

A Critique of the Article, “Who Was the God of the Old Testament?”

This is a Critique of Mr Roderick C Meredith’s article, *Who Was the God of the Old Testament?* published by the *Living Church of God* in the January-February 2009 issue of their *Tomorrow’s World* magazine.

Mr Meredith’s article presents two principal theses. His first thesis and with which I agree, is that there have been from all past eternity two God Persons, who are known in NT times as God the Father and his Son Jesus. His second thesis and with which I strongly disagree, is that Jesus was the Creator and LORD God of the OT.

In case my rejecting Mr Meredith’s second thesis be misconstrued, it should be clear from my agreeing with Mr Meredith’s first thesis that I am not a Unitarian. This may also be seen from my paper P5, “*The Bible Shows Jesus Was A Self-Existent God*”, available at my Internet home page (for details how to access this and other papers mentioned below, see at the end of this Critique).

The bulk of this Critique consists of a 2-column table carrying the text of Mr Meredith’s article in the left-hand column and my critical comments in the right-hand column. Before that are placed *Some For and Against Arguments*, followed by *The 2nd-Century Departures from Apostolic Godhead Teaching* and after that *Difficulties Arising from Mr Meredith’s Second Thesis*.

Mr Meredith’s article is in effect a fundamental teaching of the late Mr Herbert W Armstrong, who founded around 1934 the *Radio Church of God*, which was later renamed the *Worldwide Church of God*. It may therefore be safely assumed that many of the churches that derived from the former Worldwide Church of God also agree with Mr Meredith’s article and in particular with his first and second theses, save of course Unitarian churches of God.

However, that so many churches of God still support Mr Meredith’s second thesis, that Jesus is the LORD God of the OT may surprise readers after diligently studying this Critique. For example let the reader now turn to Acts 13:16-37 where Paul relates how the LORD God of the OT led Israel, raised David (verse 22) and from David’s seed raised a Saviour Jesus (verse 23). Paul quotes in verse 33 Psalm 2:7 to show that the OT LORD begot his Son. In verse 35 Paul quotes Psalm 16:10 to show that the OT God would not suffer his Holy One (Jesus) to see corruption – God the Father resurrected his Son Jesus. From this it should be clear that the LORD God of the OT, who begot a Son can only have been God the Father. That Mr Meredith’s second thesis is untenable will become increasingly clearer as the reader studies this Critique.

SOME FOR AND AGAINST ARGUMENTS

Mr Meredith uses several arguments in support of his second thesis that Jesus was the Creator and the LORD God of the OT. So that the reader may appreciate the complexity of the arguments that can be put *For* and *Against* his second thesis, I will put next several examples of each. The reader should bear in mind that if indeed there are valid arguments both *For* and *Against* Mr Meredith’s second thesis, then we would have a self-contradictory Bible and we could no longer trust the Bible as God’s Word of Truth. This is therefore a serious matter in more ways than one: not the least being that in the Church of God we ought to know who is the LORD God of the OT.

One of Mr Meredith’s most persuasive *For* arguments is the so-called “*I AM*” one linking John 8:58 with Exodus 3:14 through the shared phrase “I am”. In John 8:58 Jesus said, “...before Abraham was, I am” and in Exodus 3:14 the LORD God of Exodus, speaking to Moses from the Burning Bush, named himself “*I AM*”. The shared phrase “I am” is then taken as a dependable NT-OT link for identifying Jesus of John 8:58 with the LORD God of Exodus 3:14-15. I will soon show that this link is untenable but before that let us look at a corresponding *Against* argument based on a far more solid NT-OT link for identifying the LORD God who spoke to Moses from the Burning Bush (Exod 3:4-6).

This *Against* link is based on the title, “*The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob*” which occurs in both Acts 3:13 and in Exodus 3:6. In Acts 3:13, Peter identifies the God who glorified his Son Jesus as the “*The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob*” and in Exodus 3:6 the LORD God of Exodus identifies himself to Moses as “*The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob*”. There can be no argument that this NT-OT link identifies God the Father as the LORD God who spoke to Moses from the Burning Bush.

It is clear that if Mr Meredith’s *For* argument my *Against* argument are mutually contradictory and so at least one of these must be false. No doubt it would be anathema for Mr Meredith to reject his questionable (see next paragraph) “*I AM*” link between John 8:58 and Exodus 3:14 but would this cause him to deny the solid “*The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob*” link between Acts 3:13 and Exodus 3:6?

Let us now examine the worth of Mr Meredith's NT-OT "I AM" link from John 8:58 to Exodus 3:14.

The Greek for "I am" is "Ego eimi". This is a quite common NT Greek phrase and so lacks uniqueness. Only a few verses from John 8:58, in John 9:9 the healed blind man also said "I am" (Ego eimi) but that did not make him the OT LORD God because he only expressed his existence and did not name himself "I AM".

In John 8:58 Jesus too did not name himself "I AM" but with "I am" claimed to have existed before Abraham.

However in Exodus 3:14 the LORD God speaking to Moses did name himself "I AM" and with that declared himself to be *The Eternal* or *The Self-Existent One*.

So the usages "I am" in John 8:58 and "I AM" in Exodus 3:14 are entirely different usages. Therefore when Mr Meredith attempts to link these two usages he is not linking like usages but unlike ones. Therefore Mr Meredith fails to establish a logically valid NT-OT link for identifying Jesus with the LORD God of Exodus.

In contrast the NT-OT link, "*The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob*", from Acts 3:13 to Exodus 3:14 links like titles and therefore validly links God the Father of Acts 3:13 with the OT LORD God of Exodus 3:14-15, who spoke to Moses from the Burning Bush. This is also examined in my 2-page paper Q7, "*Quick Guide to God the Father's OT Identity*" and in paper P2, "*God the Father is the Creator and Husband of Israel!*".

An other alleged proof of Mr Meredith's second thesis is often cited in the form of Ephesians 3:9 (KJV), "*And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ*". The underlined phrase "*by Jesus Christ*" seems proof that Jesus was the Creator. However, most modern translations omit that phrase because it is now recognized that Paul did not write that phrase in his original autograph but that this phrase was a later addition (falsification) to some Greek manuscripts. Without that phrase, Ephesians 3:9 plainly states that God (Father) created all things.

Next let us look at a 4-verse passage that asserts that the God with a holy child (i.e. Father) was the Creator. The passage is Acts 4:24-27 and the defining verses are 24 and 27, which read, "²⁴ *And when they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, which hath made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is.....*" ²⁷ *For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus.*" Since verse 27 declares that the Creator God of verse 24 has a holy child Jesus, the Creator can only be God the Father.

Since Paul's original autograph of Ephesians 3:9 and Luke's Acts 4:24 – 27 agree that God the Father was the Creator, it is plain that Mr Meredith has failed to prove his second thesis that Jesus was the Creator and LORD God of the OT.

