

Who Is Jesus? V Jesus was God *before* He was the Son!

Fred R. Coulter

- Why do we have so many false prophets, preachers or teachers going around?
- What is the value of that to you and to me?
Other than just being a mental pain or something!
- What is the value of that to us?
- Why does God allow it?

I'm going to read to you an article that I think you will find absolutely shocking, and it fits in to what we want to say here.

- Why do you believe what you believe?
- Why do you know that you believe what you believe to be true?

That's one of the main reasons why there are many different prophets.

Deuteronomy 13:1: "If a prophet rises among you, or a dreamer of dreams, and gives you a sign or a wonder. [they can even do miraculous things] ...and the sign or the wonder which he foretold to you comes to pass, saying, 'Let us go after other gods, which you have not known, and let us serve them'" (vs 1-2).

Matt. 24 shows that Jesus said that in the end-time this would happen. There would be those with signs and wonders, and people will go flocking after them.

Matthew 24:24 "For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets..." *That's more than just prophesying a prophecy*; that also means someone who is preaching!

"...and they shall present great signs and wonders, in order to deceive, if possible, even the elect" (Matt. 24:24). That ties right in with Deut. 13.

Deuteronomy 13:3: "You shall not hearken to the words of that prophet or that dreamer of dreams, for the LORD your God *is* testing you to know whether you love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul." That's why there are false prophets. *God is proving us!*

- Are we going to be proved whether we're going to be faithful in the Kingdom of God or not?
- Are we going to be proved whether we love God with all our heart, mind, soul and being, or not?

or

- Is it just a simple profession that we say once, forever, and it's done?

It's very evident that there are a lot of people who figure that if they are in a *particular church* they've got it made, and they don't realize that within the very top of that church—remember what is one of Satan's most believable tactics: *to get within that church in the hierarchy and to change the doctrine subtly from the top and then you get everyone believing it*—because 'after all it comes from headquarters,' or 'after all it's from God's chosen.'

That's why, there it is right there, **God is going to test you** whether you love God with all your heart and with all your mind.

Verse 4: "You shall walk after the LORD your God and fear Him, and keep His commandments, and obey His voice, and you shall serve Him and hold fast to Him."

Only if you like it; only if you the going is good, which a lot of people would add there. *It doesn't say that!* It means under *all* circumstances, if the going is good or bad; if you like it or not like it!

Verse 5: "And that prophet or that dreamer of dreams shall be put to death..." If it isn't done by someone today, God will surely do it later in the Lake of Fire.

We've covered enough about credible false prophets, let me read to you out of the *Time Magazine*, Feb. 18, 1991, the religion section:

More Spontaneous Eruptions:

John Shelby Spong is the name of the man we're going to talk about here who is an Episcopal bishop. He's put out a new book, *Rescuing the Bible from Fundamentalism*.

Jesus Christ, as portrayed in some New Testament passages, is "narrow-minded"...

What did Jesus say about God's way? ***Narrow is the way and straight is the gate that leads to life!*** What did Jesus say about *the way*? *I am the Way!* If there is *the Way*, there is no other. So, you cannot compare Jesus in the way of human standards.

...and "vindictive." The Gospel writers "twisted" the facts concerning Jesus' resurrection, which was never meant to be taken literally.

Sounds like a doctrine the Apostle Paul was dealing with. Some say there is no resurrection. There's no new false doctrine under the sun!

The virgin birth of Christ is an unthinkable notion, and there is not much value in the doctrine of the Trinity, or in the belief that Jesus Christ was sent to save fallen humanity from sin. St. Paul, the missionary of Christianity to the Gentiles, was a repressed and "self-loathing" homosexual. As for the Old Testament, it contains a "vicious tribal code of ethics" attributed to a "sadistic" God.

Which was one of the ten most believable lies in the book by David Breese, *Satan's Ten Most Believable Lies*, and that was that God was a *cosmic sadist*.

The idea that Yahweh bestowed the Promised Land upon the Israelites is "arrogance."

Excerpts from a tract by a staunch atheist? On the contrary, those are assertions offered by a bishop of America's Episcopal Church, John Spong of Newark, in his new book, *Rescuing the Bible from Fundamentalism* (Harper San Francisco, \$16.95).

Spong's unorthodoxy is of long standing, but it has now reached epic proportions. His previous book, *Living in Sin?*, assailed Christian dos and don'ts on sex and asserted that non-marital sex can be holy under some circumstances.

In San Francisco they feel they can be under all circumstances, because on this past Valentine's Day they had a great celebration of all of the queers, perverts, homosexuals and weird-minded. They all went to the City Hall and took out their 'Document of Perversity' proclaiming that they were 'couples.'

After the work appeared in 1988, Spong ordained a sexually active gay priest, inspiring the Episcopal House of Bishops to "disassociate" itself from Spong's action.

So, this is the guy!

The provocative prelate...

a high ranking clergyman

...also has Roman Catholics fuming. A task force in his Newark diocese...

Why do they call it a diocese? These strange names are weird!

...has just declared that Catholicism's view of women is "so insulting, so retrograde that we can respond only by saying that

women should, for the sake of their own humanity, leave that communion." Spong handpicked the panel, and offers no particular criticism of its assertions, though he says he might have employed milder language. Newark's Catholic Archbishop, Theodore McCarrick, has decried the "offensive attacks" on Catholicism.

