

Focus on the Kingdom

Vol. 14 No. 12

Anthony Buzzard, editor

September, 2012

Kingdom Alert

The coming of the Kingdom worldwide at the future arrival of Jesus in glory is our primary concern. But before that, what?

Please note this very important detail about the right translation of Mark 13:14: Five modern translations give you just the information you need to know, to recognize when the Second Coming is *really* close. Jesus gave a specific sign in Mark 13:14 and Matthew 24:15. In Mark 13:14 the accurate rendering of the Greek is this: “When you see the Abomination of Desolation standing where **HE** ought not to” (New Living Translation, English Revised Version, 1881 and New American Bible). Matthew adds the detail that the Abomination will be standing in a holy place, a rebuilt sanctuary.

New English Bible: “But when you see ‘the Abomination of Desolation’ usurping a place which is not **his** (let the reader understand), then those who are in Judea must take to the hills.” Translators’ Translation: “When you see the Appalling Horror standing where he should not...”

This information will put to rest an over-excited hype which propagates the idea that Jesus can come back at any moment without further warning. Jesus’ sign should be heeded and understood. Of course individually we are always to be ready, because we do not know when our days may end.

“Adventists” (I do not mean Seventh-Day Adventists) have often made the cry that Jesus is coming at any moment a partial excuse for not getting on with the task assigned to us, the preaching worldwide of the Gospel of the Kingdom, “and *then* the end will come.” So Jesus said (Matt. 24:14). Is the world yet fully informed of the Gospel of the Kingdom?

The only definite sign of the end is provided by Jesus in Matthew 24:15 and Mark 13:14. Why is the correct translation so important here? The Abomination is a *person* according to Mark 13:14, either a man standing in a holy place or putting his image there. There was no fulfillment of this (or Dan. 9:26b: “his end”) in the first century, in AD 70.

The Abomination of Desolation spoken of by Daniel (12:11; 9:26) and Jesus (Matt. 24:14; Mark 13:14), is the Man of Sin about whom Paul warned so passionately in 2 Thessalonians 2. Paul was anxious for his people to know (he would be equally concerned today!) that the Second Coming — the Parousia of Jesus in power and glory to set up the Kingdom of God on earth — would be

preceded by the appearance of a final evil person, the antichrist of 1 John 2:18. John there said that the believers knew “that Antichrist is coming.” He did *not* say that this was false, but added that the spirit of antichrist was already at work in the first century.

Large blocks of the Bible-reading public fall easily for the false date-setting of certain individuals who make lots of money selling books to tell us when exactly Jesus is coming back. There have been scores of such failed predictions (identifying their exponents as false prophets). In our time Harold Camping and Edgar Whisenant are signal examples!

Somehow the public prefers popular books to the words of Jesus! A current theory proposes that Jesus is going to come back twice — once in a “PRE-tribulation rapture” and then publicly in power and glory seven years later. The seven-year period is well documented in Daniel 9:24-27, but the idea of a double Second Coming is false to Scripture. One has only to read carefully the sequence of events presented by Jesus for our learning and admonition in Matthew 24, Mark 13 and Luke 21. There is not the slightest hint there of a Resurrection/Rapture *before* the predicted time of Great Tribulation. In fact Jesus warned believers living in Israel to flee to the hills when the Great Tribulation was about to happen (Matt. 24:16). Strange to advise a flight to the hills if one is expecting to be lifted off to heaven! Jesus knew nothing of the popular theories of Hal Lindsey.

Paul provides an easy confirmation of this. He was not at odds with Jesus. He stated in 2 Thessalonians 1 that Christians must expect to suffer affliction and trouble and expect to be relieved of that suffering “when the Lord Jesus Christ is revealed from heaven in flaming fire taking vengeance on his enemies” (2 Thess. 1:7-8). Is that clear? No one who writes thus could imagine a relief (*anesis* in the Greek) seven years earlier!