NOTE: The reader may wonder about verses 25-26 placed between Acts 4:24 and 27 and which read, "²⁵ *Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage, and the people imaging vain things?*" ²⁶ *The kings of the Earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against the LORD and against his Christ.*" Two points may be noticed about these intermediate verses 25 and 26. FIRST although they do not alter the aforementioned message given by verses 24 and 27, they do hide this. Perhaps that is God's way of hiding that message from Christendom's textual falsifiers. SECOND verse 26 through distinguishing between the LORD of the OT and his NT Christ is yet another testimony that not Jesus but God the Father was the LORD God of the OT.

At this point the reader faces a dilemma that can not be left unresolved. Mr Meredith's article, although it puts well the traditional Worldwide Church of God view has been shown to be wanting and indeed my paper P2 shows that none of the verses Mr Meredith appeals to for his second thesis will stand up to a critical examination. I found that ministers will flee from this problem or try to dodge it by appealing to the dozen or so alleged proof verses to cling to the traditional Worldwide Church of God claim that Jesus was the Creator and LORD God of the OT.

Let us now review the history of the post-Apostolic Godhead changes that begun in earnest during the 2nd-century AD because that will give us a different perspective on Mr Meredith's second thesis that Jesus was the Creator and LORD God of the OT.

THE 2ND-CENTURY DEPARTURES FROM APOSTOLIC GODHEAD TEACHING

Although this may surprise most readers, Mr Meredith's second thesis that Jesus was the Creator and LORD God of the OT relates to an early 2nd-century AD departure from apostolic 'Godhead' teaching and which resulted in a

Unitarian Godhead. Although Mr Meredith's thesis does not go that far, it nevertheless follows in part that early departure from Apostolic teaching. It is important to recognize why such a departure occurred.

Jewish converts naturally favoured a Unitarian Godhead because they were familiar with the following OT scriptures. Deuteronomy 6:4, "*Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD*" and Isaiah 44:6, "*Thus saith the LORD the King of Israel... I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God*". Superficially these scriptures suggest a Unitarian Godhead and that is what many Jewish converts favoured.

Greek converts too preferred a monotheist Godhead because even the Apostolic two-God Godhead reminded them of the pagan polytheism of the Greco-Roman world.

Both Jewish and Greek converts whose background was the Neoplatonist philosophy of the Greco-Roman world found it inconceivable that a God (i.e. Jesus) could have died or that a God (i.e. God the Father) would have soiled his hands creating the vile physical universe. As a result they too favoured there being just one God the Father. They also believed the Father had created Jesus and that in turn Jesus had created for his Father the physical universe.

Therefore the post-apostolic 2nd-century AD church increasingly favoured a Unitarian Godhead. In particular it favoured that Jesus was the Creator of the physical universe. It is this part of the 2nd-century departure from Apostolic Godhead teaching that Mr Meredith's second thesis has adopted and frankly which needs to be reviewed.

However, some 2nd-century converts believed that for Jesus to be mankind's atoning Passover Lamb, he must have been a God incarnate. These faced the problem of reconciling a monotheist OT Godhead (e.g. Deut 6:4 and Isa 44:6) and a two-God NT Godhead (e.g. Phil 2:5-7, Heb 7:1-4). The solution adopted was a multi-modal or multi-aspectual monotheist Godhead which could present either a Father mode or a Son mode.

Over the next few centuries this multi-modal Godhead evolved into mainstream Christendom's triune Trinity, which is said to consist of a single God-substance (Greek homo-ousios) into which are subjoined the three hypostases of God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit.

Throughout this period a conflict raged between Unitarians (Arians) and the pseudo-monotheist Trinitarians. To prevent this conflict threatening the unity of the Roman Empire, several emperors influenced the theological debate and in the end the politically correct solution imposed on mainstream Christendom was the Trinity.

These Godhead changes resulted in alterations being made to various Greek NT manuscripts. Mainstream's Trinity also influenced translations into modern languages, including the English KJV Bible.

Mr Meredith and before him Mr Herbert W Armstrong adopted therefore part of the 2nd-century AD Godhead change, namely that Jesus was the Creator and Lord God of the OT because they failed to recognize the falsifications that had entered the NT Greek manuscripts and on which they depended and they also failed to recognize the many OT and NT scriptures that show that God the Father was the Creator and LORD God of the OT.

A useful book on the early Godhead changes is Harry R Boer's *A Short History of the Early Church* published by William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan (ISBN 0-8028-1339-9). Although this is a book of mainstream Christendom, we can glean enough from it to appreciate the post-apostolic Godhead changes.

How do we pick our way through the minefield of NT Greek manuscript changes, and determine which scriptures are true and which were changed? I believe the golden rule is to read the Bible from Genesis 1:1 to Revelation 22:21 with the doctrine under examination on the backburner. When we find a verse that does not fit, we must check its translation and whether its OT Hebrew or NT Greek text has been altered. My Critique of Mr Meredith's text points to several scriptures that must be questioned.

DIFFICULTIES ARISING FROM MR MEREDITH'S SECOND THESIS.

It is helpful for this Critique of Mr Meredith's article to have guide posts to direct our way. These will be examined now.

(1) Surely God the Father Cannot Be a Single Unmarried Father?

Although Mr Meredith does not mention this specifically, if Jesus was indeed the Creator and LORD God of the OT, then Jesus was also the Husband of Israel because the LORD God of the OT declares to Israel that He is her Husband (Isaiah 54:5; Jeremiah 3:14 and 31:32).

If Jesus is the Husband of Israel, then the following are inescapable but absurd consequences:

- God the Father has no Wife and therefore is a single or unmarried Father!
- God the Father begot his Son Jesus through his Son's Wife Israel, by Mary.
- Therefore God the Father committed incest with his Daughter-in-Law, Israel.

Now this should galvanize all readers into studying the Bible with renewed vigour because those inescapable consequences strike directly at the heart of man's family being an image of God the Father's Plan for his Family. God instructs us not to commit incest and so we must expect He too will not commit incest. Indeed Galatians 4:4 says, "*But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law.*"

(2) Who Was the Prophet of Deuteronomy 18:18?

The same LORD God who spoke to Moses at the Burning Bush also said to Moses in Deuteronomy 18:18, "*I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.*" The full significance of this verse may be seen from Acts 3:20-23 where Peter declares this Prophet was Jesus and quotes there from Deuteronomy 18:15-19.

Let us read again Deuteronomy 18:18 but now with explanatory comments added. "*I (Father) will raise them (Israel) up a Prophet (Jesus) from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my (Father's) words (Gospel of the Kingdom) in his (Jesus') mouth; and he (Jesus) shall speak unto them all that I (Father) shall command him.*"

Remember that Jesus stated several times that his Father had sent him (e.g. John 5:30). It is therefore plain that God the Father was the LORD God of Exodus who spoke to Moses starting with the Burning Bush.

When we take Mr Meredith's second thesis literally, namely that Jesus was the Creator and Lord God of the OT, including Exodus, then Jesus would have told Moses that He would send himself as that Prophet. However, that does not fit Jesus declaring his Father had sent him.