Why not decry the offensive attacks on God? Forget Catholicism! They deserve a lot of criticism, but what about the attacks on God?

In [the book] *Rescuing the Bible*, Spong brands traditional Catholicism as a "destructive" creed. But he is even more offended by conservative Protestants who take a literal view of biblical exegesis. Spong, 59, held similar beliefs in his boyhood as a practicing Presbyterian, and has admitted that Fundamentalism gave him a "love of Scripture that is no longer present in the liberal tradition of the church."

How can you say you have the love of the Scripture with these kinds of things? *That's incredible! That's impossible!*

In taking aim at literalism, Spong declares his goal is to reveal the spiritual truths underlying the biblical text. Still, his book lashes out both at the conservative view of the Bible and at its adherents, who are, Spong says, consumed by "enormous fear" of doctrinal uncertainty.

Oh, you poor people here, you're consumed by enormous fear of doctrinal uncertainty! What a bunch of stupidity that is. We're not! If you know your Bible, what does it say of 'perfect love'? *If you love God with all your heart, mind, soul and being, perfect love casts out fear!*

There may be a lot of people in churches who do have enormous fear because of doctrinal uncertainty, because of men just like this who undermine their faith and belief.

Spong's wildly offbeat convictions raise an intriguing question: Are there any limits to what an Episcopal leader may believe—or disbelieve? His Paul-was-gay argument, based tenuously upon the Apostle's unmarried state and frequently mentioned sense of personal sin, is causing a growing uproar among traditionalists.

I suggest that those of you who believe that the Apostle Paul could have been a homosexual, just read the Bible. If he were married, just think what his wife would have been put through. Read what

the Apostle Paul went through. So, God was being merciful in that particular case

But conservative Bishop William Frey, president of Pennsylvania's Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry, doubts any decisive stand will be taken by the church against his colleague's writings.

Why not? *Don't know!*

"The House of Bishops has shown itself to be impotent in the face of challenges to the core beliefs of the church"...

I'll tell you one thing, we are not going to find ourselves impotent in the onslaught of attacks against the Bible even from those who profess to be ministers of the Church of God. Because there are so many coming down the pike, we just may have to mention every one by name so you can be aware of who they are, what they are and what they are doing. We won't be like they are.

...Frey says. "We've been paralyzed by our politeness." Los Angeles Bishop Frederick Borsch, who chairs the hierarchy's theology committee (on which Spong sits), explains that "we are not a confessional church that tries to write a definition of orthodoxy. A lot of us would defend this as the genius of Episcopalianism."

A lot of high-sounding words that says we're not going to take any responsibility in doing anything!

Spong's latest work, however, leaves the genius somewhat embattled.

I think that's fitting to read into the record what we have here while we're going to through *Who is Jesus?* Everything we have covered so far disproves exactly what is written in this booklet *Who Is Jesus?* by Anthony Buzzard.

We're going to see that Jesus even applied one of these Scriptures to Himself in Psa. 110.

Matthew 22:41: "While the Pharisees were assembled together, Jesus questioned them, saying, 'What do you think concerning the Christ? Whose son is He?' They said to Him, 'The Son of David'" (vs 41-42)—*which is the proper answer!*

Verse 43: "He said to them, 'How then does David in spirit call Him Lord, saying, "The LORD said to my Lord... [see part 4 of this series and Psa. 110] ...'Sit at My right hand, until I make Your enemies a footstool for Your feet'"? Therefore, if David calls Him Lord, how is He his Son?" And no one was able to answer Him a word, neither dared anyone from that day to question Him anymore" (vs 43-46).

Same Jewish thinking today! They can't answer that Scripture. It's kind of like when Jesus asked them about the baptism of John.

Matthew 21:23: "Now when He entered the temple *and* was teaching, **the chief priests and the elders** of the people... [I want you to pay particular attention to who these people were] ...came up to Him, saying, 'By what authority do You do these things? And who gave You this authority?'"

Obviously, they didn't. The chief priests and the elders did not give Jesus the authority. So, they're challenging Him.

Verse 24: "And Jesus answered *and* said to them... [this is typical the way that Jesus answered a lot of questions]: ...'I will also ask you one thing, which if you tell Me, I will also tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, where did it come from? From heaven, or from men?' Then they reasoned among themselves... [notice how premeditated this is] ...saying, 'If we say, "From heaven," He will say to us, "Why then did you not believe him?" But if we say, "From men," we fear the multitude; for everyone holds John as a prophet"' (vs 24-26).

*You talk about **deliberate political decision making, devoid of the Spirit of God!** This has got to be it!*

Verse 27: "And they answered Jesus *and* said, 'We do not know.' He said to them also, 'Neither will I tell you by what authority I do these things.'"

That's much the same philosophy that one of the premises that's in this book is, which is that *nowhere in the entirety of the Bible do you find that Jesus was called the Son being eternally the Son of God.* Which is kind of a play on words, because the Bible doesn't call Him the Son before He became the Son.

