebrew text in Psalm 110:1 is actually LADONI ("L" + "adoni").

ADONI = my lord.

LADONI = TO my lord.

In the Greek of the LXX, LADONI becomes:

"to kurio mou" (= to my lord)

If the text had read:

LADONAI (= to the Divine Lord) the Greek would have read simply “to kurio.”

Please learn the lesson and show your friends. Your translation of the second lord of Psalm 110:1 may be a fraud and very deceptive, actually turning the lord Messiah into GOD!✧

## Shouting from the Rooftops!

by Robin Todd, Washington

**H**ello everyone. I’m not sure what is drawing to a close more quickly — my own life or this present world order.

My name is Robin Todd and I am a (rapidly aging) singer and witness for the one God of the Bible. As this age draws to a close and the return of the Messiah Jesus is imminent, it is my purpose to proclaim the one true Gospel of God and Jesus once again to this dark world of religious confusion, beginning right here in my home town area of Lacey, Washington, and extending out to whoever in the world will listen. What I have to bring you in word and song, I bring in the worship of Yahweh, the One true God, and in His miraculously begotten and now exalted human Son, Jesus of Nazareth.

At the foundation of this age God had prepared the Kingdom for us (Matt. 25:34), and invited us to go take possession of it — rule over it (Gen. 1:28). The Father considered that His physical human children, made in His image, were truly good enough to successfully administer the affairs of His creation while spiritually maturing in relationship with Him.

However, we did not take possession of that Kingdom because we didn’t believe that God was right — that we really had what it takes to do so. We wrongly perceived that our carbon-based bodies and minds were not good enough, and only through exercising the intellectual and spiritual capacities of a non-physical, so-called “immortal soul,” would we be considered worthy in God’s sight (see the Satanic deception in Gen. 3:4-5). Problem is, there is no such thing as an “immortal soul.” It was an invention of the Devil designed to denigrate and shame the physical human being made in the image of the One and Only immortal God.

And so we, the children of God, have lived in constant fear of rejection by our Father, afraid that we don’t have what it takes to please Him. And from that fearful posture we have become jealous, envious, covetous, greedy, hateful, and spiteful competing siblings, growing up to be fathers and mothers who pass this fear along to our children. Each one of us lacks the confidence and faith in our Creator’s heart and His assessment of us — a Father who from the beginning has stood ready to

convey nothing but grace and patience, if we would only believe Him and His final revelation in His Son Jesus.

Our original **misperception** about our Father and our relationship to Him, cleverly engineered by Satanic deception, has subsequently led to dysfunctional relationships between fathers and their children down through human history. Coupled with modern science and technology, the human family is headed for extinction. But there is a way out, even now, if we will begin to take seriously the issue of believing the TRUTH, i.e. what is true, and give up on the lies we may have been taught (2 Thess. 2:10 says it all!).

Beginning once again with Abraham, God has made belief in the message of a coming Kingdom of God and our inheritance of it, the foundation of our relationship with Him and our healing and salvation. Abraham believed, along with Isaac, Jacob, Joshua, Caleb, David, the prophets, Jesus, the apostles, and others. Jesus came to confirm the promises made to the fathers (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; see Rom. 15:8). He is the cornerstone of the entire Kingdom plan. Therefore, if we are Christ’s, we are Abraham’s seed and heirs according to the promise (Gal. 3:29).

Contrary to the religions of this age God declares through the Gospel of the coming Kingdom and the things concerning Jesus, that physical human beings are, in fact, good enough to inherit and successfully administer His Kingdom on earth. It is our God-given destiny. Our identity is to rule in His coming Kingdom with and under Jesus, the Anointed One. We don’t need an immortal soul to be valuable and lovable to our Father (contrary to the Satanic lie of Genesis 3 which set the foundation of this world’s religious system). We are lovable and “justified” solely by His grace as a Father toward His children.

In like manner, the idea that Jesus is the incarnation of a pre-existent God person is designed by the enemy of the One God and Father, to once again convince us that being human is not good enough. It is biblically incorrect and is a systematic attempt to destroy the innocent, childlike mind God gave human beings. This belief and teaching is a major weapon wielded by mankind’s enemy to hold men and women captive to sin. The biblical truth is that Jesus was a miraculously begotten, carbon-based human being born of the line of David. He is not God, but is the Son of God; and as God’s agent he has functional equality with Him. He has been given authority to rule and to judge by the One and Only God.