For further explanations go to my Internet home page and there read the 2-page article Q7. "*Quick Guide to God the Father's OT Identity*" and also the short articles Q6, Q7, A2, A3 and the in-depth study paper, P2, *God the Father is the Creator and Husband of Israel!*

(3) Surely Jesus did not Deny his Father in Isaiah 44:6?

If Mr Meredith's second thesis is true that Jesus was the Creator and LORD God of the OT, then Jesus was the LORD who said in Isaiah 44:6, "*Thus saith the LORD the King of Israel... I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God?*" Does this mean Jesus denied the NT God the Father? Clearly that would be the case if Jesus was the LORD God of the OT and so we must assume that it was God the Father who is quoted in Isaiah 44:6.

Even then we have a problem, because now it seems that God the Father denies his NT Son Jesus being a God incarnate. I explain this in paper P5, "*The Bible Shows Jesus Was A Self-Existent God*". In essence the explanation consists of two points. First Jesus surrendered for all future eternity his former Self-existent divinity to become mankind's atoning Passover Lamb and so there remains only one Self-existent God. Second since God the Father, as the LORD God of the OT, is also the Husband of Israel, He reminds Israel in Isaiah 44:6 that she is to relate only to him and to no other god. That in Isaiah 44:6 the phrase "... beside me there is no God" refers to pagan gods rather than Jesus may be seen from Isaiah 44:7-9.

NOTE: The reader may disagree with my writing that God the Father is the only remaining Self-existent God. After Jesus agreed to become and die as man's atoning Passover Lamb, he depended on his Father for his Resurrection from the grave to eternal Life. Therefore Jesus surrendered for all future eternity his former Self-existent Godship (divinity) and so only God the Father remains as a Self-existent God. Therefore only God the Father and not Jesus could name himself in Exodus 3:14-15, "*I AM*", that is "*The Eternal*", or "*The Self-Existent One*". Therefore all life, whether this be angelic, human or our Lord Jesus, has come from God the Father.

(4) How Was God the Father Neither Seen Nor Heard?

Mr Meredith claims that God the Father can not be the LORD God who spoke to Moses because Jesus declares that no man has seen or heard God the Father (e.g. John 1:18 and 5:37). For example, in John 5:37 Jesus said, "*And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape*". That seems a powerful argument till we remember that when Jesus said this, God the Father's voice had been heard at Jesus' baptism! For example, Matth 3:17, "*And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*"

Obviously Jesus had something else in mind in John 5:37. For example, although Adam and Eve were spoken to by God the Father in Eden, they did not heed his words. In fact starting with Eve, all of mankind has consistently refused to listen to God the Father. For example, immediately after God the Father finished

announcing the Ten Commandments, the people said in Exodus 20:19, “... *but let not God speak with us, lest we die.*” In Deuteronomy 18:15-19 Moses recalls how God reminded him of that incident at Mt Horeb (Sinai). Then God (Father) added that he would send a Prophet (Jesus) and put his (Father’s) words in his (Jesus) mouth.

Therefore man has never heard (listened to) God the Father’s word. That is one reason why God the Father sent Jesus so that Jesus could put his Father’s message of the Gospel of the Kingdom to the people.

Man also has not seen God. Not even Moses saw God the Father because when Moses asked to seek God’s glory he was told this was impossible. Instead God placed Moses in a cleft in the rock, covered him with His hand and Moses was shown only a glimpse of God’s back (Exod 33:22-23).

Therefore scriptures such as John 1:18 and 5:37 do not rule out God the Father having been the Creator and LORD God of the OT. For a more detailed explanation see my paper, P10, “*How God the Father Was Seen and Heard!*”

We are now in a position to critically review Mr Meredith’s article in the following 2-column table in which the text of Mr Meredith’s article is given in the left-hand column and my critical comments in the right-hand one.

Who Was the God of the Old Testament?

<i>Text of Mr Meredith’s Article</i>	<i>Henk Jens’ Critical Comments</i>
<p>Did God the Father give ancient Israel outdated instructions, which Jesus Christ had to come to change? Or were the ancient Israelites guided by the same One who was born as Jesus Christ? The answer may surprise you!</p>	<p>Mr Meredith’s suggestion that Jesus was the One who guided Israel is denied by Hebrews 1:1-2a</p> <p>Heb 1:1-2a “<i>God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son...</i>”</p> <p>In other words God the Father spoke directly through the prophets (starting with Moses) to OT Israel but in NT times God the Father spoke through Jesus.</p> <p>With only a couple of exceptions “God” in the NT refers always to God the Father, e.g. Romans 1:1-3, “<i>Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, (which <u>he</u> had promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures,) Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh.</i>” Here the underlined “he” denotes the God of the OT who had a Son and therefore must be the NT God the Father.</p>
<p>Many Christians try to distinguish the God of the Old Testament from the person of Jesus Christ. Yet your Bible shows that Jesus Christ, who pre-existed with God the Father from eternity, was the One who spoke to Abraham and Moses and gave the Ten Commandments!</p>	<p>Contrary to Mr Meredith’s claim, the Bible does not show that Jesus was the One who spoke to Abraham and Moses.</p> <p>I showed above that in Acts 3:13 Peter identifies God the Father with <u><i>The God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob</i></u> (Exod 3:6). Also that the God who met Moses at the Burning Bush named himself <u><i>The God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob</i></u> and was therefore not Jesus but was God the Father!</p> <p>Here is another example.</p> <p>If Jesus was the LORD God of the OT who spoke to Abraham and who said to Abraham that He was the God Most High, then Jesus would have made himself greater than his Father. However, Jesus said his Father</p>

<i>Text of Mr Meredith’s Article</i>	<i>Henk Jens’ Critical Comments</i>
	<p>was greater than he (John 14:28). Therefore again Jesus can not have been <i>the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob</i>.</p> <p>Consider now Abraham meeting Melchizedek in Gen 14:18, “<i>And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God.</i>”</p> <p>Who was Melchizedek? His name means “<i>King of Righteousness</i>” which clearly alludes to Jesus. Heb 6:20 - 7:4 declares that Melchizedek was without beginning of days. This mean Melchizedek was not a created Being. Mr Meredith agrees there were from all past eternity only two Self-existent Gods and so Melchizedek was the One who became Jesus.</p> <p>Therefore Melchizedek of Gen 14:18 was a rare OT Christophany in the form of priest to the most high God. Therefore the most high God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob was neither Melchizedek nor Jesus but was God the Father!</p>
<p>Most religious scholars and commentaries know the clear scriptures we will be discussing in this article. They are aware of what a number of biblical passages make very clear. But most of them avoid these scriptures like the plague! Or, on the other hand, they may do a little verbal “dance” around them—touching on them in their technical commentaries—but then gliding on to “safer” subjects without fully explaining them one way or the other.</p>	<p>Ministers prefer their church’s human tradition over God’s Truth to avoid admitting error and troubling their flock with changes. That was the case with the Pharisees during Jesus’ earthly ministry. Nothing has changed as the reader should find out if he were to test Mr Meredith on his second thesis that Jesus was the Creator and LORD God of the OT.</p>
<p><i>Why?</i></p> <p>Why should professing Christian leaders be afraid of the fact that the One who became Jesus Christ pre-existed with God the Father from eternity? That He was the God of the Old Testament—the God who spoke to Abraham and Moses—the God of David, the One who actually spoke the Ten Commandments? Why be fearful of these clear biblical teachings? We will explain the dark origins of this fear later on. But first, we need to understand the genuine origin of Jesus Christ—the One who died for our sins. Who was Jesus Christ, really? Where did He come from? Why is His life so valuable as to constitute a payment for all of our lives—<i>billions</i> of us—put together? The truth about this topic is very important to understand. And it is truly inspiring!</p>	<p>The answer is simple: <i>Human church tradition</i> is preferred to God’s Truth to avoid admitting error.</p> <p>These two paragraphs require no comment because Mr Meredith is assuming as valid his second thesis that Jesus was the Creator and LORD God of the OT. It should by now be obvious to the reader that this thesis not only stands on very shaky grounds but has no ground to stand on!</p>
<p><i>The Origins of Jesus Christ</i></p>	
<p>The Apostle John makes it clear that the One who became Jesus Christ existed from eternity: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with</p>	