As we covered in part 4 of this series, **Jesus was not the Son until He became the Son!** But we have shown as clear as we can, from the Old Testament, that the One Who became Jesus was Yahweh Elohim, the God of the Old Testament. He was not eternally the Son of God. But He was Yahweh Elohim, and He did not become the Son **until** He became the Son.

Who Is Jesus? by Anthony Buzzard: [The Logos in John 1:1](#)

Here is his explanation of Logos, the capitalized word *Word* (John 1). We will get into the meaning of John at a proper time, but I want to cover Buzzard's explanation of John 1:

There is no reason, other than force of habit, to understand the “word” in John 1:1 to mean a second divine person, *before the birth of Jesus*.

There’s no reason other than the force of habit. I’ll disprove that right now:

John 1:1: “In *the* beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word **was** God.:

That becomes very important as I’ll show in just a minute. Apparently he did not read that last statement: *the Word was God!* If that little phrase was not there, then you could build a reasonably strong case that Jesus was not God, providing you ignored a lot of other Scriptures. But this is very strong and very powerful.

A similar personification...

See what he’s doing? A personification of an idea or word.

...of wisdom in Proverbs 8:22, 30 and Luke 11:49 does not mean that “she” is a second person.

We’ll see that that even in Prov. 8 it doesn’t talk about the *she*—wisdom—being expressed in that particular sense as a person. We will see that it was a possession, something you possess.

There is no possible way of accommodating a “second divine Person” in the revealed Godhead as John and Jesus understood it.

Those are pretty powerful words! No possible way!

The Father remains, as He always has been, “the only true God” (John 17:3)...

In the prayer of Jesus where He says, ‘I come to you Holy Father.’ And where He says, ‘That they may know You as the only true God and Jesus Christ Whom You have sent.’ So, therefore, if it says, “the only true God” that means Jesus could not be God. We’ll explain it when we get there.

...“the one who alone is God” (5:44). Reading the term *logos* (“word”) from an Old Testament perspective we will understand it to be God’s activity in creation...

[He’s saying]: Logos is not God, is not a person, it is now:

“God’s activity in creation, His powerful life-giving command by which all things came into existence (Ps. 33:6-12). God’s word is the power by which His purposes are furthered (Isa. 55:11). If we borrow from

elsewhere in the New Testament we will equate the word with the creative salvation message, the gospel. This is the meaning throughout the New Testament (Matt. 13:19; Gal. 6:6, etc.)

Strong words, but not true!

It is this complex of ideas which go to make up the significance of *logos*, the “word.” “Through *it* all things were made and nothing was made without *it*” (John 1:3).

John 1:3: “All things came into being through **Him**... [not IT] ...and not even one *thing* that was created came into being without **Him**. In **Him** was life...” (vs 3-4). He translates this in his booklet: *it*. That is completely without foundation in the grammar of the Greek and English—totally.

In John 1:14 the word materializes in a real human being having a divine origin in his supernatural conception....

What he’s saying is that Logos is an idea, virtue, word, command or an attribute of God that now materializes in human form.

Verse 14: “And the Word [Logos] became flesh...” *He didn’t materialize in human form!* To *materialize* in human form is a New Age concept going back to the old materialization of God in the flesh, ala Buddha.

From this moment, in “the fullness of time” (Gal. 4:4), the one God expresses Himself in a new creation, the counterpart of the original creation in Adam. Jesus’ conception and birth mark a new unprecedented phase of God’s purpose in history. As the second Adam, Jesus sets the scene for the whole program of salvation. He pioneers the way to immortality. In him God’s purpose is finally revealed in a human being (Heb. 1:1).

We’re going to cover about the first Adam and the second Adam. Which is greater:

- To be the original hand-created human being fashioned by the hand of God?

or

- To be a supernatural new impregnation in an already line-descendent human being from Adam down to Mary?

Which is really the greater? *To me the greater would be the original creation made by the hand of God Himself!* That in effect is totally supernatural! *God did it Himself!* The other is—though it’s supernatural—He is already using an existing

humanity, rather than creating something entirely new.

All this does not mean, however, that Jesus gave up one life for another. That would seriously disturb the parallel with Adam who was also “Son of God” by direct creation (Luke 3:38). It would also interfere with the pure monotheism revealed throughout the Scriptures which “cannot be broken” (John 10:35). Rather, God begins to speak to us in the first century A.D. in a new Son, His last Word to the world (Heb. 1:1).

Let’s examine this place where it talks about *wisdom*. We know that wisdom comes from God. We know that it comes from the mind of God.

Proverbs 8:1: “Does not wisdom call? And does not understanding put forth her voice? She stands in the top of high places, by the place where the paths meet. She cries in the gates, at the entrance of the city, at the doors: ‘To you, O men, I call; and my voice *is* to the sons of men. O you simple ones, understand wisdom; and, you fools, be of an understanding heart. Hear; for I will speak of excellent things; and the opening of my lips *shall be* right things, for my mouth shall speak truth; and wickedness is an abomination to my lips” (vs 1-7).

This is wisdom talking. It is in the feminine sense, it is called *she*. It is a personification of wisdom, but it is not a real person; everyone understands that. Why do they all understand it that way?