It is wise for us and our families to be properly instructed in these fundamental facts about the future Parousia, arrival of Jesus in glory to resurrect the faithful dead of all the ages. By all means do not be misled by anyone at your door stating that the Parousia was invisible and happened in 1914! If the Kingdom of God really began in 1914, you and I have missed it. Current events in Syria and the massive defection in the West, particularly from biblical morality, which we now see, are not, absolutely not, characteristic of the coming Kingdom of the Messiah on earth. And the Kingdom is the heart of the Christian Gospel! ✧

Which Day Did Jesus Die?

The NIV and NIB and God's Word translation recover an important fact about John's confirmation of the three other gospels, that Jesus died on the preparation day, which is Friday. And it was "the Friday of Passover week" (John 19:14, see those translations). Jesus had eaten the Passover meal at the same time as the nation, the day before (Thursday). If you *start* by reading Matthew, Mark and Luke's plain statements that Jesus celebrated what was later called the Lord's Supper, at **the same time as the annual Jewish Passover**, all is clear.

John 19:14: "It was the day of Preparation of Passover Week, about the sixth hour. 'Here is your king,' Pilate said to the Jews" (NIV, NIB). "The time was about six o'clock in the morning on the Friday of the Passover festival. Pilate said to the Jews, 'Look, here's your king!'" (GWN).

A lot of completely unnecessary confusion was caused by taking Matthew 12:40, the exceptional text, as the basis of a recalculation of the events of Passover week. Had Luke 24:21 been carefully noted and relied on, it would be clear that Sunday, the resurrection day, was the "third day since" the crucifixion. All this is easy. Luke notes that "Sabbath [Saturday] was approaching, and the women then rested on the Sabbath [Saturday] and then came to the tomb early on Sunday morning" (see Luke 23:54- 24:1).

Luke 24:21 sums it all up, using the inclusive reckoning demonstrated by Jesus in Luke 13:32-33. Sunday is the third day since the crucifixion on Friday (Luke 24:21). ✧

What Do You Mean "Preexistence"?

The so-called "preexistence" of Christ presents your mind with a vague "fog word," and many do not think this through. How can you preexist yourself? Have you thought about that? Most have not. Jesus is supposed to have "preexisted." But what does that mean?

Now the word "preexist" is very easy when we use it intelligibly, say of a "preexisting condition." You apply for health insurance and you already have a condition needing attention. The disease existed before you got the insurance! It was a preexisting condition.

But what — think this through — is the "preexistence" of Jesus? Do you mean there was a person called Jesus who lived from eternity and then one day reduced himself to a fetus and got himself born? Many churchgoers believe something like that. Does it not strike you as very odd, if not strange and even pagan? Are you getting upfront, clear sermons in church to clarify all this?

Where are the sermons and Sunday School lessons tackling this very important issue which dramatically affects your notion of who Jesus is? It seems as if it is a taboo subject. Yet the identity of Jesus and your belief in the right, rather than a fictitious Jesus is crucial (2 Cor. 11).

Suppose you say that **the Son of God** was alive before he was born. Or was it God the Son, a second member of the Trinity? Again, how can you exist before you exist? Can you actually *begin* to exist in the womb of your mother, *if you already exist*? If you exist before your conception, would your conception/begetting really be a "coming into existence"?

The simple answer is that you cannot come into existence if you already exist. If you *already exist* you can be *transformed* or transform yourself and begin to live in a different mode of existence. But you are not coming into existence. You are being transmuted into a different order of existence.

The Bible does not call for any of this complexity. Read Matthew and Luke *first*. The fact to be squarely faced is that Luke and Matthew declare that Jesus, the unique Son of God, *began to exist* by biological miracle in Mary (Matt. 1:18-20; Luke 1:35). That means of course that he did not exist before that, except in the sense that his existence was planned ahead of time by the One God his Father. The begetting = coming into existence of Jesus was in God's mind (1 Pet. 1:20; cp. Jer. 1:5).

That explanation is simple, and avoids the enormous complexities and tangled, technical vocabulary involved in trying to work out how the Son of God (or "God the Son," itself a phrase not found in Scripture) "put on" a human body or human nature (but *not* a human personality: so the official creed says) in Mary. This would mean that Mary was really the mother of a human body, but not the Son of God. Is that sort of Son of God really a human being, or is he really just GOD dressed in a human body?