<i>Text of Mr Meredith’s Article</i>	<i>Henk Jens’ Critical Comments</i>
<p>God. All things were made through Him, and without Him nothing was made that was made” (John 1:1–3).</p> <p>Here John points out that the Word—the Logos or Spokesman—had been with God from the beginning. He was the creative agent—acting for God the Father in making everything that is. Later: “He was in the world, and the world was made through Him, and the world did not know Him. He came to His own, and His own did not receive Him. But as many as received Him, to them He gave the right to become children of God, to those who believe in His name” (vv. 10–12).</p>	<p>Mr Meredith claims from John 1:3, “<i>All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made</i>” that the Word (Jesus) was the Creator.</p> <p>In this Mr Meredith overlooks that John 1:3 contains a serious mistranslation to support Jesus having been the Creator.</p> <p>In John 1:3 the English verb “made” is used three times (see underlined <i>made</i> above) to translate the Greek verb ‘ginomai’ (Strong # 1096) but which Greek verb does not even remotely have the meaning ‘to make’! Rather it means ‘to become’ or ‘to come into being’.</p> <p>Most English translations render John 1:3 similar to the KJV but some give a more correct rendering. For example, Bullinger in the side notes to John 1:3 of <i>The Companion Bible</i> and Rotherham in his <i>Emphasized Bible</i>.</p> <p>If John 1:3 did indeed support Jesus being the Creator than we would have a self-contradictory Bible in the face of the previously examined Acts 4:24-27 and modern translations of Ephesians 3:9.</p> <p>John 1:3 has been mistranslated and read out of context of the Bible’s overall message. For an explanation the reader should read Section 4.1 of paper P2, <i>God the Father was the Creator and Husband of Israel</i>, at my home page.</p>
<p>In several scriptures the inspired Apostle Paul makes the same point.</p>	<p>Mr Meredith now quotes several NT scriptures which, when read superficially, seem to support that Jesus was the Creator God of the OT.</p> <p>I have already dealt with the falsified Eph 3:9 (KJV) but which originally revealed that God the Father was the Creator. We will see similar problems with the other verses cited by Mr Meredith and that therefore he fails to prove his thesis that Jesus was the Creator and LORD God of the OT.</p> <p>Although I briefly examine these verses, for a fuller explanations the reader should study my paper, P2, <i>God the Father is the Creator and Husband of Israel</i> at my Internet home page</p>
<p>In Colossians 1:15–16, Paul speaks of Jesus Christ: “He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn over all creation. For by Him all things were created that are in heaven and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers. All things were created through Him and for Him.”</p>	<p>In paper P2 Section 4.3 I show that Colossians 1:16 is a mistranslation, admitted by several authorities. Had Mr Meredith not been convinced his second thesis is correct, he may have examined this verse more carefully.</p>
<p>And the book of Hebrews tells us that God, “has in these last days spoken to us by His Son, whom He has appointed heir of all things, through whom also He</p>	<p>Here Mr Meredith focuses on Heb 1:2b which with “... <i>through whom (Jesus) also He (Father) made the worlds</i>” seems to say that Jesus was the Creator.</p>

<i>Text of Mr Meredith's Article</i>	<i>Henk Jens' Critical Comments</i>
<p>made the worlds" (Hebrews 1:2).</p>	<p>First note that the Greek does not refer to the physical worlds but to ages (aeons Strong # 165). Since other scriptures show that God the Father was the creator of all things (e.g. Paul's original autograph of Eph 3:9 and Luke's Acts 4:24 & 27, we may not conclude from Heb 1:2b that Jesus was the Creator, else the Bible would be self-contradictory. Rather we should recognize that God the Father could create Adam and Eve only because Jesus had agreed to become man's atoning Passover Lamb and this opened the ages up for mankind to live.</p>
<p>And again, "But to the Son He says: 'Your throne, O God, is forever and ever; a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of Your Kingdom'" (v. 8).</p>	<p>This verse does not state that Jesus is the Creator.</p>
<p>And finally, "You, Lord, in the beginning laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Your hands" (v. 10).</p>	<p>Here Mr Meredith appeals to Hebrews 1:10, which he claims shows that Jesus was the Creator. I deal with this verse in Section 4.5 of my paper P2, <i>God the Father is the Creator and Husband of Israel</i>. There I show that although Hebrews 1:10 (KJV) quotes Ps 102:25 it does not quote this properly. Let us put these verses side by side: Heb 1:10, And, Thou, Lord in the beginning has laid the foundations of the earth..... Ps 102:25, Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: Notice the word "Lord" occurs in both the Greek NT and the KJV for Heb 1:10 but this does not occur in Ps 102:25 (KJV). This tells us there is a problem – probably related to the Greek Septuagint. Anyway in Ps 102, we can identify who is referred to in verse 25 by going back to verse 22, which refers to the OT LORD God and this I have shown is God the Father. Therefore Mr Meredith is mistaken that Heb 1:10 (KJV) supports his claim that Jesus is the Creator.</p>
<p>Note that in verse 8 above, Christ is addressed, "O God." He is described as the One who "made the worlds" (v 2) and who laid the foundation of the earth" (v 10). There is absolutely no indication that any of these verses written by Paul or John were poetic or metaphorical! They simple state the fact that the Personality who became Jesus Christ was in the beginning" with the Father, that He was the "Word" or Spokesman for the Father and that all things were directly created through Him, Jesus Christ!</p>	<p>Mr Meredith here repeats himself and I have already dealt with Hebrew 1:2, 8 and 10. However let us read them in context and correctly taking note of the Greek text and whether this was falsified or mistranslated. Mr Meredith accepts mainstream's versions which happened to suit his own thesis and mainstream's post-Apostolic teaching that Jesus was the Creator. For example, had Mr Meredith read Heb 1:1 and 2a, he should know that God the Father was his own word (spokesman) to the OT fathers (through the prophets) and that Jesus became the Word of God only in NT times.</p>
<p>How did all this come about?</p>	<p>With this Mr Meredith enters a very wrong line by</p>