Verse 8: “All the words of my mouth *are* in righteousness; there is nothing twisted or perverse in them. They *are* all plain to him who understands, and right to those who find knowledge. Receive my instruction and not silver, and knowledge rather than choice gold, for wisdom *is* better than rubies, and all the things that may be desired are not to be compared to it. I, wisdom, dwell with prudence, and find out knowledge and discretion. The fear of the LORD *is* to hate evil; I hate pride, and arrogance, and the evil way, and the perverse mouth. Counsel and sound wisdom *are* mine; I *am* understanding; I have strength” (vs 8-14).

This is why we know it is a personification, and this is why we know it is not a person, v 22: “The LORD **possessed** me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old.... [It was a possession of God!] ...I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, before the earth ever was. When *there were* no depths, I was brought forth; when *there were* no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills, I was brought forth. Before He had made the earth, or the

fields, or the highest part of the dust of the world, when He prepared the heavens, I *was* there; when He set a circle upon the face of the deep; when He established the clouds above, when He established the fountains of the deep, when He gave to the sea its limit that the waters should not pass His command, when He appointed the foundations of the earth, even I was *with Him* as a master workman; and I was daily *His* delight, rejoicing always before Him” (vs 22-30).

What Anthony Buzzard does in this book—*Who Is Jesus?*—is that he says ‘Logos, meaning the Word, was just like wisdom’ in Prov. 8. I dare you to search the Bible high and low and see if you can find any place where it says that wisdom is God. In the Greek ‘the Word was God’ is pronounced: ‘ho Logos en Theos’

If it was by wisdom that God created everything, why change the name in the New Testament from *wisdom* to *Word*? The Greek word for *wisdom* is ‘ha sophia.’ Of course, we have the female name Sophia. We even have a capital city in Bulgaria called Sophia. Why would it not, in John 1, start out this way:

- ‘en arche en ho spohia’—*in the beginning was wisdom*
- ‘kai ho spohia en pros ton theon—*and wisdom was with God*
- Why change it?
- Was not John a Jew? *Yes!*
- Was not John familiar with the Jewish language? *Yes!*
- Was not John familiar with the language and the expression of ‘ha sophia’? *Yes!*
- Why did he not write it ‘ha sophia’ instead of ‘ho logos’?

That is the question Anthony Buzzard can’t answer!

This may be a little technical for some people, but I think you follow what I’m saying here.

This understanding of Jesus in John’s Gospel will bring John into harmony with his fellow apostles and the monotheism of the Old Testament will be preserved intact.

There is the purpose of this whole book, right here! *To take away from the revelation of John and to make the New Testament conform with Old Testament theology, inasmuch as they understand it.*

The facts of church history show that the unrestricted monotheism of the Hebrew Scriptures was soon after New Testament times abandoned under the influence of alien Greek ideas....

Now we blame the Greeks for this. Then it says that this conflict has been there all the time, it has been unresolved.

...The result was years of conflict, still unresolved, over how an already existing second divine Person could be combined with a fully human being in a single individual.

I don't find that a problem at all; maybe he does!

The concept of literal preexistence for the Messiah is the intruding idea, the part of the Christological puzzle, which will not fit. Without it a clear picture of Jesus emerges **within the terms of the Hebrew revelation...**

Remember what I said about the Jewish Marranos tearing down New Testament theology. There it is right there, subtly exerting its force.

...If Christianity is to be revived and unified it will have to be on the basis of belief in Jesus, the Messiah of the Bible, unspoiled by the misleading speculations of the Greeks who displayed very little sympathy for the Hebrew world into which Christianity was born.

I will show you that it was not the Greeks who did this in the book of John, but it was the Apostle John.

Then it talks about the Divinity of Jesus; talks about the form of God. It says between the form of God and the likeness of God there's no difference, but I'll prove that there is a difference.

However, are we not demanding of Paul more than he could possibly give by asking him to present us, in a few brief phrases, with an eternal being other than the Father? This would so obviously threaten the strict monotheism which he everywhere else expresses so clearly.

Then we come to Philip. 2 where it says 'Let this mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus.' Notice his comment on this:

It has often been asked whether it is in any way probable that he would enforce this lesson by asking his readers to adopt the frame of mind of one who, having been eternally God, made the decision to become man.

- Why should we not have that frame of mind?
- What did God literally have to give up to save humankind?

Everything!

- What do we literally have to give up to become one of the members of the Family of God at the resurrection?

Everything!

It might also be strange for Paul to refer to the preexistent Jesus as Jesus the Messiah, thus reading back into eternity the name and office he received at birth.

The traditional reading of the Philippians 2 passage depends almost entirely on understanding Jesus' condition "in the form of God" as a reference to a preexistent life in heaven. Translations have done much to bolster this view. The verb "was" in the phrase "was in the form of God" occurs frequently in the New Testament and by no means carries the sense of "existing in eternity"...

This is a trap for someone who doesn't know Greek, or doesn't understand verbs. Sure, you can take any verb and make this statement, but that doesn't take away from the rest of it. You can't isolate the verb alone from the rest of what it's talking about. Could you isolate the verb from: *I came home*, and take the verb *came* and say that can apply to many other things? *Certainly it can apply to many other things!* But in this sense it's restricted to the rest of it. 'Was in the form of God' is not dependent upon the verb in this case.

...Paul says that a man ought not to cover his head since he *is* in the image and glory of God.