Some Bible readers will produce an almost automatic reflex. They will say, "But what about John 1:1?" The proper reply to that objection is to say, "Let's not oppose John to Matthew and Luke!" The fact is that John did not write, "In the beginning was the SON of God." He wrote "In the beginning was the word," not, as wrongly capitalized in many translations, "Word." Who gave the translators the right to impose on you what they thought John *ought* to say?

The word "word" occurs hundreds of times in the Hebrew Bible (the OT) and it never appears as "Word." It never means a spokesperson or Son. It invariably means "word," "promise," "affair," "thought," "intention," etc. It is never a person, much less a Son of God. And never an angel.

I am thrilled at the good words of the professor of Systematic Theology at Fuller Seminary, Dr. Colin Brown who writes, “It is a patent misreading of John 1:1 to read it as if it said ‘In the beginning was the Son.’”¹ Why not then give up that bad habit and harmonize John with Matthew and Luke and the rest of Scripture? It will put the mind into a state of harmony and rest!

Most people avoid thinking about any of this. That is why it is important that we write about it. The importance of defining God and Jesus properly are incalculable.

Here is an encouragement for further reflection. This frank remark is from the very celebrated Bible scholar, the late F.F. Bruce. I had asked him in correspondence some 40 years ago about “preexistence” and this was his frank reply:

“On the preexistence question one can at least accept the preexistence of the **eternal word or wisdom of God, which** (who?) became incarnate [embodied] in Jesus. But whether any New Testament writer believed in his separate conscious existence as a second Divine Person before his incarnation is not so clear...When Paul speaks of the pre-incarnate activity of Christ this I think is because he, like other NT writers, identified Christ with the creative word or wisdom of God **which** certainly existed as long as God did” (June 13 and July 29th, 1981, from Derbyshire, UK).

What caution, wisdom and candor! Bruce admits here that there is no reason for writing the “word **who**,” leading you on to believe that it means a preexisting **God the Son**. What if we just go with “the word which”? Then all is easy and agreement with Matthew and Luke is kept intact. What preexisted with the One God, the Father, was His wisdom, word, intention and plan. It was “with Him,” a very Hebrew way of saying it was the intention of His heart (Job 10:13, etc.).

(Bruce did think that “on the whole” John had taken the further step to a preexisting Son. But not Paul.)

Now consider the dire results of treating the word in John 1:1 as a second Person, Word. It leads immediately to *two* Persons who are God — i.e. the Father and the Son. Two who are God of course means two Gods. “This person is God and this other Person is God” makes two Gods! This is a step from which we should shrink in horror.

Secondly, when “God the Son” (of post-biblical theology) is transformed into a human being, and Mary just adds a human body to him, is that person really and truly a lineal, biological descendant of David? Remember that he *must* be related to David biologically (“of the fruit of your loins,” Ps. 132:11) to qualify as the Messiah. Adding a preexisting “God the Son” to a body or “human

nature” created in Mary makes it impossible for Jesus the Son to *be truly human*.

On the Trinitarian theory the Son had no beginning. He was “eternally begotten.” The core of his personality as Jesus was *not* human at all. He did not arise within the biological chain of the human race. Is that really the Messiah, son of David? The true Jesus of history and the New Testament?

The secret to success in understanding this subject is the brilliant oracle recorded in Psalm 110:1. Uniquely in the Psalms, we have “a divine utterance” by the One God referring to the Messiah, Son of God, who was to come a thousand years after the time of David. “The Lord [YHVH] gives this oracle to my lord: ‘Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool under your feet.’” For the NT writers of Scripture this is the most favorite of all verses, quoted or alluded to in the NT some 25 times! It is essential to understand its meaning. It defines who Jesus is. (*Strong’s Concordance* will not show you this.)