<i>Text of Mr Meredith's Article</i>	<i>Henk Jens' Critical Comments</i>
	<p>claiming that 'God' (Hebrew 'Elohim', Strong #430) in Genesis 1:26 is a plural Hebrew noun which it is not!</p> <p>Trinitarians claim that Elohim is a plural noun because that suits their 3-Person Godhead. It also suited HWA because he adopted a kind of 2-Person Godhead consisting of Father and his Son ("<i>God is a Family</i>"). Better would be to say instead, "<i>God the Father has a Family</i>" to avoid any suggestion of there being a pseudo monotheist Godhead!</p>
<p>Turning to Genesis 1:1, we read, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." All scholars know that the Hebrew word here translated God is "Elohim," a plural noun—like church or family—as would signify one family with several members.</p> <p>And now notice Genesis 1:26, "Then God said, 'Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.'"</p> <p>Note that God said, "Let Us make man in Our image." So the Father and the Logos or "Word"—who later was born as Jesus of Nazareth—were both included here. Acting for the One we call God the "Father," the One who became Jesus Christ was used by the Father from the beginning in dealing with mankind.</p>	<p>Contrary to Mr Meredith's claim that "all scholars know" that Hebrew 'Elohim' is a plural noun, the leading Hebraists point out that throughout the Hebrew OT 'Elohim', in reference to the true God of Israel, behaves always as a singular noun, which governs only singular Hebrew verbs and singular Hebrew pronouns.</p> <p>In other words 'Elohim' in reference to the God of Israel denotes always a single God Person.</p> <p>To illustrate this consider Genesis 1:26, "<i>And God said...</i>". Although we can not tell whether the English verb "said" is singular or plural and therefore we can not tell whether the English subject noun God (Hebrew Elohim) is singular or plural, it is different in Hebrew. The Hebrew verb for "said" is singular and so the Hebrew subject noun Elohim (God) is singular.</p> <p>Therefore contrary to Mr Meredith's claim the Hebrew 'Elohim' (God) is singular and denotes always a single God Person. This is consistently so in Genesis chapter 1 and indeed throughout the OT.</p> <p>It is true that both God the Father and Jesus are involved in Genesis 1:26 but it was God the Father who addressed his fellow God Jesus with, "<i>Let us make man in our image...</i>". The One speaking, God (Elohim) is just one God Person (Father), who spoke to his fellow God (Jesus).</p> <p>This was Jesus' last opportunity to withdraw from becoming man's atoning Passover Lamb. God the Father needed Jesus' agreement to be man's atoning Passover Lamb since man's fall was inevitable.</p> <p>That explains NT verses such as John 1:3, which should read: "<i>All things through him came to be, and without him came to be, not one thing that which came into being</i>" rather than the KJV's, "<i>All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made</i>" (the verb "made" being a gross mistranslation).</p> <p>Although God Father was the Creator, he could create only after Jesus' agreed to be mankind's Passover Lamb.</p> <p>That indeed it was God the Father who addressed his fellow God, Jesus, with "<i>Let us make man in our image...</i>" can be shown by tracing the ongoing God</p>

<i>Text of Mr Meredith’s Article</i>	<i>Henk Jens’ Critical Comments</i>
	<p>statements throughout Genesis chapters 1, 2 and 3 till we come to Genesis 3:15.</p> <p>In Gen 3:15 this same LORD God said to the Serpent, “<i>And I (Father) will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed (Jesus); it shall bruise thy head, and thou (Serpent) shalt bruise his (Jesus’) heel.</i>”</p> <p>Therefore we know that it was God the Father who spoke to the Serpent because he referred to Jesus’ heel as “<u>his</u> heel”. Had, as Mr Meredith claims, Jesus been speaking to the Serpent, then he would have said “<u>my</u> heel” rather than “<u>his</u> heel”.</p> <p>It is therefore plain that the Creator God (Elohim – singular!) was God the Father and not Jesus! Therefore ‘God’ in Genesis 1:26 was God the Father speaking to his fellow God, who became the NT Jesus.</p>
<p>We see this also in Genesis 18. Here the Logos appeared to Abraham. He did <i>not</i> appear in His full glory in dealing with Abraham, Moses and others, but more in human form—yet apparently with a “difference” so that Abraham recognized that he was dealing with the “Lord” (vv. 3, 27). After the Eternal had explained to Abraham His intent to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah because of their perverted sins, Abraham asked, “Shall not the <i>Judge</i> of all the earth do right?” (v. 25).</p>	<p>Mr Meredith being unaware that God the Father was the LORD God of the OT continues with the same error by assuming the Logos or Word or Jesus spoke to Abraham.</p> <p>Actually Mr Meredith errs because it is not “Lord” but “LORD” in Gen 18:3 and in 27. These are 2 of the 134 instances where the Sopherim altered JHVH (LORD Strong #3068) to Adonai. LORD (JHVH) denotes <i>The Eternal</i> who can only be God the Father.</p> <p>Note that Mr Meredith refers to Him as the Eternal and yet claims He was Jesus. As explained above, once Jesus became man’s Passover Lamb, only God the Father remains as <i>The Eternal</i> because Jesus was dead for three days and three nights.</p>
<p>Here Abraham was certainly dealing with the One who became Jesus Christ! For Christ Himself revealed later, “For the Father judges no one, but has committed all judgment to the Son” (John 5:22).</p> <p>Abraham was certainly <i>not</i> dealing with God the Father. For the inspired Word also tells us, “<i>No one</i> has seen God at any time” (John 1:18).</p>	<p>Yes Abraham referred to the Eternal (Father) as the judge of all earth. Indeed God the Father was the Creator and so the possessor of all things (Gen 14:19) and therefore was the judge of all things in OT times.</p> <p>Note how Jesus said in Matthew 28:18, “<i>All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth</i>”. So apparently things changed after Jesus completed his mission as man’s Passover Lamb.</p> <p>I have already addressed the question of no man having heard or seen God the Father. Now Mr Meredith appeals to John 1:18 that no man – including Abraham! – has seen God at any time. That is correct because mortal man lacks the senses with which to truly see or hear spirit beings. God and angels have to manifest themselves as similitudes before we can discern them. So indeed no man has truly seen the full glory of God. Not even Moses, who was shown only a small glimpse of God the Father after God placed him in a cleft in the rock and covered him as God passed by (Exod 33:22)</p> <p>There is a lot more to hearing and seeing God and for that the reader may like to read my paper P10, <i>How God the Father Was Seen and Heard!</i></p>