So, he says form and image are interchangeable.

Paul's intention in Philippians 2 is not to introduce the vast subject of an eternal divine being who became man, but to teach a simple lesson in humility. We are to have the same attitude as Jesus, to think as he did. We are not being asked to imagine ourselves as eternal divine beings about to surrender Godhood in order to come to the earth as men.

Then he gives this quote by a Regius Professor of Divinity wrote in 1923, and he wrote an explanation of it saying that Paul wasn't saying that, but just exhorting to just accept what he's giving up here.

A.H. McNeile, suggests the following paraphrase:

Note that a paraphrase never proves doctrine. A paraphrase is a paraphrase. Let's go to Philippians 2:5 so we know what we're talking about: "Let this

mind be in you, which *was* also in Christ Jesus.” Here’s his *paraphrase* of Philip. 2:

(go to the next track)

“Though Jesus was throughout the whole of his life divine, yet he did not think it a privilege to be maintained at all costs to be treated as on an equality with God but of his own accord emptied himself (of all self-assertion or divine honor) by adopting the nature of a slave.”

Paul is pointing to the fact that Jesus appeared on the human scene as any other man (“in the likeness of men”). His life, looked at as a whole, was a continuous process of self-humbling, culminating in his death on the cross. The second Adam, unlike the first, submits himself entirely to the will of God and in consequence receives the highest exaltation.

Let’s look at this in a little more detailed way. If you have an Interlinear it will be helpful in this particular case. If you know anything about Greek that also will be helpful. I’m going to cover some Greek words and I hope I can make it understandable to everyone.

Verse 6: “Who, although He **existed [being] in the form of God...**” **What does this mean in the Greek?**

- form—from the Greek word ‘morphe’

Anthony Buzzard claims that the word ‘morphe’ means the same as ‘eikono.’

1-Corinthians 11:7 (KJV) “For a man indeed ought not to cover *his* head, forasmuch as he is the **image** and glory of God...”

- ‘image’—‘eikono’
- ‘being’—*state of existence*; he’s existing in the image of God

It’s different than *form*, because this word ‘eikon’ also refers to and is the word used for *image of the beast*. So, the image is not the reality. If you have a picture of someone, is that really that person? *No!* If you have the image of a statue depicting something, provided it’s not an idol, it’s still in the Greek called an ‘icon,’ is that the reality? *No!* Is man, being in the in image of God, is he God? *NO!*

When we come to the word *form* we’re talking about the reality of your form. It says, Philippians 2:6 (KJV): “Who, being in the form of God...”—you can look at the Greek and see that the word *being* means *subsisting*—‘huparchon.’ So, who was subsisting? What does subsisting mean?

- ‘huparchon’—*a state of being, to exist really or actually.*
- What is this state telling us?
- Is Paul telling us that Jesus literally, actually was existing in the form of God?
- A state of being as God?

That’s what Paul is telling us here in the Greek! It’s exactly what he’s saying. It’s not an idea that He was in the form of God; it wasn’t the same as an image, because an image is a replication. A form is what you are.

Remember the two disciples that Jesus met after His resurrection? He appeared to them in a ‘different’ form. What they really saw was the reality of Jesus in a different form. It’s the same word *form*, which is ‘morphe’—it’s the reality of what you really are. What Paul is saying is that ***Jesus was actually existing in a state of being in the form of God!*** If you are in the form of God and you are God then it’s not “...robbery to be equal with God” (v 6)—is it? *No!* That’s what he’s saying.

Let’s see where the word ‘huparchon’ is used again. This is how that you establish doctrine in studying the Bible. You see how the things are used in the Bible, what it really means.

Luke 7:25—parable talking about John the Baptist and Jesus said, “But what did you go out to see? A man dressed in soft clothing? Behold, those who *dress* in splendid clothing and **live** in luxury are in the palaces.”

- live—‘huparchon’—it shows he’s living

Are they not living? Those who are dressed that way are living in king’s courts. It is *a state of existence*. That’s what he’s saying of Jesus, *a state of existence*.

We could go through and do a much more in-depth word study, but I’m not going to. This is talking about the nature of man:

Luke 11:13: “Therefore if you, **being** evil...”—‘huparchon’—*a state of real existence!*

Are we, by *a state of real existence* of ourselves, evil? *Yes!* That doesn’t mean we aren’t capable of doing good, but what did Jesus say about human nature? *It is evil!* If you being—‘huparchon’—evil; a state of existence.

Roman 4:19—about Abraham: “And he, not being weak in the faith, considered not his own body, already having become dead, **being** [‘huparchon’] a bout one hundred years old...”

Was Abraham, at that time, in a state of being, literally existing at 100-years-old? *Yes!* So,

when it talks about Jesus being, or living, in a state of actually being in the form of God, 'esteemed it not robbery to be equal with God.' Is Paul not saying that Jesus was God? *He's saying that Jesus WAS God!*

Notice what God had to do. This is not used of any other human being.

Philippians 2:7 (KJV): "But made himself of no reputation..." *That's not a correct translation, but it's fair.* If you are of God you have a reputation; you live forever, you're the ever-existing one and so forth. In the Greek it means:

(FV): "**But emptied Himself...**"

- How can a human being empty himself?
- If He was just a man, not God, how can a man empty himself?