Jesus used this verse to settle all arguments! Why don’t you? (See Matt. 22:44-46.) YHVH speaks to *adoni*, my lord. You need some basic Hebrew here to read with intelligence. Let me give you a brief lesson. The word *adoni* (pronounced adonee) in Hebrew looks like this: אֲדֹנָי

Take your first step now in the language of Scripture in the Hebrew Bible. You must read from right to left (perhaps they wrote in that direction because right-handed people could chip out of rock in that direction most easily). The first letter you see here — remember to start on the right — is an ALEPH. Then comes a DALET, then a NUN and then a YOD. Originally just the consonants were written. This is not as hard as you might think. Try this: “If you CNT RD THS U MST B as DM as a BX of RCKS.” (I helped you along a bit, but BRDS NST is not so hard without vowels.) Or “PLS DNT TXT N DRVE.” Let me show you this precious information, giving you again the actual Hebrew letters as they appear in the original texts and all the printed copies of the Old Testament.

I repeat: Here is the **second lord** of Psalm 110:1, the “my lord,” of your English translations. *Adoni*, אֲדֹנָי means “my lord,” my master, my **human** superior, It is to be carefully distinguished from the word ADONAI (440 times in the OT).

Now here is the word ADONAI which means the same as YAHWEH, and means the Lord GOD. אֲדֹנָי has a *different* vowel at the end. You can see this for yourself. We will explain this word ADONAI, meaning “the supreme Lord [God].”

¹“Trinity and Incarnation,” *Ex Auditu*, 1991, p. 89.

אֲדֹנָי Start on the right and work towards the left.

Underneath the first letter of the word (working from the right) you will see a vowel point, looking like a small line and two vertical dots. Then over the next letter D there is a single dot, giving the sound “oh.” Then comes the consonant N. Underneath that N you have a vowel looking like a small ט. **That vowel has the sound of “ah.”** The word ends with a Yod.

So the whole word is pronounced ADONAI (“adon-eye”). ADONAI means the one Lord God and refers to YHVH, the one God of the Bible, the one God of Jesus. ADONAI means “the supreme Lord.” As any lexicon will report ADONAI refers to God:

of God, always אֲדֹנָי

Now back to that earlier word above אֲדֹנָי pronounced **adonee**. Do you see the all-important dot *underneath* the next to last letter, reading from the right? It gives us the sound of “ee.”

There is, as any Hebrew reader will tell you, a vast difference in meaning. *Adoni* is the word for a **non-Deity superior**, a boss, a husband, a ruler and especially the king. This word *adoni* occurs 195 times in the OT and it is the word in Hebrew for the second lord in Psalm 110:1. “The LORD (YHVH) gave an utterance to *adoni*, my lord (the Messiah).”

This is the word which has been hiding from the public, because in many English translations a false capital letter has been placed on it to make it read “Lord” instead of “lord.” Now the policy of most Bibles is to read Lord (capital L) when the Hebrew word is ADONAI, the **Lord God**, and to translate “my lord,” or “my master” when the Hebrew word is *adoni*, my lord (without a capital L). Many translations misleadingly put a capital L on the second lord in Psalm 110:1, giving you the impression that the word is ADONAI when it is not!

You see now that the Bible is a sort of crime scene here, and the elephant in the room is not hard to detect.

In this one verse in Psalm 110 translators regularly broke their own rules! They gave you the false impression that the Hebrew for the second lord was ADONAI, the Lord God. This would make the psalm oracle say that YHVH (the Lord God) spoke an utterance to ADONAI, the Lord God. This would be God speaking to God, making two GODS. This is the ultimate horror and assault on Scripture, creating a polytheism which is everywhere forbidden. On the internet you will find this mistake repeated over and over, and a false argument in favor of the Messiah being GOD follows.

The fact is that the second lord in Psalm 110:1 is *adoni*, which is never a title for Deity, but is the etiquette and protocol designation of the ruler or king. It is the word which describes who Jesus is, the promised human

Messiah, “the anointed of the LORD,” as Luke 2:26 reports.

If you go into your local Christian bookstore you may well find popular commentaries which actually tell you, wrongly, that the second lord in Psalm 110:1 is ADONAI, the Lord God! This is an astonishing mistake copied from author to author who apparently cannot or do not bother to consult the Hebrew text. It is highly offensive to readers of the Hebrew Bible, especially to Jews.