<i>Text of Mr Meredith’s Article</i>	<i>Henk Jens’ Critical Comments</i>
<p>Jesus Himself said: “‘Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day, and he saw it and was glad.’ Then the Jews said to Him, ‘You are not yet fifty years old, and have You seen Abraham?’ Jesus said to them, ‘Most assuredly, I say to you, before Abraham was, I AM’” (John 8:56–58). The Jews recognized that the expression “I AM” referred to the God of Israel. They thought that Jesus was both lying and blaspheming. So “then they took up stones to throw at Him” (v. 59). These Jews were blinded to the fact that Jesus had been the very Personality who had been the God of Abraham, Isaac and Israel! They were standing right there talking to the One who was their God! And they did not know it.</p>	<p>Mr Meredith now appeals to the NT-OT “I AM” link from John 8:58 to Exodus 3:14 to identify Jesus as the God who spoke to Moses from the Burning Bush. I have dealt with this above and there showed this is not a valid NT-OT link to identify Jesus with the LORD God of Exodus.</p>
<p><i>Christ Was the “God of Israel”</i></p>	
<p>In Matthew 22:42–45, Jesus challenged the religious leaders: “‘What do you think about the Christ? Whose Son is He?’ They said to Him, ‘The Son of David.’ He said to them, ‘How then does David in the Spirit call Him “Lord,” saying: “The LORD said to my Lord, ‘Sit at My right hand, till I make Your enemies Your footstool’”? If David then calls Him “Lord,” how is He his Son?’” The Pharisees were not able to answer. For they knew that King David of Israel certainly had no human “lord.” This scripture had to be describing two personalities in God’s Family—one greater than the other. And, as should be obvious to us, David’s immediate “Lord”—the one who later became Jesus of Nazareth—was told to sit at the right hand of the Father until it was time for Him to become King of kings. Yet the Jews knew that the coming Messiah was to be a literal “son of David.” How could this one also be David’s “Lord” yet having a still “greater” Lord telling Him what to do?</p>	<p>In Matthew 22:24-45 Jesus quotes Ps 110:1, “<i>The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool</i>”</p> <p>Although the KJV gives the identical sounding “LORD” and “Lord” these have significant different meanings. The all-capitals “LORD” (Strong # 3068, Hebrew JHVH) means, “<i>The Eternal</i>” or “<i>The Self-Existing One</i>”, who, as shown earlier, can only be <i>God the Father</i>. But the form “<i>Lord</i>” (Strong #113, Hebrew Adonai) means “Master” or “Lord”.</p> <p>Therefore Ps 110:1 identifies “LORD” as the OT most high God, whom Jesus called his Father. Since in John 14:28 Jesus said, “<i>My Father is greater than I</i>”, he declared his Father to be the most high LORD God of the OT.</p> <p>Note that Jesus never identified himself as the most high LORD God of the OT but always as His Son: but even that incensed the Jews (John 5:18).</p> <p>Also note in Genesis 22:16 that the LORD God of the OT told Abraham he had sworn by himself and that Paul explained in Hebrews 6:13, that this was because the LORD God had no one greater to swear by. Again it is clear that it was God the Father who spoke and swore by himself to Abraham because had it been Jesus, then he could have sworn by God the Father!</p>
<p>In 1 Corinthians 10:1–4, we read that ancient Israel was baptized into Moses and they all “ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink. For they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ.”</p>	<p>Here Mr Meredith makes several errors which I explain in detail in Section 4.7 of paper P2, “<i>God the Father is the Creator and Husband of Israel!</i>” but here only brief explanations can be given.</p> <p>1 Cor 10:4, “<i>...Rock that followed them and that Rock was Christ</i>”. First the pronoun “them” does not occur in the Greek and indeed it is preposterous to think that Jesus would have followed Israel for surely had Jesus been the God of Exodus, he would have led Israel</p>

<i>Text of Mr Meredith's Article</i>	<i>Henk Jens' Critical Comments</i>
<p>Again, it is clear—as a number of commentaries acknowledge—that the same Spirit Personality who dealt with ancient Israel was the One who became Christ.</p> <p>For, as we have seen, Jesus said that “no one” had ever seen “God”—obviously meaning the One we call the Father. Yet right after giving the Ten Commandments and some of the statutes to ancient Israel, we find that the “God of Israel” did indeed appear to some of Israel’s leaders! “Then Moses went up, also Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, and they saw the God of Israel. And there was under His feet as it were a paved work of sapphire stone, and it was like the very heavens in its clarity. But on the nobles of the children of Israel He did not lay His hand. So they saw God, and they ate and drank” (Exodus 24:9–11). So more than 70 of the leaders of Israel “<i>saw</i> the God of Israel.”</p> <p>Could anything be more clear?</p> <p>It was the One who became Jesus Christ who literally walked and talked with Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden.</p> <p>He was the One who dealt directly with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. He was the One who spoke “face to face” with Moses (Numbers 12:8). He was the One who spoke the Ten Commandments from the top of Mount Sinai!</p>	<p>(Exod 13:21) rather than followed. Therefore let us not read into this that Jesus was the God of Exodus when so many scriptures attest this was God the Father!</p> <p>The Rock referred to is indeed Jesus but this followed in time the church in the wilderness as Jesus preceded in time the NT church.</p> <p>Consider the various symbols given in 1 Cor 10:1-4. First Israel’s national baptism in the Red Sea (verse 2). Then the symbols of meat and drink which refer to the NT Passover symbols that point to Jesus as our Rock (verses 3-4).</p> <p>Jesus as man’s Passover Lamb “followed” the church in the wilderness ‘in time’: just as he preceded the NT Church in time. Jesus was not as a leader who had lost his way and become a follower.</p> <p>Unfortunately Mr Meredith fails to give references and I distrust the pronouncements on God by the commentaries of Trinitarian Christendom.</p> <p>That not Jesus but God the Father was the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Israel follows from Peter’s declaration in Acts 3:13, “<i>The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus...</i>”. How clear that Peter understood that the God of the OT fathers was God the Father!</p> <p>Mr Meredith needs to work with greater precision. I explained above what Jesus meant when saying in John 5:37 that no one had heard and seen his Father.</p> <p>This is not correct as may be seen from my earlier discussion of Gen 3:15, which shows that God the Father spoke to Adam, Eve and the Serpent.</p> <p>How can it be when Peter identifies in Acts 3:13 God the Father as “<i>The God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob</i>” that Mr Meredith insists that Jesus is this God?</p> <p>Notice how Mr Meredith misleads himself with half-truths without being aware that he does this. I agree with him that the God who dealt with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob was also the One who spoke face to face with Moses and was the One who spoke the Ten</p>