A person doesn't empty himself; you are what you are! You can empty your brain; you can do that. You can have a humble mind, but you are not emptying yourself.

Remember the example of Abraham when the Lord and the two angels came to meet him. Abraham scurried around like he was the lowest slave around. But it doesn't say that he emptied himself; he was humbled toward God!

This is talking about God on a level of existing ***Who then empties Himself from being God!*** That's what it's talking about. Would God literally have to empty Himself to become a human being? *Yes, He would!*

- He'd have to give up eternal life
- He'd have to give up power
- He'd have to give up authority

Verse 7: "He emptied Himself... [of the form—'morphé' of God] ...and was made in the likeness... ['homoiomati'—the exact sameness as man; flesh and blood] ...of men and took the form... ['morphé' means *that is what you are*] ...of a servant ['doulos']."

We have here very clearly going from one state of being as God to another state of being as a slave, or human being.

- He didn't take on being nearly man
- He didn't take on a better form of flesh than we have

For God to do that, ***God literally had to empty Himself of it.*** If God has to pay for the penalty of sin Himself, by His death, how else is God going to do this. As God, ***God cannot die!*** So, you have to become human, because a human can

die! In order for you to die as a human, you have to take on the same exact nature that human beings have and be subject to death, otherwise, you couldn't die.

That's what it's saying here. God wants us to have that same mind of Jesus Christ Who, when He was God, ***gave up everything*** to save humankind! So, we, in response to God need to have that same attitude, that ***we give up everything to God!*** That's what we need to do.

That's why it's so dangerous for a church to come in and take that dedication that people have toward God and use it for their own ends, means and purposes.

Verse 8: "And being found in *the* manner of man..."—meaning all of the bodily processes of a human man. He did everything that a human had to do:

- He had to eat food
- He had to eliminate
- He sweat
- He was tired
- He had to sleep

Remember, one time He was sleeping in the back of a ship and there was a big storm going on. That means He was really, literally, truly, absolutely, ***completely human*** in every way like we are.

"...He humbled Himself, *and* became obedient unto death, even *the* death of *the* cross" (v 8). *There's an awful lot here*; this part of the Bible is telling us an awful lot.

How is that someone can read this and say that Paul is not saying this. Either he doesn't know what he's saying, *or* he didn't understand Greek, *or* if understands Greek, *he doesn't research it enough, or he has a preconceived notion as to the premise of where he is going and everything he must do must fit that premise!* I would say that is the case in this booklet *Who Is Jesus?*; to make the New Testament conform to the Old; whereas the Old Testament cannot be understood except for the New Testament.

- Can you understand Daniel without Revelation? *No! You can understand part of it!*
- Can you understand about the Messiah without the New Testament? *No! Only part of it!*
- What did Jesus have to do with His own disciples? *He had to open their minds to understand the Scriptures concerning Himself!*

Verse 9: "Therefore, God has also highly

exalted Him and bestowed upon Him a name which *is* above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *beings* in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ *is* Lord to *the* glory of God *the* Father” (vs 9-11).

I know this gets a little tedious, I understand that, but that’s the only way to answer a sophisticated argument. You’ve got to get in and be tedious and plod through it and have the fortitude to get all the way through it.

Beginning with Jesus, humanity makes a new start. In Jesus as representative man, the new Adam, society begins all over again.

Society didn’t begin all over again when Jesus was here!

This correspondence is seriously disturbed if Jesus after all did not originate as a man. As Adam is created a “Son of God” (Luke 3:38), so Jesus’ conception constitutes him “Son of God” (Luke 1:35).

Jesus is the firstborn of every creature as well as the firstborn from the dead...

The term “firstborn” designates him the leading member of the new created order...

That almost smacks of New Ageism!

...as well as its source, a position which he attained by being the first to receive immortality through resurrection.

That’s a reasonably true statement!

In none...

that’s a strong one

...of Paul’s statements are we compelled to find a “second, eternal divine being.”

In other words, there is not another one called *God*. We just read some of Paul’s statements.

He presents us rather with the glorified second Adam, now raised to the divine office for which man was originally created (Gen. 1:26; Ps. 8). Jesus now represents the human race as the Head of the new order of humanity. He intercedes for us as supreme High Priest in the heavenly temple (Heb.8:1).

Nothing in Colossians 1 forces us to believe that Paul, without warning, has parted company with Matthew, Mark, Luke, Peter, and John, and deviated from the absolute monotheism which he states so carefully and clearly elsewhere...

It will be useful by way of summary and to orient ourselves to the thought world of the authors of the New Testament to lay out the principal passages of the Hebrew Scriptures from which they derived their unified understanding of the person of Christ. Nowhere can it be shown that the Messiah was to be an uncreated being, a fact which should cause us to look outside the Bible for the source of such a revolutionary concept.

Jesus thus represents the presence of the one God, his Father. In the man Jesus, Immanuel, the one God is present with us (John 14:9).

While the evidence of the Old Testament was largely rejected—as well as the evidence of the synoptic Gospels, Acts, Peter, James, and John in the book of Revelation—a series of verses in John’s Gospel and two or three in Paul’s epistles were reinterpreted to accommodate the new idea that Jesus was the second member of an eternal Trinity...

we’re talking about duality

...coequally and coessentially God. That Jesus, however, is scarcely the Jesus of the biblical documents. He is another Jesus (2 Cor. 11:4).