Psalm 110:1 is *the key* text for the identity of the Messiah. Now go to Acts 2:36 to see how Peter works his sermon around Psalm 110:1, identifying the risen and ascended Jesus as the one — the human lord — foreseen by Psalm 110:1. He is the Lord Messiah, just as Luke reports in Luke 2:11! He is the “my lord” of the phrase “mother of my lord,” as Elizabeth said (Luke 1:43). It was not God who was born (an impossibility) but the Lord Messiah Jesus. 1 Timothy 2:5 echoing Psalm 110:1 sums it all up: “There is one God and one mediator between God and man, the **man** Messiah Jesus.” It is a tragedy that the simplicity of Scripture was not allowed to prevail on this point.

What we are recommending here, as to the vital difference between *Adonai* (the Lord God) and *adoni*, a non-Deity title is fully endorsed by the celebrated *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, in its article on “Lord” “The form **ADONI**, my lord, a royal title (1 Sam 29:8, etc.) is to be carefully distinguished from the title **adonai**” (Vol. 3, p. 157).

How the Church Left Jesus Behind

The ultimate anointed King of the line of David, Jesus the Messiah, was deemed unfit in post-New Testament times to be the focus of all the activity of the One God. “We do not want this man to reign over us,” would-be believers cried. “So we have a better idea! We prefer a second God. Now we won’t actually say ‘second God,’ but if you listen carefully to what we say, we do speak of two who are God, and thus of two Gods. We do not care for a mere Jewish Messiah as our Savior.”

The Jesus of actual history came into existence in Mary:

“And on his thinking of these things, lo, a messenger of the Lord in a dream appeared to him, saying, ‘Joseph, son of David, thou mayest not fear to receive Mary thy wife, for that which in her **was begotten [fathered] is of the Holy Spirit**’” (Matthew 1:20, Young’s Literal Translation and many others). ✧

One Really Does Mean One

(See also my discussion with Dan Gill of 21stcr.org)

It is not a pleasant task to have to “blow the whistle” on evident misinformation about the Bible word for “one.” But we must expose the extraordinary nonsense which has sometimes paraded as scholarship!

E.W. Bullinger’s mammoth *Companion Bible* has this to say about Deuteronomy 6:4: “The Lord our God is one Lord.” Dr. Bullinger is keen to make us believe that the innocent word “one” used of God tells us that God is more than one Person. Here is how the trick works. It is a clever sleight of hand. The idea you are supposed to gain from his note on Deuteronomy 6:4 is that the Hebrew word for “one” **contains within it** the sense of plurality affecting the noun which follows it. This is absolutely false, at the most elementary level:

“Heb. *echad* = a **compound unity**, one made up of others: Gen. 1:5, one of seven; 2:11, one of four; 2:21, one of twenty-four; 2:24 one made up of two; 3:22 one of the three [Trinity]; 49:16, one of 12; Num. 13:23, one of a cluster. So Ps. 34:20, etc. It is not *yachid*, which is unique — a single or only one, occurs 12 times: Gen. 22:2, 12, 16; Jud. 11:34; Ps. 22:20; 25:16; 35:17; 68:6; Prov. 4:3; Jer. 6:26; Amos 8:10; Zech. 12:10. Heb. of all other words for ‘one’ is *echad*” (Bullinger, *Companion Bible*, p. 247).

This information is entirely misleading. “One” means one, as it does in English. We all know that “one” can modify a **collective noun**, like family, team or cluster. That is perfectly obvious. Now watch carefully what Dr. Bullinger has done. He wants you to think that in the phrase “one cluster” the word “one” implies a plurality! It absolutely does not! One cluster is not two clusters!

One cluster means “one single cluster,” not two clusters, or more. The numeral adjective “one” can be applied to any noun you like to mention, but it still means one and not more! Let me make the point absolutely clear, and you can share this with friends.

Does “one tripod” mean that “one” means three?

Does “one quartet” mean that “one” means four?

Does “one centipede” mean that “one” means 100?

I trust you see how clever this deception is. Any honest lexicon will confirm this easy fact, but you need no more than common sense.