We must begin our walk with the One God by believing in His Kingdom message and in His Son Jesus who is the King of that Kingdom. If we do, we are standing under the new covenant that God makes with His children, and the blood of Jesus which ratifies that covenant cleanses us from sins we committed through our previous disbelief.

Therefore first I urge the religions of this world, Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, Jainism, Theosophy, orthodox Christianity, and any other mystery-based systems of belief, to come back to the faith of the fathers, prophets, Jesus, his apostles, and subsequent disciples. Physical human beings made of the dust of the ground are in themselves inherently valuable and lovable in the eyes of God. It is only through the resurrection and subsequent glorification of our physical bodies that we shall receive immortality. Reject the immortal soul doctrine immediately and fully embrace your humanity, as Jesus himself did. Believe in the good news of the coming Kingdom of God prepared for you from the foundation of the world, as Jesus himself did and about which he specifically preached.

Secondly, I plead with Judaism to recognize Jesus of Nazareth as the man and Messiah appointed by the One God of Israel to usher in the soon to come Kingdom on this earth. The hearts of the fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, cry out to the children of Israel through this exalted man, to return to the faith they had in the promises made to them by the ultimate Father. It is by the grace of a loving and accepting God and Father that we are saved through this faith. Jesus is the perfect example of this faith in God's grace and promises. Therefore there is no other name by which we must be saved. Remembering the law of Moses in a new spiritual light can give further insight into how important believing in the Gospel of the kingdom of God is to our health and salvation.

And finally, I urge Islam to also confess that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah appointed by the One God. He is the one we have been waiting for to come and rule the earth from Jerusalem and lead all men back to God, who is the Father of us all.

For those who possess a love for the truth and want more information, write to me at [robinsings4u@comcast.net](mailto:robinsings4u@comcast.net). If you will have me, I also make myself available to proclaim and sing the good news of the one God and Father, and of His appointed Christ Jesus. ✧

What have some translators in some verses of the Bible been up to?!

On Hebrews 4:8, KJV: "Our translators have introduced here with 'If **Jesus** [actually Joshua!] had given them rest...' (KJV) utter confusion into the minds of the ordinary English reader" (Henry Alford, *Commentary on the Greek New Testament*).

## Comments

"As you know — even more so than I — it isn't often that one meets non-Trinitarian Christians. I've been reading some of your articles on Restoration Fellowship and watching video posted to your YouTube channel. I've found these materials to be helpful and entertaining. I like your mix of direct fact-based arguments against Trinitarian illogic, combined with well-meaning (and well-deserved) ridicule of the same. It is a difficult task to ridicule something without being 'nasty' or rude about it — yet you accomplish this." — *Ohio*

"I have started reading your book *The Doctrine of the Trinity* and have already found a diamond mine of information and confirmation." — *Canada*

"I thought you might be interested in my discovery of the squircle. It was discovered quite accidentally while I was debating about the two natures doctrine on the Blogging Theology site.

Here is my definition:

A 'squircle' is 'a 2D shape that has both a square nature and a circular nature, and it is acknowledged in the two natures, unconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably; the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved and concurring in one shape, not parted or divided into two shapes, but one and the same shape.'

Mathematicians have hitherto regarded a square circle as impossible. But we now understand that this impossibility is only 'merely apparent,' and that by insisting that the two natures of squareness and circularity are not confused in the squircle, we can arrive at this marvelous figure.

It is a shame that nobody yet has been able to draw it, and so its true dimensions must remain for the moment a little mysterious. But mystery or not, here it is, and mathematicians will henceforth be required to believe in it under pain of being cast into the outer darkness (where there are no publishings nor salaries nor tenure).

I think I deserve a Nobel Prize in Mathematics (at least!). — *England*

Please see my wife Barbara's book reviews at 21<sup>st</sup> Century Reformation — [21stcr.org](http://21stcr.org) — including reviews of Jenkins' *The Jesus Wars*, Rubenstein's *When Jesus Became God*, and Dunn's *Did the First Christians Worship Jesus?*