<i>Text of Mr Meredith's Article</i>	<i>Henk Jens' Critical Comments</i>
	Commandments, he still has to prove that he was the NT Jesus. Indeed Acts 3:13 with Exodus 3:6 show that he was not Jesus but God the Father.
<i>WHY Is This Truth So Seldom Acknowledged?</i>	Could it be because Christendom is confused over the matter? For example, Christendom's Apostles' and Nicene Creeds state that God the Father is the Creator but the KJV's translation of John 1:3 and of Ephesians 3:9 convey that Jesus is the Creator.
<p>When you understand that last sentence in the paragraph above, you can begin to grasp why so many professing priests and ministers shy away from explaining the real origin of Jesus Christ. For they have nearly all been taught that the Ten Commandments were a product of some harsh "God of the Old Testament" and that Jesus somehow "knew better" than His Father. In many cases they say, instead, that somehow the Apostle Paul "knew better" than either Jesus or the Father—and that he did away with God's law, the Ten Commandments.</p> <p>These misguided men may be sincere. But they are "blinded" (2 Corinthians 4:3–4)—as is the whole world. Remember Jesus' instruction about most of the religious leaders of His own day: "Let them alone. They are blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind leads the blind, both will fall into a ditch" (Matthew 15:14).</p>	<p>I accept that Mr Meredith is sincerely mistaken that Jesus was the Creator and LORD God of the OT.</p>
<p>It is embarrassing—to men who have been taught that the Ten Commandments were "done away"—to admit that it was the One who became Jesus Christ who gave the Ten Commandments in codified form to Moses. He is the One who commanded, as an integral part of God's great spiritual law: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days you shall labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God. In it you shall do no work: you, nor your son, nor your daughter, nor your male servant, nor your female servant, nor your cattle, nor your stranger who is within your gates. For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it" (Exodus 20:8–11).</p>	<p>It must be just as embarrassing to Mr Meredith to be shown that it was God the Father who gave Israel the Ten Commandments, including the 7th-day Sabbath commandment.</p> <p>In some ways it wouldn't matter who had given the Ten Commandments because Jesus said that he and the Father are agreed as one. Jesus explained at length to his disciples that there was no need for him to show the Father because having known him sufficed.</p>
<p>Most ministers today do understand that God, through Christ, specifically commanded His people to keep the seventh day—not just any day. They know that during His entire human lifetime Jesus kept the seventh-day Sabbath—the same day the other Jews were observing! And they probably also realize that the original Apostles kept the seventh-day Sabbath. Along with scores of other respected scholars, mainstream Protestant church historian Jesse Lyman Hurlbut acknowledges: "As long as the church was mainly Jewish, the Hebrew sabbath was kept" (The Story of</p>	<p>Mr Meredith here states the 7th-day Sabbath truth but this does not support his thesis that Jesus was the Creator and LORD God of the OT. After all God the Father gave the Ten Commandments and was the Creator who rested on the 7th day.</p>

<i>Text of Mr Meredith’s Article</i>	<i>Henk Jens’ Critical Comments</i>
the Christian Church, p. 45).	
<p>Again, most ministers understand that the inspired writer of Hebrews tells us, “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever” (Hebrews 13:8). And they know that neither Christ nor the Apostles ever attempted to “do away” with the biblical Sabbath. If they had made such an attempt to overthrow such a major precept coming from the very hand of God, the Jews surrounding them would have rioted, persecuted them unmercifully, not allowed them to continue worshiping in the Temple as they did for many years, and would quickly have proclaimed them heretics and lawless.</p> <p>The enormous upheaval that would have ensued from such an action would have made the Jewish upset over circumcision—described in Acts 15—seem like a “tea party” by comparison!</p>	Mr Meredith continues stating the Sabbath truth but fails to support his untenable thesis that Jesus was the Creator and LORD God of the OT.
<p>Of course, no such change in God’s great spiritual <i>law</i> was ever discussed or instituted by Christ or the Apostles. For a quarter of a century after Jesus’ crucifixion, and after the Holy Spirit had come upon the early Church to guide it, the original Christians were still “zealous” for the <i>law</i> (Acts 21:20). Even the Apostle Paul was still obedient to the spiritual law of God, the Ten Commandments. For notice the inspired account of the instruction given by “headquarters” Apostle James to Paul: “...this will let everyone know there is no truth in the reports they have heard about you, and that you too observe the Law by your way of life” (Acts 21:24, <i>The New Jerusalem Bible</i>).</p>	Mr Meredith continues stating the truth about the law being upheld by the apostles but this does not support his thesis that Jesus was the Creator and LORD God of the OT.
<p><i>The Logical Consequence of This TRUTH</i></p>	<p>By “This Truth” Mr Meredith means his second thesis that Jesus was the OT LORD God who gave the Ten Commandments to Israel. The consequences being that Christians ought to obey Jesus’ commandments.</p> <p>It should be clear to the reader that Mr Meredith’s second thesis is untenable. It should be noted how Mr Meredith denies his second thesis several times in the following paragraphs without realizing this!</p>
<p>If all professing Christians were taught the truth—that the One who became their Savior is the One who gave the Ten Commandments—perhaps their actions would be quite different. The world would surely be a much safer place! All would realize that true Christianity is a law-abiding religion—a way of life based on the great spiritual law of God. They would learn that—although no one is suddenly perfect, and we are commanded to grow in Christ’s character—it is possible to follow Christ’s inspired example through His Spirit within us.</p>	Indeed the spiritual law of God (the Father!)
As the Apostle Paul wrote: “I am crucified with Christ:	

<i>Text of Mr Meredith's Article</i>	<i>Henk Jens' Critical Comments</i>
<p>nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me" (Galatians 2:20, KJV).</p> <p>Christians would then understand the beloved Apostle John's explanation of the very love of God and how it functions: "For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments. And His commandments are not burdensome" (1 John 5:3).</p> <p>They would read with new understanding John's inspired statement in Revelation 14:12: "Here is the patience of the saints; here are those who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus."</p>	<p>Let us read all of 1 John 5:1-3 (KJV) and not just verse 3 as Mr Meredith suggests, "¹<i>By this we love the children of God, when we love God</i> ²<i>By this we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments.</i> ³<i>For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous.</i>"</p> <p>Verses 1 and 2 make it plain that the God John refers to has children and therefore can only be God the Father. Therefore in verse 3, quoted by Mr Meredith, the commandments of God are the Commandments of God the Father!</p> <p>OK I know that Mr Meredith's comeback is likely to be that God the Father gave the commandments through Jesus but this he is unable to show from the Bible. Indeed my following comment rejects such a comeback.</p> <p>Note Mr Meredith's quote of Rev 14:12 identifies the Commandments as being of God and the faith required being that of Jesus.</p> <p>Let us look into this.</p> <p>What is the faith of Jesus? He trusted his fellow God to restore him from the grave to his former glorious spirit Life. We have to have the same faith in God the Father as had Jesus because God has promised that we will be resurrected from the grave. However the Commandments are God's and not Jesus' as is plain from Rev 14:12 but we know that Jesus agrees with his Father's commandments and indeed brought the message that these are to be raised to the spirit plane for Christians!</p>
<p>The true Christ revealed clearly in the Bible co-existed with the Father from eternity.</p> <p>He and the Father planned together the creation of mankind.</p> <p>Speaking for Himself and the Father, the Logos—who became Christ—said, "Let Us make man in Our image." Then, about 4,000 years later, the Logos was willing to give up the indescribable glory, power and majesty He had always shared with the Father.</p>	<p>Yes I agree with Mr Meredith's first thesis.</p> <p>But this is where Mr Meredith goes off the rails.</p> <p>It is the Father who had the Plan (Word) and this He put to his fellow God, who is the NT Jesus. Jesus' contribution was to agree being made God the Father's NT Word and mankind's atoning Passover Lamb.</p> <p>Therefore God the Father's contribution was his Plan for mankind's incredible potential to be born again as perfected literal spirit children of God in God the Father's Family.</p> <p>Jesus' contribution was equally impressive albeit of a different type. He surrendered for all future eternity his Self-existent Godship (divinity) to become and die as mankind's atoning Passover Lamb and to become</p>