There are some 970 occurrences of “one” (*echad*) in the Hebrew Bible. The word means one and not more than one. One single. The fact that one day has an evening and morning (Gen. 1:5) does not in any way alter the meaning of the word “one”! Think this through carefully and show your children! “Abraham was one [*echad*] person” (Ezek. 33:24). What does that tell you about the plurality of Abraham?! Nothing. The language is exactly the same for God. Both are “one p/Person”!

“The Lord our God is one Lord,” Jesus said (Mark 12:29) and his word is final. “One Lord” is not more than one Lord! Mark 12:29 has yet to make its impact on the churchgoing community. So also John 17:3.

One Lord (Yahweh) is one single Lord. That One God is the Father of Jesus. Jesus is His Son as defined by Luke 1:35. None of this is difficult. What Dr. Bullinger attempts is astonishing. To put it technically, he thinks that a compound noun like family, or cluster, or team, tells you that the word “one” which precedes it somehow implies a plurality. But it does not! One is one only. “One” means one and not two or three. The word “family” is a collective noun, but the word “one” is still “one single.” God is not a plurality.

Hebrew, Greek and English have no other way of informing you that God is one single Lord. That is because “one” (*echad*) means “one single, one only, one and not more than one.” One family is still one family and not more than one family, not two families! One cluster is one cluster and not two clusters. Is the point clear to you now? If so drop me an email and we will rejoice together!

More Complete Falsehoods on “one”

Please read carefully. “The Scriptures say, ‘The Lord our God is one Lord’ (Deut. 6:4). The ‘one’ used in this statement is **not the numerical digit ‘one’** in the number series 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. It is the ‘one’ used to refer to a state of unity.”²

The only problem: The word for “one” here is **precisely** the numerical digit one (*echad*)! Ask anyone who knows Hebrew! Ask a Jewish child to count “one, two, three” in Hebrew.

Now another mistake. G.A.F. Knight: “To say that there is only ‘one’ God, as the Bible does, does not mean that we exhaust the meaning of the word when we say that *one* just means *unique*, and not two. ‘Before me there was no God formed; neither shall there be after me,’ declared Isaiah, and we agree. But Hebrew has a word for this meaning of the word *one*. It is *yachid*. It is used in such expressions as ‘Take now your *only* son,’ when God commanded Abraham to lead Isaac to sacrifice, **and even of God when, in Zechariah 14:9, it [*yachid*] certainly bears the sense of unique” (“A Biblical Approach to the Trinity,” *Scottish Journal of Theology, Occasional Papers*, p. 17).**

Now note this: The word for “one” of the One Lord in Zechariah 14:9 is **not *yachid*** at all, but the word ***echad***.

Here is what we suggest as a way to promote a careful investigation about who God is. As a professor of Bible and Bible languages, I want to say that the Trinity is not a biblical doctrine. Jesus is our guide and savior

² M.G. Gutzke, D.D, Ph. D, *Plain Talk About Christian Words*, 1964, p. 14.

and rabbi. It should be obvious to a child that he did not believe in the Trinity! In Mark 12:29 Jesus affirmed, agreeing with a Jewish scribe, that “the Lord our God is ONE LORD.” Anyone with a modicum of understanding knows that Jews never believed in the Trinity! One Lord means one Person, not three! There are 1300 references to “God” in the New Testament alone, and God in those verses is the Father, not Jesus! Many who write on this subject say correctly that “There is one God,” but they leave out the rest of the sentence! Look it up in 1 Corinthians 8:4-6. Paul said, “There is one God, THE FATHER AND NO OTHER GOD BUT HE”! Why did they not quote Paul properly? 1 Timothy 2:5 states the creed of the Bible: “There is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the MAN Messiah Jesus.”