He’s saying that if you believe that Jesus was God. He makes a statement that He’s co-equal with God. *But Jesus revealed that the Father was ‘greater than I am’!* But the Bible does reveal that the One Who became Jesus was Yahweh. Had to be Yahweh, no way around it. I’ll prove that as we go along.

A perusal of standard works on Christology reveals some remarkable admissions which may encourage the reader to conduct a personal quest for the Truth about Jesus. In an article on the Son of God, William Sanday, once professor of divinity at Oxford...

Which by the way is Episcopal, and we read how the Episcopalians bury the Truth at the beginning. So, we lay great stress and authority on Professor Sanday.

...asks the question whether there are any texts in the four Gospels which might lead us to the idea of Jesus as the “preexistent Son of God.” He concludes that *all* the statements about Jesus in Matthew, Mark, and Luke refer to the life of Christ on earth. There is not a single reference to his having been the Son of God before his birth.

I want you to understand something here: This is a very clever argument, because that statement of and by itself is true—that He was eternally the Son of

God before His birth. He was Yahweh, not the Son before His birth. He did not become the Son until He was begotten. So, you take a little technical statement like this and you build your case upon this.

It's like this: Many of these murder trials that we see have been thrown out on a technicality. Even though the person has confessed to the murder! Conviction is thrown out, confession is thrown out, because the police officer did not inform him that he could have an attorney present.

That's the same reasoning that we're using here. Taking a true fact that Jesus was not the Son eternally and saying that since He was not the Son eternally then He could not have been God before He became a human being. *That's throwing out the whole case on a technicality!*

If we examine John's Gospel "we have to look about somewhat for expressions that are free from ambiguity. *Perhaps there are not any*" (*Hastings Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. IV, p. 576, emphasis mine).

We'll see that are some very direct statements by Jesus that remove all ambiguity whatsoever about Who He was and what He was before He became human, and where He was. Notice the absence of Scriptural proof. Notice the absence of getting into the Scriptures and the Greek and the Hebrew to prove what he is alleging.

Here, then, is the statement of a leading expert to the effect that there may not be a single reference in all four Gospels to Jesus being the Son of God before his birth. Yet it remains a fact that the churches teach the eternal Sonship of Jesus as a basic and indispensable tenet of the faith.

Professor Sanday is left guessing why Matthew, Mark, and Luke know nothing about Jesus' preexistence: "It is probable that the writers had not reflected upon the subject at all, and did not reproduce a portion of our Lord's teaching upon it"

He concludes his remarks by quoting a German theologian...

Remember who we found some of those German theologians were? *Protestant Marranos!*

...as saying that "from the Old Testament and Rabbinism... [which is Judaism] ...there is no road to the doctrine of the divinity of Christ" (i.e. that he is God). Professor Wernle maintained that "the title Son of God is strictly Jewish and that the further step from Son of God to God the Son

was taken upon Gentile ground through lax ideas brought in by the converts from paganism" (*Ibid.*, p. 577).

Statements of this kind show on what shaky ground the whole edifice of "preexistent Sonship" is built. The possibility must be squarely faced that the dogmatic statements about Jesus which date from post biblical times rely on their own authority rather than that of the apostles. The wisest course is to take our stand upon the dogmatic statements of the Scripture itself and to recognize with Jesus that "eternal life consists in this: that we may come to know the Father as *the only true God* and Jesus, the Messiah whom He sent" (John 17:3).

Basically, he says that if you believe that Jesus was Divine before He became human you have the wrong Jesus. *I may say that it's the other way around!* Only one point that he has that is correct is that He was not the Son eternally. But that's a statement; that does not mean that Jesus was not God before He became human.

Jesus had sent seventy out preaching and to cast out demons, etc., Luke 10:17: "Then the seventy returned with joy, saying, 'Lord, even the demons are subject to us through Your name.' And He said to them, '**I beheld Satan fall as lightning from heaven**'" (vs 17-18). When did Satan fall? Before Jesus was born? *or* After Jesus was born?

If Jesus did not exist until He was conceived in Mary's womb, and *if* Jesus was not God before He became human, pray tell, how could He see Satan fall from heaven as lightning? *The fall of Satan occurred before the creation of Adam and Eve! Absolutely!* Jesus is telling us—not directly, but in fact—*He existed before Satan fell!* I don't know how else to read it.

If Jesus were not Yahweh Elohim, the God of the Old Testament Who dealt with Israel, we could not have Rom. 7 at all, the first part of it. Let's review before we get into Rom. 7.

Israel was married to Yahweh. Didn't He say in Isaiah. 54:5^[transcriber's correction]: "For your Maker is your husband; the LORD of hosts is His name..."

In order to end the Old Covenant, which is a marriage—a physical covenant based upon physical promises—God following His own law something had to happen. What happened to loose a marriage? *Die!* That's right, to end a marriage, the covenant, someone had to die.