<i>Text of Mr Meredith's Article</i>	<i>Henk Jens' Critical Comments</i>
	<p>an obedient Son to his former fellow God. Few have understood the full enormity of Jesus' sacrifice.</p> <p>Note that the Plan (Word) was with God from a beginning (John 1:1). Also that Hebrews 1:1 states that God (Father) put his own Plan (Word) to Israel through the OT prophets (starting with Moses). Further that Hebrews 1:2a reveals that <u>only</u> in NT times did God send his Plan (Word) through Jesus.</p> <p>This last point agrees with God the Father telling Moses in Deut 18:18, <i>"I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him."</i></p> <p>By writing <i>"He and the Father planned together..."</i> Mr Meredith seeks to persuade the reader that the God who said in Gen 1:26, <i>"Let us make man..."</i> was Jesus. Yet the reader has seen that I showed from Gen 3:15 that this God was God the Father. Post-apostolic Christendom has not understood John 1:1-3 and it seems that Mr Meredith is no exception.</p>
<p>As correctly translated, Paul tells us that Christ "emptied" Himself, "taking the form of a bondservant, and coming in the likeness of men. And being found in appearance as a man, He humbled Himself and became obedient to the point of death, even the death of the cross. Therefore God also has highly exalted Him and given Him the name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those in heaven, and of those on earth, and of those under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (Philippians 2:7-11).</p> <p>Jesus said, "I and My Father are one" (John 10:30). So the One who had been totally "one" with God—and who was God—"emptied Himself" to become our Savior. Truly His life is worth more than all of ours combined, because He created not only the human race, but the entire universe as well. Having bought and paid for us by His death on the cross, Christ now doubly "owns" us.</p> <p>He is our Maker. He is our God. He is our Master.</p>	<p>I have made it abundantly clear that it does not follow that Jesus was our Maker.</p>
<p>Yet after the death of the original Apostles, a great apostasy took over the name of "Christianity." The clear teachings and examples of Christ and the Apostles began to be altered. The very concept of Christ being a real "Master" began to be undone and permanently altered. He came to be considered a "Lord" who demanded no obedience to the very spiritual law—the Ten Commandments—that He had given mankind.</p>	<p>Mr Meredith continues mixing biblical truth with his unbiblical second thesis.</p>

<i>Text of Mr Meredith's Article</i>	<i>Henk Jens' Critical Comments</i>
<p>His clear and persistent teaching, “if you want to enter into life, keep the commandments” (Matthew 19:17), was now explained away as instruction only for the Jews. So also were dismissed the powerful statements of the Apostle John such as, “He who says, ‘I know Him,’ and does not keep His commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him” (1 John 2:4). These clear statements were explained away as applying only to the “spirit” of the law or to some “new” commandments of Jesus. But when you study these new commandments, they are only magnifications of the Ten Commandments, which Jesus Himself gave on Mount Sinai!</p> <p>And again, “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever” (Hebrews 13:8).</p>	<p>Let us bear in mind that OT Israel did not receive God’s holy spirit and so was unable to obey God’s Ten Commandments at the spirit level to which Jesus raised these in the Sermon on the Mount. For example, it sufficed if an OT Israelite did not commit actual adultery but Christians must not even lust after a woman in their mind’s eye.</p> <p>When Israel refused to listen in future to God the Father after He gave the Ten Commandments (Exod 20:19), Israel cut herself off from his Plan (Word). However, in Deut 18:15-19 God the Father told Moses he would send a Prophet (Jesus) with his Plan (Word). This Word Jesus as the Gospel of the Kingdom of God.</p> <p>Of course Jesus is the same today and yesterday because He agreed with his Father’s Plan (Word) and brought this to the NT church (Heb 1:2a).</p>
<p>May God help all of you who read this to <i>understand</i> and to respond to the true Jesus Christ of the Bible. As He said, “<i>Why</i> do you call Me ‘Lord, Lord,’ and not do the things which I say?” (Luke 6:46). If you really want to obey the Christ of the Bible, write us today and request your <i>free</i> copy of our very revealing and fully documented booklet entitled, <i>Which Day is the Christian Sabbath?</i></p>	<p>And may God help those, who read my critical comments, to know who is God the Father.</p> <p>If the reader really wants to obey the God of the Bible and his Christ, then learning about the Sabbath is not a bad start</p> <p>But remember that we must live by every word of God (Matt 4:4).</p> <p>In Matthew 4:4 Jesus points Satan to the OT Word of God the Father. Note that Jesus did not refer Satan to his own OT Word but to God the Father’s OT Word. This is confirmed by Hebrews 1:1, which declares that the Father was his own Word in OT times and Hebrews 1:2a reveals that Jesus became his Father’s Word only in NT times. Therefore Hebrews 1:2a is in accordance with Deut 18:18!</p>
<p>We at <i>Tomorrow’s World</i> are involved in restoring original Christianity—the religion that Jesus and the Apostles actually taught and practiced. We can assure you that the living Jesus Christ—the One who existed with the Father from eternity—is the One who will guide you, strengthen you and bless you if you determine to do what He says and worship Him not only as Savior, but as Lord and Master now and forever.</p>	<p>Let us see if Mr Meredith and his ministers indeed are committed to restoring Apostolic Christianity and will sincerely examine this Critique of Mr Meredith’s article. For example, will Mr Meredith examine that God the Father can not be a single Father who begot his Son ‘incestuously’ through his Son’s Wife Israel by Mary, which is an inevitable consequence of Mr Meredith’s untenable second thesis.</p>

IN CONCLUSION

It has been shown that Mr Meredith’s second thesis, that Jesus was the Creator and LORD God of the OT is untenable and that instead God the Father was the Creator, the LORD God of the OT and Husband of Israel.

REFERENCES:

The following papers are referred to above:

- P2 *God the Father is the Creator and Husband of Israel!*
- P5 *The Bible Shows Jesus Was A Self-Existent God*
- P10 *How God the Father Was Seen and Heard!*
- Q6 *Quick Guide To God the Father Being The God of Exodus*
- Q7 *Quick Guide To God the Father's O.T. Identity*
- A2 *How can God be unmarried and yet be a Father with a Family? – Part 1*
- A3 *How can God be unmarried and yet be a Father with a Family? - Part 2*

These may be downloaded from www.rightly-dividing.net or requested in writing from:
Henk Jens, P.O. Box 121, Belmore, 2192, NSW, Australia.

–oOo–

Issue 1.1, May 9, 2009 Heading over table columns made more prominent.