Do you see that the one God here is again the FATHER and not Jesus? This is true of 1300 verses in the NT. There are thus 1300 appearances of the word God in the NT, about 17% of all the verses in the NT. These unanimously say “The One GOD is the Father.” You can write to me if you like and I will send you more information on this important issue about how to believe in the One God and in Jesus as HIS SON. The Church has not informed you accurately in this matter. If you are confused by the teaching that “The Father is God, the Son is God and the Holy Spirit is God, and that makes one God,” you have a right to be confused! This is an incomprehensible proposition, and it is important not to speak nonsense about God. Paul said, “There is one God, the FATHER.” No verse in the Bible says, “There is one God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.” No Bible verse presents God as Triune. Give this some serious thought. ✧

How Scholars Skirt Round the Obvious Fact That the Messiah Is Not God

Richard Bauckham has this to say about our key Psalm 110:1: “Early Christian theology, like other Jewish theology of the period, proceeded primarily by exegesis of the Hebrew scriptures...The point is important now, because participation of Jesus in the unique divine sovereignty was understood primarily by reference to one key OT text (Ps. 110:1), and other texts brought into exegetical relationship with it. Ps. 110:1 is the OT text to which the NT most often alludes (21 quotations or allusions), scattered across most of the NT writings...**Ps. 110:1 is the verse most quoted from the OT in the NT**...My argument is that the exaltation of Jesus to the heavenly throne of God could only mean, for the early Christians who were Jewish monotheists, his inclusion in the unique identity of God, and that furthermore the texts show their full awareness of that

and quite deliberately use the rhetoric and conceptuality of Jewish monotheism to make this inclusion unequivocal... Jesus’ exaltation to the right hand of God is expounded [by Ps. 110:1] by proving his superiority over all the angels...Christ is therefore served by the angels...but if Jesus is superior to the angels, participating in the divine sovereignty, this means, precisely for Jewish monotheistic conceptuality, that he is included in the unique identity of the One God...[Early Christians] are redefining the unique identity of God in a way which includes Jesus...

“The *addition* of a unique Lord to the unique God of the *Shema* would flatly contradict the uniqueness of the latter. The only possible way to understand Paul as maintaining monotheism is to understand him to be including Jesus in the unique identity of the one God affirmed in the *Shema*. But this is in any case clear from the fact that the term ‘Lord’ applied here to Jesus as the ‘one Lord’ is taken from the *Shema* itself. Paul is not adding to the one God of the *Shema* a ‘Lord’ the *Shema* does not mention. He is identifying Jesus as the ‘Lord’ whom the *Shema* affirms to be one. Thus in Paul’s quite unprecedented reformulation of the *Shema*, the unique identity of the one God *consists of* the Father *and* the one Lord, his Messiah...by including Jesus in this unique identity. Paul is certainly not repudiating Jewish monotheism, whereas were he merely associating Jesus with the unique God, he certainly *would* be repudiating monotheism...Paul maintains monotheism not by adding Jesus to but including Jesus in his Jewish understanding of the divine uniqueness...

“If Isaiah 52:13 means that the Servant was exalted to share the heavenly throne from which God rules the universe, then it is readily connected with Ps. 110:1, which was, as we have seen in chapter 2, the central OT text for the early Christian inclusion of Jesus in the identity of God. Therefore two NT references to the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God combine allusion to Ps. 110:1 with allusion to Isa. 52:13, and one combines allusion to Ps. 110:1 with allusion to Isa. 57:15 (Heb. 1:3).”³

My comment: The argument is false, and fails precisely because it does not bother to follow its own lead! The key *is* Psalm 110:1, and that key provides just the definition of Jesus as “lord” which explains all. The second lord of Psalm 110 is the Hebrew form of *adon*, i.e. *adoni*, which designates someone who is not Deity. That second “lord” of Psalm 110:1 is precisely and expressly descriptive of one who is non-Deity! *Adoni* (LXX and NT *kurios mou*) is the term which in all of its 195 occurrences distinguishes man or angel from the one

³ *God Crucified*, “Psalm 110:1 in early Christology,” p. 29, 36, 51.

God who is *Adonai*, the one Lord God. Paul speaks of the “one Lord *Messiah*” (1 Cor. 8:6), the very one who was so designated from birth (“Today in the city of David there has been born for you a savior, who is the Lord *Messiah*” Luke 2:11). Thus he fully affirms the reference to the Messiah of Psalm 110:1, who is **not God Himself** but the ultimate human superior and agent of God, exalted to the throne of God. There remains the one unique Lord God of the Shema, the Father of Jesus and the God of Israel and the Bible, who is contrasted with the one Lord Messiah (*adoni*, not *Adonai*) of Psalm 110:1. Jewish monotheism has positively *not* been reformulated or tampered with in any way by Paul or the NT. Jesus’ own affirmation of the Shema in its Jewish sense (its only sense) prevents any such change (Mark 12:29ff).