Romans 7:1: "Are you ignorant, brethren (for I am speaking to those who know law)... [you have to know the law] ...that the law rules over a

man for as long a time as he may live? For the woman who is married is bound by law to the husband as long as he is living; but if the husband should die, she is released from the law *that bound her* to the husband. So then, if she should marry another man as long as the husband is living, she shall be called an adulteress; but if the husband should die, she is free from the law *that bound her to the husband*, so that she is no longer an adulteress if she is married to another man. **In the same way, my brethren, you also were made dead to the marriage law of the Old Covenant by the body of Christ in order for you to be married to another,** Who was raised from *the* dead, that we should bring forth fruit to God” (vs 1-4).

Jesus—Who was the God of the Old Testament—died. That’s what the whole analogy here is. They then were no longer bound to the law of the Old Covenant so that they could enter into the New Covenant, which is that you should be married to another. What are we? *We are as a chaste virgin espoused to Christ!* The Church is to marry Christ. Christ could not have had two marriages! One had to be dissolved legally/Godly; that’s why He died!

Verse 4: “In the same way, my brethren, you also were made dead to the *marriage law of the Old Covenant* by the body of Christ in order for you to be married to another, Who was raised from *the* dead, that we should bring forth fruit to God.”

We will see some of the writings of the Apostle Paul where he distinctly, directly, without a doubt at all whatsoever, calls Jesus ‘*God!*’ There is no doubt!

Titus 1:1: “Paul, *a* servant of God and *an* apostle of Jesus Christ, according to *the* faith of God’s elect and *the* knowledge of *the* Truth that is according to Godliness; in *the* hope of eternal life, which God Who cannot lie promised before the ages of time, but revealed in its own set time in *the* proclamation of His Word, with which I was entrusted according to *the* commandment of **God our Savior**; to Titus, a true son according to *our* common faith: Grace, mercy *and* peace from God *the* Father and *the* Lord Jesus Christ **our Savior**” (vs 1-4). *Is he not calling Jesus Christ God?*

- God our Savior
- Lord Jesus Christ our Savior

Does that mean that God the Father is not God? *No! He is still God! He is the Highest!*

Titus 2:13: “Looking for the blessed hope and *the* appearing of the glory of **our Savior and great God Jesus Christ...** [Here He’s called *the Great God!*] ...Who gave Himself for us, so that He might redeem us from all lawlessness, and might

purify for Himself a unique people, zealous of good works” (vs 13-14).

Titus 3:3: “For we also were once foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving all kinds of lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful *and* hating one another.” *Sounds like people today! Why? Because there’s no difference in human nature today as it was then!*

Verse 4: “But when the graciousness and the love of **God our Savior** toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we practiced, but according to His mercy He saved us, through *the* washing of regeneration and *the* renewing of *the* Holy Spirit, which He richly poured out upon us through **Jesus Christ our Savior**” (vs 4-6).

- God our Savior
- Jesus Christ our Savior

Jesus Christ our Savior is God! Absolutely clear as a bell!

1-Timothy 3:16: “And undeniably, great is the mystery of Godliness... [that mystery is great and takes some understanding to get into it] ...**God was manifested in the flesh**, was justified in *the* Spirit, was seen by angels, was proclaimed among *the* Gentiles, was believed on in *the* world, was received up in glory.”

Jesus was God manifested in the flesh!
That is a very key and important statement.

Before we get into the book of John I’m going to cover certain things about the canonization of the New Testament so we can understand why the writings of John are different than Matthew, Mark and Luke; why they are a little different than the Apostle Paul’s; the Apostle Peter’s, and why John wrote what he wrote and when he wrote, so that we can have the knowledge that we have.

When we get to the Gospel of John we’re going to find a tremendous number of Scriptures that you cannot dispute in any way refer to Jesus’ pre-existence as God!

Scriptures from *The Holy Bible in Its Original Order, A Faithful Version* (except where noted)

Scriptural References:

- 1) Deuteronomy 13:1-2
- 2) Matthew 24:24
- 3) Deuteronomy 13:3-5
- 4) Matthew 22:41-46
- 5) Matthew 21:23-27
- 6) John 1:1, 3-4, 14
- 7) Proverbs 8:1-14, 22-30

- 8) Philippians 2:5-6
- 9) 1 Corinthians 11:7
- 10) Philippians 2:6
- 11) Luke 7:25
- 12) Luke 11:13
- 13) Romans 4:19
- 14) Philippians 2:7-11
- 15) Luke 10:17-18
- 16) Isaiah 54:5
- 17) Romans 7:1-4
- 18) Titus 1:1-4
- 19) Titus 2:13-14
- 20) Titus 3:3-6
- 21) 1 Timothy 3:16

Scriptures referenced, not quoted: Psalm 110

Also referenced:

Article: *Time Magazine*, More Spong-taneous

Eruptions (Feb. 18, 1991)

{time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,972348,00.html}

full article found at: holysmoke.org/sdhok/bishop.htm

Books:

- *Rescuing the Bible from Fundamentalism* by John Shelby Spong
- *Satan's Ten Most Believable Lies* by David Breese

Booklet: *Who Is Jesus?* by Anthony Buzzard
(christianmonotheism.com/media/text/WhoIsJesusBook.pdf)

FRC:bo

Transcribed: 8-6-13

Reformatted/Corrected: 2/2020