Psalm 110:1 is indeed the key to NT Christology, and for some unaccountable reason scholars have not bothered to tell us the meaning of the lord, *adoni* of that Psalm. Not only that, they have committed in many instances the amazing error of actually misreporting the second lord of Psalm 110:1 as being the Hebrew *Adonai*, which would make Yahweh (God) speak to Adonai (God). The NASV margin at Acts 2:34-36 tells us that the second lord of Psalm 110:1 is “*Adonai*.” It is not! The mistake has been repeated over and over again, and the precious key to Christology of Psalm 110:1 thrown away.

Jesus and Stephen knew well who was at the right hand of the Father, according to Psalm 110:1. It was the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of glory, and Stephen when dying saw the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God (Acts 7:56). After all according to the Messianic Psalm 80:17 the Messiah was to be God’s **right-hand man**: “But let Your hand be upon the man of **Your right hand**, the **son of man** whom You have made strong for Yourself!” Jesus too defined the *adoni* at the right hand of God as the Son of Man: “You will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power and coming in the clouds of heaven” (Mark 14:62). Jesus knew that the second lord of Psalm 110:1 was *adoni*, not Yahweh!✧

Comments

“This book [*Jesus Was Not a Trinitarian*] was a light in a dark world of confusion for me. I’ve always felt funny about the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and wondered how this had gotten into the orthodox church when it seemed so obviously wrong. If Jesus is God, who was He praying to in the Garden of Gethsemane? If God left heaven to become a baby, who was keeping the planets and moons spinning and all the atoms in the universe from flying apart? I definitely recommend this book to anyone who is neither a Trinitarian nor a

“Oneness” believer. There is an alternative!” — *Amazon.com*

“I would like to thank you so much for your work. Sir Anthony and the whole staff at Restoration Fellowship have been pivotal in my transition from the theological and intellectual smoke and mirrors of Trinitarianism and towards biblical unitarianism. I do however have a niggling question, something I have not fully resolved. How do I respond to the argument that *kurio mou* can indeed be a translation of *Adonai* and NOT just *adoni* as evidenced in the LXX translation of Psalm 16:2 and Psalm 35:23?”

See my article in the next edition of Focus on the Kingdom, Oct. 2012. No need to have any fears! But for the moment, be assured that the official Hebrew text reads adoni, my lord. More later.

“Thank you for mailing me copies of your articles and newsletter. Although they were interesting it was quite alarming that you outright deny the deity of Jesus Christ. No man is able to remove sins. If Christ is not God in the flesh you are still in your sins and we have no hope. I am forced to conclude that you are outside the realm of orthodoxy and teaching heresy. Please either renounce the errors that you have been teaching or remove yourself from Christian radio. I intend to send a letter to the radio station in my area which broadcast your program and find out what the standards are for broadcasting on a Christian station. I am fairly certain that the deity of Christ is a central tenet. I can therefore not imagine why you would want to continue to be part of an organization that is hostile to your beliefs. I certainly do not want Christians to be misled by someone teaching that our glorious Lord is a creature similar to us. For these reasons, I will also ask them to remove you from their programming if you do not do so yourself.”

A good colleague of mind reacted with these words: “This is so sad. Jesus’ death removes sin because God says it does. It is amazing that anyone would be offended that we say Jesus shares our humanity. It certainly shows the effect of the terrible turn of events made at Chalcedon. That Council hoped to avoid the problems that this person has fallen into!”

On the other hand this letter was a joy: “I ran across your program on the local station which broadcasts into our area when the signal is right and I must say it has been a real blessing to me. I’m 53 years old and have been in the ministry since my early 20s. However, of late, I have become very disenchanted with the traditional Christian ministry. Your program has been a breath of fresh air blowing through my soul. I have downloaded and read several of your articles which I find that I can agree with totally. I again and again return to your website which I have bookmarked to get a few more articles to read.”